

make her a Church of Christ in the one case, and thereby qualified to ordain, it certainly can in the other. If, however, she was not a Church of Christ when Luther and Knox were ordained, they got no ordination, and our ordination as a form can therefore be of little or no importance. Why, then, all this ado in the Presbyteries and in the General Assembly for nothing?

When "Erigena" agrees with "Protestant" that the Church of Rome is more thoroughly anti-Christian than at the Reformation, both are certainly astray, so far as the question of morals is concerned. Speaking of the Church at the time of the Reformation, D'Aubigne says: "The evil at this period wore a character and universality that it has not borne subsequently. And above all the mystery of iniquity desolated the holy places as it has not been permitted to do since the days of the Reformation" (History of the Reformation, page 18).

Those dogmas which have been added to the creed of the Church of Rome, since Reformation times, have been generally held by Rome ever since that epoch, though not formulated as now. No dogma that has lately been added can exceed in blasphemy the doctrines of transubstantiation, absolution, and plenary indulgences. It is no new thing for Rome to steal the prerogative of God. She did it long prior to the Reformation. On the whole, the Reformation has had a stimulating and elevating effect even on Rome; so that while in spirit she remains the same, her outward life as exhibited to the world has vastly improved. Protestantism has shamed her into better conduct.

"Erigena" holds that the Church of Rome has not been a Church of Christ since the Reformation, and yet in the same breath he maintains that "it shewed a large amount of both charity and carefulness to have accepted all along the baptism and ordination of the Romish Church." I cannot go so far in sympathy for Romish error as this. I hold there was neither charity nor carefulness in accepting the ordination and baptism of Rome, if she had no claim to be a Christian Church. There was no charity in condoning error, there was no carefulness in putting antichrist on the same footing with the Church of Christ. If, on the other hand, we shewed charity in accepting all along her ordination and baptism, then we should still continue to exercise it in the same direction, for charity is one of those things that "never faileth." Let "Erigena" again take either horn of the dilemma he pleases.

My argument, as given in my past letter, is that the official acts of a minister or church are held as valid without reference to moral character; so long as such minister or church continues to profess Christ and is not legally excommunicated. I instanced the case of Judas, whose official acts as an apostle were recognized by Christ, and therefore it would be wide of the mark to give in detail, on the invitation of "Erigena," anything Judas did outside of the apostleship.

The Church of Rome claims still to be a Church of Christ—in fact so strong is her claim that she desires to monopolize the whole ground—she believes in the Trinity, therefore she holds a very different position from "any organization which teaches a fragment of truth and has some good persons in it," though "Erigena" holds that such organization would have as good a claim to be called a Church of Christ as she has. Mohammedism and the different systems of heathenism individually teach many fragments of truth, and there are good persons in each and all of them, yet not one of these systems believes in the Trinity, nor do any of them profess to be the Church of Christ, as Rome does; so "Erigena's" adroit inference does not follow. What "Erigena" needs to do is to shew that Rome has been cut off by the Church Catholic, but he will find it pretty hard to do that, in face of his own admission, that other branches of the Church have all along admitted her claim to be a Church of Christ, by accepting her baptism and ordination. Granted that the Church of Rome has very erroneous ideas as to the nature of a sacrament, does that invalidate the form of ordination, so far as that form is scriptural? Suppose a detective is ordered at head-quarters to arrest two noted criminals, and mistaking the orders, he arrests one of the criminals and an innocent man, allowing the other criminal to escape, because believing him innocent, is the arrest of the one criminal thereby invalidated? So, though Rome has exceeded her duty in some cases, and sadly failed in it in others, does that invalidate that part of it in which she agrees in form with the original commands. If so, then the Romish doctrine of intention must be right after all. It is a question whether the above detective might not merit dismissal, but it could only be after a fair trial and by the proper authorities. So Rome can only be dismissed after a fair trial, and

by the proper authorities—the Church Catholic, which tribunal has yet to be convened.

In conclusion, I see "Erigena" has got into an "ecclesiastical corner," after all, about that Romish priest, that enters the Church of England priesthood without re-ordination, and is accepted into our ministry again without re-ordination, while his more straightforward brother-priest who comes to us direct from Rome will not, according to "Erigena's" terms, be accepted unless he submits to re-ordination. "Erigena," in courtesy to the Church of England it appears, would not re-ordain the Church of England priest, though, coming from Antichrist through Episcopalianism, he had got neither ordination nor baptism. If this ordination question be a mere matter of courtesy to this or that Church, and not a matter of principle, then let us be courteous to, and consistent with, our own past record and do as we have always done; or if we hold that ordination be not valid unless complete in every respect, then I maintain we must consistently ignore all ordination (as well as all baptism that springs therefrom) except that which is Presbyterian; for it alone is complete according to Scripture. In this case we will not only shut out Rome, but every other branch of the Church visible that does not confer ordination according to the Scripture form, viz., "with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." WHY?

CALVINISM AND INFANT DAMNATION.

MR. EDITOR,—As an editor (especially an editor of a Presbyterian journal) is supposed to know everything, would you kindly inform me, in your next issue, in what Calvinistic work I would find the following utterance: "There are infants in hell not a span long."

