

In the sense in which the word conversion or converted is, in every instance used throughout the whole of the New Testament, there is not the slightest ground for believing that there was even so much as one single convert before the day of Pentecost; nor the slightest ground for believing that it was any part of the great plan of salvation that there should have been; facts which will more fully appear in my next letter.

LAYMAN.

COLLEGE FELLOWSHIPS.

SIR—In the olden times in the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, the position of Fellow was both honorable and easy. His duties consisted in residing in the college, taking such part as might be agreeable in the general management of its affairs, and helping to maintain the college dignity, by a life of learned leisure, it was indeed, a scholastic sinecure, requiring some distinguished merit to obtain it, continuing until death, marriage, or the presentation of some "fat living," requiring little other college labour, except drawing the endowment money from the college bursar and spending it in a manner becoming a gentleman. John Wesley, after his brother Charles marriage, transferred to him his Oxford Fellowship to enable him to support his family.

The position of Fellow in this country, I suppose, will be different. Our young men, however, should not be sent to the Divinity School to be experimented upon by inexperienced young tutors, who treat an appointment to teach as one more "college honor" to be worn for a year or two. Theological schools ought to be more than mere knowledge shops. It is possible to teach the most sacred things, without appealing in the least to the religious element in our nature. The education of young men in college should not be confined to the routine of study, recitation, instruction and examination, but should include also the personal acquaintance, friendly intercourse, and special interest of the president and professors. In many colleges the student remains a comparative stranger to his professors, seldom, if ever, has any social intercourse with them, and feels that his education is purely a business matter extending over so many years, and requires so much money. The individuality of the student is lost in the common mass. The professors do not need to deal with young men in the mass, they can know them one by one. From hand to hand the lamp of learning has been passed down the ages.

My recollections of a short college life, do not stir within me a single emotion. They do not suggest one spiritual idea. I sat in the lecture-room of the ablest theological teachers. The great and sacred subjects were treated in the most exhaustive manner, but the associations of that room are anything but sacred. They were infatuated with the idea that we had come there to study theology, and they were determined to fill us with it. Indeed the entire work of the theological class was done in the most professional manner. There is danger that our professors are filling their places just as a medical professor or a law professor would fill theirs. They are laboring under the mistake that the students are there to learn how to exegete Scripture, to learn Greek and Hebrew, and fill themselves up with theology. We expect theological students to make some attainments in scholarship, but we want that scholarship sanctified. We would not ask that the class-room be converted into a chapel, but we do want it to differ from that of a law school or medical college. How is the Church to free herself from her "professional ministers," men following the ministry as a profession! A theological college is not merely a place where Greek and Hebrew and theology are taught as studies, but an institution where young men are prepared to preach the Gospel in all its tenderness and beauty and power. One of the most successful educators in America has said that "One great want of our times, is a society for the suppression of useless knowledge." Develop the mind and neglect the heart, and you only produce an instrument of ruin, develop the heart and neglect the mind, and to say the least, you greatly circumscribe the person's influence for good. Combine the two in due proportion, and you balance the attacking and resisting forces which are in perpetual operation in society. Demosthenes and Cicero did not know so much as our modern scholars, but they were more eloquent. St. Paul was eloquent because he knew but one thing, "Jesus Christ, and him crucified."

January 28th.

PHILIP TOCQUE.

"A POOR CHURCH, IS A PURE CHURCH!"

SIR.—I occasionally dip into the works of that fervent and eloquent and, in the main, orthodox divine, the late Edward Irving. From his comment on the words "I know thy poverty (but thou art rich)," I send you the following excerpts, which may not prove

had reading now that the mother church is threatened with spoliation; and, at any rate, the principles propounded will be found of universal application.

YOURS. JOHN CARRY.

14th February, 1885.

PORT PERRY.

