

[Nov. 4, 1886]

Nov. 4, 1886.]

DOMINION CHURCHMAN.

681

child would be excused from the first lesson if his guardian objected to the book used. On a fixed day in the week, the minister in charge of any local congregation might personally or by deputy give that lesson to the children of his own flock. Choosing his own books, unless the choice of books were taken from him by the Synod to which he owed allegiance.

The Minister of Education would then be required to elaborate a scheme under which, if the church people in a particular district decided to have a separate school, they might do so, and have their own rates for the purpose, and due assistance from the public chest. He would provide for proper inspection, and arrange what books might be used, and how the clergy should be related to the schools. The two last questions might be within certain limits, at the option of the supporters of a school, or the trustees. He should consider in what districts the church people might elect to have a church school. Whether these should be parishes or school sections, or less definite, depending on the voluntary association of a sufficient number of people, and whether in any church school district, the minority of church people might assign their rates to the public school. Possibly this would be demanded in the name of justice. Why, then, if minorities have rights against religion, should they lose those rights if they desire to exercise them in its favour? Our despot would not refuse the same privileges or rights to other Christians. Even if an Oriental despot, it is to be hoped one would be wise enough to thank any wiser man who could improve this project, and not being an Oriental despot, one must, of course, submit to any modifications thought necessary by the majority, although uncertain whether the majority be "mostly" wise. I will continue the subject in my next letter.

Yours,
O. P. FORD.

EVANGELISTS.

SIR,—Sometimes an evangelist visits a place and influences people in a way that makes them think and say they "never knew what religion was before," and starts them off with a zeal that years of regular teaching could not accomplish. But in a little while they are back again in the old place. Then, again, an evangelist, or a set of them, stops in a city and preach, and the immediate effect is to stir the people that they see, as they express it, for the first time, the proper effect of the Gospel. Henceforth, they believe, the religious life of their denominations will be unspeakably better. But in a few weeks this same religious life has fallen down to zero. These things are talked of as among current experiences and observations, and are worth considering.

Evangelists of the right kind, such as the Scriptures speak of, are greatly needed. We want more men to go to destitute places and preach the Gospel. But the so called evangelist who goes where he is not needed—to a city full of churches and preachers, and having raised "a great arousalment," (a thing always easy to do) and goes away with his pocket full of money, to another city where he plays the same game, with the same result, is a nuisance to society. We have seen much of this work, but now nearly at the end of a long life, we put our testimony on record that in very few instances have we ever seen any permanent good come from it.

October 20th.

P. TOCQUE.

PRIMITIVE EPISCOPACY.

SIR,—I desire to lay before as many Episcopalians as I can, a consideration of primitive parochial versus diocesan episcopacy as a basis for organic unity between ourselves and the other religious bodies. Whoever desires to study the proposition I am urging can see it successfully stated by Hammond on the Canons, Nicene Synodal Epistle, Note 4, in his definition of a primitive "parish" or a parochia of a Bishop, and can see it fully elaborated and urged by Bingham in his Antiquities, Book ix. My proposition is simply to recommend to my brothers with me in the ministry a careful as well as prayerful study of what Hammond and Bingham set forth as the form of episcopacy in the early and united church. Hammond says: "There was ordinarily placed a Bishop in every city of the empire, the limits of whose jurisdiction were the city itself and the neighboring districts, with the country towns and villages, which were subject to the civil jurisdiction of the city. This district, which we now call by the name dioceses, was usually called in the primitive church by that of parish, parochia; and was under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of one Bishop, with his presbyters and deacons under him." He then proceeds to define an ecclesiastical province, which was co-extensive with a civil province, and presided over by a Metropolitan, with all the city or parochial bishops subject to him, though as an equal.

