

wards, at which Sir John and Lady Macdonald, Hon. Thos. White and other distinguished guests were also present.

PRESBYTERY NOTES.

In the interests of closer oversight of an extended field, a division of the Presbytery in the near future is by several of the missionaries deemed advisable. It is almost impossible for those in the remote West to attend meetings at the present seat of Presbytery, and still less can the Eastern brethren be expected to travel five or six hundred miles west to suit the convenience of a few fields in the shadow of the Rocky Mountains.

The recently-issued map of Manitoba and the North-West Territories—even if it does misplace some rivers and trails in the Alberta district and spell "Principal Meridian" as "*Principle* Meridian" every time—will give the Church in the East a better idea of the mission work in this Presbytery at date than any number of columns of descriptions.

The same map will show, eloquently, the need that this Presbytery at any rate has of just such an office as that of the Superintendent of Missions. From Moosomin, east of the second principal meridian, to the left-hand end of the map is three-quarters of the length of the whole map; but the Presbytery of Regina covers all this ground and, in virtue of its mountain mission, runs considerably further west than the map has room for. How are a few scattered missionaries, who cannot even get together in Presbytery on account of distance and expense, to go travelling about visiting new fields, watching the progress of settlement, planting new stations, building new churches?

VANCOUVER CITY AND CHURCH.

The following extracts from a letter just received from Mr. Thomson by the Convener of the Home Mission Committee will be read with interest. Any of our readers who have not yet sent help to this most needy congregation, who can do so, will, we are sure, at once respond.

MY DEAR DR. COCHRANE,—I have been so busy for the past four weeks I really have had no time for writing, at any rate my hands have been so stiff at night I had no inclination to do so. On the 29th June I spoke to three or four men, and asked them to come with me and help me to clear off the rubbish from the church ground. It seemed to be a new thing on the Pacific coast to be asked by a minister to do such work that they fell in with it at once. We got shovels, picks and all necessary tools, and in three days the ground was cleared—graded, and posts in the ground for the foundation of a church. I drew a plan, got a carpenter to fix an estimate of the lumber required, went to the lumberyard and ordered all the material required for a building 60 x 35 feet, with 20 foot ceiling. I went round to all the teamsters, and got them to haul it on to the ground. I got carpenters to come and work without pay, except thanks. I have worked every day on it myself since hammering, sawing, carrying boards, etc., and urging the men to work, and last Sabbath, 25th July, six weeks after the fire, I preached in it twice. It was a real *church opening*, neither windows nor doors were in. To-morrow, 31st July, it will be complete, except plastering and painting inside. It is nicely painted outside, the work of it gratuitous too. I am truly glad to be in our own building again. Had I called a congregational meeting to discuss what to do, very likely they would have decided to do nothing, "till we see if we get help from the East." Having nothing left themselves they would not incur the risk of building, and the result would be our people would scatter. I thought best to take the whole responsibility, and, having no building committee, I had no one to thwart my purposes. I had perfect confidence the Church at home would send the necessary help. It might not seem very decorous for a minister to be digging and doing rough carpenters' work, but decorous or no, I have felt all through that I was practically magnifying my office and serving the Lord. I have a church now (we call it the "Presbyterian Hall"), and had I not done as I have said, I would not have had one for months yet, and the cause would have suffered. I have given my own note for \$350 to pay for some of the materials, and have paid out what Dr. Reid sent me. I may have to give another note. I hope not, but trust money will come from the East in time to pay for

the material as it becomes due. Vancouver may soon be so far recovered from the effects of the fire as to stand alone—then separation from North Arm will require to take effect. There is plenty of work for one man in the North Arm field, and I think it would in a year be self sustaining. The church at North Arm was opened on 4th July; a very neat church, 46 x 28 feet, complete with a very nice spire. Its whole cost, with furnishings, is about \$2,000, and opened entirely free of debt. The opening collection was handed to me next day to help me with the Vancouver Church, which is one evidence of the bond of sympathy between the two congregations.

Business is very dull here just now. A large amount of building is going on. There has been a reckless quantity of liquor licenses. A part of another body was found yesterday supposed to be that of some one who had fled to the woods from the fire. There was nothing left of the body but part of the leg and foot one boot; no one has any idea of whom it was, or what became of the rest of the body. I fear many in the excitement fled to the woods and died there.

Our Presbytery meets on Tuesday, 3rd August. Mrs. Thomson is much better, but suffers still a little from the excitement of the 13th. She has never felt lonely in British Columbia till now. The little house we have is anything but comfortable and my being away every day at the church building makes her feel more so. With regard to the suggestion of one of your lady members as to increasing Mrs. Thomson's wardrobe, let me say we both brought sufficient clothing with us to do for three years. Mrs. Thomson had nearly the whole of hers burned, having very little left. She wishes me to say that she is exceedingly thankful for the kindly remembrance of her in her loss, but none of the ladies here have very much to wear. The wardrobe of all is reduced, so by the time others are able to dress better, Mrs. Thomson may be able to replenish hers. She feels at giving any one trouble, or causing expense on her behalf, and would as soon just be doing with what she has left. Nevertheless, she feels exceedingly grateful to her lady friends who have thought of her, and especially to yourself for your kindness. Allow me to thank you for remittance of \$26 50, and also \$60 which I have acknowledged in THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN. This will be a great help. If I find it is not really needed for the church building we will use it for ourselves. We certainly need it, but we need the church first. Ours is the only place of worship here now. May the Lord preserve it to us. With my best wishes and thanks for acts of kindness and sympathy, I am yours very faithfully,

THOMAS G. THOMSON.