"Some, looking to this distinction, have rashly concluded that therefore a church should be established in poverty, and it hath passed into a maxim in the north, that a poor church is a pure church; and that the Church of Scotland is founded upon the rock of poverty. God forbid that she should not be founded upon some better foundation than this! No, such reasoners abuse and wrest the Scriptures which commend not poverty as a blessing or a good, but comfort those that are under it, as being in a trial, which, through their faith will rebound unto honor and glory in the day of the Lord. Godliness hath the promise of this life, as well as that which is to come, and the psalmist boasteth in God, "I have been young and now am old, yet have I never seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." That maxim which has got into the mouths of certain puritanical or churlish men, savours more of the mendicant orders of the Papacy, or the sacrilegious spoliation of the nobles which went on at the time of the Reformation, especially in Scotland, than it doth of any reverence for the Church, or enlightened view of her prosperity. The true doctrine concerning the outward state of a minister, is by our Lord in the code of instructions, which we have already referred to, in these words (Luke x. 7, 8), "And in the same house remain eating and such things as they give, for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you." This evangelical canon is that upon which the apostles went, or if at a time they departed from it, as did Paul or Barnabas, it was with the reservation of the right when they pleased to resume it, as may be seen set forth at large in the ninth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, and by this canon every church, and every minister ought to regulate himself. And what is the spirit of the canon? Not obligation to any particular condition of life; as poverty, nor preference of one to another, but indifference to all; a willingness to abound, a willingness to want, a willingness to be in riches, a willingness to be in poverty. This is the noble dignity, this is the royal liberty of the minister's calling, to sit and feast with the king in his palace, to sit and fare with the king's poorest subject in his cottage, and to be as much at home with the one as with the other. Oh, it is a poor, crude, yea, and a wicked view of our office, to say that we should be kept poor, as if upon being intrusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven, we might not be intrusted with any portion of this world's goods. I do admire, while I perfectly penetrate that good natured care of us incompetent ministers, which moves so many of our liberal statesmen to argue that there should be no livings in the church above such and such a value, and none below such and such a value. The laity indeed may be trusted with untold wealth, a citizen with a plume of money, a noble with the lands of a county, and the revenues of a king, but a clergyman is not to be entrusted, and must be put under the tutelage of our most parsimonious and economical exchequer. The Church lands, which the piety of our fathers devoted unto the necessities of the church must be taken under the management of the lords of the treasury, who have managed their concerns so well as to involve their country in many hundred millions of debt. God forgive me if I speak lightly or irreverently, but my heart is embittered with the clamours which I hear from all men, concerning the trustlessness of the servants of the Lord Jesus Christ, the angels and ministers of the churches, who, let me say it, though there be shameful exceptions, live poorer and die poorer than any other class of the community above the class of the day labourer. Ignoble age! Ungenerous children of generous fathers! Where now is your liberality to the Church of the living God? Methinks you are preparing for such another abominable sacrilege as heretofore was transacted in these lands at the Reformation. O ye nobles of Scotland, who left the Church in beggary, tell if ye be at this day the richer for all the plunder which ye made of your mother's estates? Are you at this day the less incumbered with mortgages, that ye did incumber the reformers and first preachers of Scotland with want, bare want and miserable poverty? And yet behold, O Church of Scotland, how the poverty of thy reformers and thy ministers was not able to embarrass or prevent thy prosperity, but did rather bind thee round the neck of thy people, and write thy worthiness upon the tablets of their hearts. Though thou wast sore hampered in thy purposes of good for the realm of Scotland, by the avarice and the sacrilege of the nobles, thou wast only the more endeared to the body of the nation, who witnessed thy labors for their salvation, in the midst of poverty and nakedness. And when the day came of thy sore tribulation, and thy covetous nobles turned away their face from thee, thou foundest in the devotedness of the people

that arm of strength which set thee in thine honorable place, the poorest, and the most efficient, the worst rewarded and most laborious of all the Christian churches. But be not vain of thy poverty, or churlish toward thy sister's grandeur, join not those sons of Belial, who under the name of reforming the church, would meddle with her sacred treasures, and ruin themselves, and, if they could, ruin her.