Next he defines the later division of the empire into dioceses, each of which comprised many provinces. Under modern nomenclature as well as our church

practice, there is not only a dropping of the name parochia for a bishop's sphere, but there is also an enlargement of the sphere of a bishop until it is made to correspond in size to the primitive province. And so we have, as it were, the primitive Metropolitan Bishop, but not the bishop of the primitive parochia. I suggest a return to primitive parochial episcopacy, i.e., to the rule given by Hammond, and so fully set forth and urged by Bingham. I suggest it as a basis of organic unity, on the matter, of course, only of the polity.

I would deprecate any sacrifice of principles of truth about ordination, or any setting aside of liturgical worship, though much, I think, can be done in regard to both these to make a re-union more possible. It would be a very great sacrifice for me to assent to make the use of our incomparably excellent liturgy optional as the Rev. George Forneret suggests. But I am prepared for such a sacrifice in humble submission to the Saviour's prayer for organic unity. As to ordination, I certainly could not countenance, knowingly, anything that would exchange our inheritance of the apostolate. That is to me and to all Episcopalians nearly, a precious divine truth. I see no reason why the apostolate should cease any more than the orders of presbyters and deacons. And no one lower than an Apostle can transmit the apostolate. This is true on the principle universally admitted that a stream cannot of itself go higher than the fountain. So that he who has not the apostolate cannot transmit it. But it does not follow that none but an apostle can transmit the orders of presbyter and deacon. Possibly every man can give what he has. It may be unlawful, and as many think of lay baptism, it ought not to be done, but when done it is valid. I do not state this as my settled conviction. I do not feel dogmatically certain about it; but it occurs to me as a possible solution of a very difficult problem. And so, if it please the mind of the bishops, I think that no harm could come from our uniting organically with others, without our bishops re-ordinating those not episcopally ordained, provided only that in all future ordinations the hands of a bishop be imposed.

But to return to the matter of Parochial Episcopacy. Many over here, not studying Bingham's book ix, thoroughly, and only reading parts of it, and not distinguishing between parochia, province, and diocese, have inferred that I, in proposing parochial episcopacy am an advocate of *Laura* Episcopacy. I hope to set myself right in the outset in the Dominion. I ask that no "cousin" of mine have his eye so intent upon *Laura* as to fail to get well acquainted with *Laura's* mother, grand-mother, and great grand-mother, whose Christian names are parochia, province, diocese. A Patriarch married diocese; a Metropolitan married province, and a Bishop was the always present husband of parochia. He was in that early day no occasional Metropolitan visitor, but was the constant companion of parochia, daily providing for her and all her beautiful daughters named *Laura*.

I ask my brethren, in conclusion, to study the form of Episcopacy as here proposed, in relation to the Presbyterian and Congregational Church Polities. It will appear that the essential principles of these polities formed with the other principle of Episcopacy one divine system. Episcopacy changing from the primitive parochial to its present so called diocesan form, necessarily separated these principles, which I believe to be all equally divine. God left them to His Church joined. And without our contending about who disjoined them, or one principle saying to the others ye are imperfect, it seems to me to behoove us earnestly to bestir ourselves about the business of rejoining all these three principles. I venture to submit these thoughts for publication, trusting that if they do not help to work out the problem, how can all Christians be organically united again, they at all events can do no harm.

Yours prayerfully for organic unity,

R. R. GOUDY,
Rector.

Albert Lea, Minnesota.

ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, THOROLD.

SIR,—As an item relating to a special vestry meeting of St. John's Church, Thorold, I would beg leave, as chairman of the meeting, briefly to refer to the subject.

1. As to the finances of the church, which are stated to be "in a deplorable condition," the difference between the assets and liabilities is about \$300.

2. The resolution, which proposed that the rector, who has been suffering from a severe and protracted illness, should resign, received three votes.

3. The grounds upon which the rector's resignation is required, appear to me to be such as call for not only the sincere sympathy of the church for the rector, but also the greatest consideration in dealing with the subject, and for all who love the church, now to rally around her.

Yours,
Thorold, October 26th, 1886. JAMES H. BALL.

THE PORTER FUND.