THE LATER CHRISTIAN FATHERS.

BY REV. T. F. FOTHERINGHAM, ST. JOHN, N. B.

According to Cyprian's evidence then, his presbyters were competent to perform all the functions of his office during his absence. The presbyters of Rome were of the same opinion (the pope is not referred to, by the way, and, without a word of disapproval, Cyprian has repeated the opinion of his friend Firmilian that all the episcopal acts were within the powers of presiding elders. Does it not follow that Cyprian held the bishop to be merely the head and representative of his presbyters? Certainly he never hints at a belief in the divine appointment of such an order, nor does he quote a single passage of Scripture in support of the extravagant language he sometimes employs.

Eusebius (died A.D. 340) frequently mentions bishops, but they are by no means bishops in the prelatic sense. In his time a distinction had indeed grown up, but it was far from that which now obtains. Several named as bishops by him are proved to have held only the rank of presiding presbyters. He distinctly states, moreover, that he cannot speak with certainty of all his bishops in any case.

In B. v. c. 24 is found a fragment of an epistle from Irenæus to Victor of Rome, in which he says: "And those presbyters who governed the Church before Soter, and over which you preside, I mean Anicetus and Pius, Hyginus with Telesphorus and Xystus . . . those very presbyters before thee . . . Anicetus said that he was bound to maintain the practice of the presbyters before him." And yet Eusebius himself says (B. iii. c. 2): "After the

martyrdom of Paul and Peter, Linus was the first that received the episcopate at Rome. Again (B. iii. c. 21): "During this time Clement was yet leader of the Romans, who was also the third that held the episcopate there after Paul and Peter, Linus being the first and Anencletus next in order;" and in B. v. c. 6, quoting Irenæus, "The blessed apostles, having founded and established the Church, transmitted the office of the episcopate to Linus . . . he was succeeded by Anencletus, and after him Clement held the episcopate, the third from the apostles. . . . This Clement was succeeded by Euaeristus, and Euaeristus by Alexander. Xystus followed as the sixth from the apostles, after whom was Telesphorus. . . . then came Hyginus, and after him Pius. He was followed by Anicetus, and was succeeded by Soter. The twelfth from the Apostles in the episcopate now is Eleutherus."

My argument is this, In one passage Irenæus calls Xystus, etc., "presbyters," and in the other he styles them "bishops." Eusebius calls the predecessors of these same persons bishops; therefore, neither Irenæus nor Eusebius regarded the episcopal office as constituting a separate order from the presbyters. The same persons bear indifferently both titles: that of presbyters when their authority in matters of doctrine or custom is concerned, and that of bishops when they are mentioned as presiding presbyters.

Take another instance. In B. v. c. 20 Irenæus is quoted as writing to Florinus concerning the doctrine taught by Polycarp. "I can bear witness in the sight of God, that if that blessed and apostolic presbyter had heard any such thing as this, he would have exclaimed and stopped his ears, etc. Yet in B. iii. c. 36 Eusebius says, "About this time flourished Polycarp in Asia, an intimate disciple of the apostles, who received the episcopate of the Church at Smyrna at the hands of the eyewitnesses and servants of the Lord." Here again, Polycarp is called a presbyter when the weight of his authority is claimed for a point of doctrine, and bishop when his presidency over the Church is commented upon.

In fact, we find Eusebius styling Irenæus himself simply "a presbyter of the Church at Lyons," when referring to him as the bearer of an epistle from the persecuted Gallic Church to Eleutherus, the Bishop of Rome. The epistle also says, "We would certainly commend him amongst the first as a presbyter of the Church, the station which he holds" (B. v. c. 4). To this prelatists reply that Irenæus was not yet bishop. But if there was another bishop why does the epistle run in the name of "the servants of Christ dwelling at Lyons and Vienna in Gaul" (B. v. c. 1 and 3), and not in the name of the bishop? Why is the bishop never mentioned in the epistle? He does not send his greeting to his right reverend brother. This is certainly not apostolic courtesy. If Irenæus was not bishop, who was? His predecessor, was dead nine years before Irenæus became the bearer of the letter (Smythe on Pres. 311).

Thus I have shown that the mere use of the name bishop by Eusebius is no evidence in favour of diocesan episcopacy. His "bishops" are simply the presiding presbyters or pastors of the churches. Of proof that in his time bishops possessed the exclusive right of ordination, confirmation and supreme jurisdiction, I have not found a single word.

We now come to consider the evidence of Jerome (died A.D. 420), who is styled by Erasmus, "Without controversy, the most learned of all Christians, and the prince of divines," and of whom Augustine says that "no man knew anything that was unknown to Jerome." In regard to the whole writings of this father Bishop Stillingfleet observes (Irenicon, p. 277): "I cannot find one passage that founds the superiority of bishops upon a divine right, but only on the convenience of such an order for the peace and unity of the Church."

A dispute had arisen in the Church at Rome regarding the relative positions of the presbyters and the deacons. The latter, because they had the handling of the finances, probably, fancied that they were of more importance than the presbyters, and refused to obey their behests. For the purpose of rebuking this spirit and restoring peace to the Church, Jerome wrote his famous epistle to Evagrius, of which the following is a fair summary.

"Let the deacons be subject to the presbyters, for (1) the sacred functions belong exclusively to presbyters; (2) they are, by divine right, of the same dig-