My reason for troubling you about the matter, is, that in a friendly discussion the other day, with an intelligent Methodist clergyman, he asserted that the doctrine of infant damnation was taught by the old Calvinists in the most unmistakable terms. I told him that I had often heard the same thing asserted before by enemies of Calvinism, but had never been able, as yet, to discover such teaching in any book of Calvinistic theology, and that I would like to know if he had really ever, in his reading, met with it. His answer was that he had, and that the book in which the "horrible doctrine" is taught, in the very language above quoted, was in his library. I then asked him to give me the name of the author, but he said *he had forgotten it!* My own opinion is that he never saw the utterance in any Calvinistic work, and that it is a mere inference of his own from some book or sermon he had read or heard. I may be mistaken, though, and if I am, I would like you to set me right.

I recollect long ago reading a public discussion between Dr. Rice, an American divine, and Alexander Campbell, the founder of the Campbellite sect, in which the latter brought forward the charge against the Presbyterian Church of holding the doctrine of infant damnation. Dr. Rice replied: "I am truly glad that the gentleman has made the charge against us; because it is believed by many who are unacquainted with our views. He says our Confession of Faith teaches this doctrine. This is not correct. It is true that it speaks of 'elect infants,'—'elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit.' Are all infants, dying in infancy, elect? All Presbyterians who express an opinion on the subject so believe. The expression 'elect infants,' the gentleman seems to think, implies non-elect infants; but I call upon him to produce one respectable Presbyterian author who has expressed the opinion that infants dying in infancy are lost. Mr. Campbell boasts of his familiarity with the doctrines of our Church. He, then, is the very man to make good this oft-repeated charge. I call for the proof." Mr. Campbell like the Methodist friend, above referred to, could not produce the authority, *he too had forgotten the author's name.* Perhaps Mr. Editor you are in the same position; if so it can't be helped, and I will just have to apply to some other editor for the desired information. A CALVINIST OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

[We are not aware of the particular author from whom the now somewhat notorious "span-long" phrase was professedly at first quoted. So many have repeated the words at random that we are afraid it would puzzle the most of them to verify the quotation. Sure we are at any rate that the words will not be found in any official document of any Calvinistic Church or in any authoritative utterance whatever, and in any case, when the particular reference is given, we should like to verify it for ourselves; for we have found, again and again, passages attributed to certain divines, to Calvin for instance, which could not be discovered at the places mentioned in any edition of their writings upon which we could lay our hands. The imaginations of some individuals are, on certain occasions and under a certain stimulus, so fertile.—EDIT. OF C. P.]

PASTOR AND PEOPLE.

MAKING CHURCH ATTRACTIVE.

The problem of making church attractive for all is by no means the simple thing it is thought to be in some quarters, or the inquiry would not be so frequently met with, "How is it that we are not keeping our hold on the young,—that while our youth have grown up into men and women we have few boys and girls to take their places?" Whenever a church has this question to ask it may rest assured there are some matters in that church which need changing,—a condition of affairs susceptible of decided improvement. The difficulties in this matter of making churches attractive are twofold: first there is the wide divergence in matters of taste and feeling which prevails in all organized bodies; and there is the unwillingness of many to give way in matters of individual preference involving no surrender of principle at all. And right here lies a principal source of church troubles: good Christian people, not given to accurate thinking, mistake a question of taste for a matter of principle. Take the simple question of flowers in the church, for example. We all know that the young people like to see them in the church, on the pulpit platform or the communion table, and they would love in these May days to use the lily and the rose, or the anemone, arbutus, hepatica, and columbine, to beautify God's house. But there is good Deacon Quirk and Elder Sniffen, both of whom declare they are opposed to flowers in church "on principle," as if there was any ethical principle involved in the matter at all: the truth is, they have simply mistaken a matter of taste for a question of principle; they fondly imagine they are standing up for the right when they are perseveringly, however sincerely, asserting the supremacy of their own individual preference. But the opposition is effective: no one wants trouble, and so no flowers are allowed. The young folks see fresh roses and flowers in other churches in which there is as large a measure, if not more, of spirituality and that dreadful thing known by the name of "church order," as in their church; they see all this, and who shall judge of that cerebral process by which the young, as they see so much to invite them to other churches, are eventually led to decide, when they assume life's responsibilities for themselves, to take up their lot with the cheery church? And there are other matters than flowers: there are church sociables in the chapel, with tableaux, and other entertainments for the young; there is good music, solo, quartette, chorus; there is an occasional change in the order of service, sometimes a response or an extra hymn sung by the choir; sometimes the minister varies the service a little by the responsive reading of a psalm by pastor and people.

Now we are far from asserting that any or all of these are sufficient to give a church prosperity. Far from it. On the other hand, neither is it possible to build up a church, and secure the attendance of the young, without doing something to interest them and to make them feel that to a large extent the church is theirs. Yes, to a large extent!—for, a few years, and the venerable elder and the efficient deacon, session, trustee, consistory, will all be gathered home, and these young people whom you have been able to keep in your church are they who in turn will choose a pastor when the voice of him who now preaches to you is stilled forever, and the organ pipes no longer speak to the pressure of fingers that now draw from them weird harmonies.

This whole history of the rise and fall of individual churches is largely the history of interesting the young; and a church which does not succeed in doing that, is in a decline, no matter how high its steeple, or how eloquent may be its preacher, or skilful its organist. And this leads us right here to say that it is to be feared there is too much endeavour put forth in the direction of running a church by individual prejudices—by such a method you can run a church indeed, but only in one direction—you can run it into the ground. What a hubbub is witnessed in some churches when a minister shall think to add interest on some special occasion by varying the service a little, or when a choir shall sing an anthem which shall not fall pleasantly on some ears!—why, we once knew of a prominent church member in a western city to conspicuously rise from his seat in church, and deliberately walk out in the beginning of the service, and all because some flower-loving young folks put flowers on