SIR,—The appeal on behalf of the family of Rev. F. G. Porter, was addressed to over 200 persons. A response has been received from eighteen, and now our funds are quite exhausted. Charitable friends here are taking steps for the relief of the household, but the responsibility should, we think, be shared by the Church at large.

Kingston,

October 21st, 1886.

J. KER MCMORINE,
St. James' Parsonage.

Notes on the Bible Lessons

FOR SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS, ON THE INSTITUTE LEAFLETS.

Published under authority of the Sunday School Committee of the Toronto Diocese.

Compiled from Rev. J. Watson's "Lessons on the Miracles and Parables of our Lord" and other writers.

NOVEMBER 14th, 1886.

VOL. V.

21st Sunday after Trinity.

No. 51

BIBLE LESSON.

"The Ten Virgins."—St. Matt. xxv. 1, 13.

As we approach the closing days of the life of our Blessed Lord on earth, the lessons he teaches relate more to His second advent. The word "then" with which our lesson opens, connects it with the prophecy in the previous chapter. The parable was spoken only a few days before the passover, when our Lord was put to death. Jesus was sitting on the Mount of Olives over against the temple, and the disciples had been showing Him the buildings of the temple. He foretold its destruction, and on their asking Him when these things should come to pass, has warned them to be watchful, uttering the two parables recorded here as picturing the judgment, the lesson of the parable under consideration being the necessity of perseverance and watchfulness.

1. *Going to meet the Bridegroom.* The marriage customs in India were different from ours. They were generally celebrated at night; after the wedding a feast, lasting sometimes a week, took place. It is not quite certain whether this was given in the bride's or bridegroom's house. After a while they proceeded with a torchlight procession to their own home, the bride attended by her friends, a similar party coming from the house of the bridegroom would meet them and bid them welcome. These are the ten virgins mentioned, see them starting each with her lamp, each light hearted, and yet though we cannot yet tell the difference between them, verse 2, tells us five were wise and five were foolish. Who does the Bridegroom represent? Christ; He is the Bridegroom of the Church, St. John iii. 29; Rev. xix. 7. If then we are His Bride, how we should love Him above everything. The virgins represent Christ's professing people; to the eye of man no difference, but the all seeing eye of God can tell who are His in spirit and in truth.

2. *Waiting for the Bridegroom.* Verse 5. It seems as if He would not come for some time, so they forget their watchfulness, and gradually fall into a profound sleep, just like many who set out on the Christian path. The early Christians were expecting his coming. They were in a constant state of readiness, just what He wanted, He had told them to watch; see St. Mark xiii. 37; St. John xiv. 8; 1 Cor. xvi. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 7; St. Luke xii. 35, 37. Yet Jesus has not yet come. Is He really delaying? He tarries in mercy. The scoffer asks "where is the promise of His coming?" Just as in the days of Noah, when the long suffering of God waited one hundred and twenty years. His command is still the same "watch," the night is far spent. He may come in our time. His words are, quote 1 Thes. v. 2; Rev. xvi. 15; Rev. xxii. 20. Since we are all liable to be off our guard let us ask God to give us a watching, waiting, expecting, believing frame of mind.

3. *The Coming of the Bridegroom,* verse 6. Notice the suddenness of His coming, at any hour least to be expected. The cry awakens the virgins, their first thought, is my lamp burning? And five of them find their lamps at the last flicker. In fear and confusion they ask their companions to let them have some, but they had none to spare. With the Bridegroom coming they start off for fresh oil, too late, however, verse 10. Now let us see what the oil represents,—the supply of the Holy Spirit of God, without which true religion cannot exist, see Acts x. 38. Just as the lamp without oil was useless, so a mere formal religion will go for nothing; observe, too, no one can give grace to us, they may point out where it can be got, but each one must get for himself, see Psalm xlix. 7; St. Luke xvii. 10. It is God alone who sells the oil of the Holy Spirit. St. Luke xi. 13; Isaiah lv. 1; it is freely offered to us, we must seek it from him in prayer and the other means