The true principle, therefore, upon which an angel of the churches should feel and act, is never to mind his outward estate, be it rich or be it poor, so long as he hath bread to eat and raiment to be clothed withal. But if he should be in want of necessary supplies for him and his wife, or for his children, he ought then to tell the Church, whereof he is angel, that the Lord will not prosper their worldly industry, that he will disappoint their hopes and defeat their labours, until they shall have provided for the ministry of His altar. And if the people refuse to hear the Lord speaking by his lips, the Lord will speak in another way, and make Himself be heard. Let not His faithful servant fear. God will not leave him desolate. His children shall not beg their bread."

SURPLICED CHOIRS AND HYMNS.

SIR.—Allow me to notice "A conservative churchman's" letter in your issue of the 1st ult. I take his statements seriatim. "Surpliced choirs have been used in the English Cathedrals, and College Chapels, since the Reformation." That may be, but the people have nothing to do with the usage of Cathedrals and College Chapels, where gorgeous vestments and full choral services charm the eye and ear of the rich and great, of whom their congregations are mostly composed. The people's model is the parish church, where surpliced choirs were almost unknown till about fifty years ago, when Dr. Pusey and the pervert Newman began to build the underground railway from Oxford to Rome. He says, "Surpliced choirs were not innovations at the Reformation." Then it follows that they had been used by the Roman Church, down to that time, and the Anglican Ritualists of the present day follow her example. He refers to the custom of the Church in "those early and uncorrupted times when, as the learned Rector of Montreal has pointed out, the whole congregation wore the flowing white surplice." I am sorry that he has not given the date of "those early and uncorrupted times," as my impression is that the Christian Church was more or less corrupt, even in the time of the Apostles, as St. Paul's and St. John's epistles show. He says, "The choir is not the proxy of the congregation, but merely a part of the congregation appointed to lead, and set the example to the rest of the worshippers." By whom appointed, the minister or the people? I am afraid they have no voice in the matter. Nor do they need a leader or example if they follow the Rubrics. The fact is, the choir deprives the people of their right to respond throughout the service, and this, not the surplice, is the chief grievance of which I complain. He asks, "Who, could bring any valid objection to a chorister putting on a surplice and praying thus, 'Cleanse me, O Lord Jesus, &c.'" I do not object to the garment if he cannot pray without it, but question his right, as a layman, to wear in the church a clergyman's official vestment. I believe that a minister of the New Testament unduly magnifies his office when he claims the place of a sacrificing priest, and degrades it when he dresses a number of illiterate boys in the clerical garment, and gives them authority to teach the people how to worship. I was in Toronto, a few years ago, and attended morning service at St. James' where there was no surpliced choir, but the simple, time-honoured custom of the parish church. In the afternoon I went to another church where I saw for the first time a procession of surpliced adults and boys, singing as they marched round the building. I could not distinguish the officiating minister from the other men in the procession. I had been more than forty years a communicant of the Church of England, and was never before at a loss to know a clergyman by his official vestment. When I heard a band of striplings, in a singsong tone, answering for the congregation in prayer and praise, I cannot help thinking they should go to Jericho till their beards grow.

I regret that "A Conservative Churchman" follows "Selwyn" in misrepresenting me. I refer your readers to my letter in your issue of Nov. 27, 1884, signed "English Churchman," where they will find that I name a dozen innovations, that have led many Churchmen in England to accept the Virgin Mary instead of Christ, and the Pope instead of Queen Victoria as their temporal sovereign. He explains the name given to the Blessed Virgin in H.A.M. viz: "Shall we not love thee, mother dear?" to mean mother of Jesus, not of those who address her. I do not think this correct, and offer the following as the author's meaning, "Dear mother, shall we not love thee? The votaries as children address Mary as mother, I leave your readers to judge. He gives