

The pall was borne by the Bishops of Hereford, the Provost of Eton, Archdeacon Allen, Mr. Gladstone, the Earl of Powis, Lord Hatherton, Sir Percival Heywood, and Sir William Heywood, late Chief Justice of New Zealand. Among the mourners were the representatives of the great societies of the Church, besides many New Zealand and Australian friends of the late Bishop. Mrs. Selwyn was present in one of the chapels near the Presbytery. The music, as usual, was that of Purcell and Croft. The lesson was read by the Dean, as also the service at the grave, the benediction being pronounced by Bishop Abraham.

THE SECOND SUNDAY AFTER
EASTER.

MESSIAH, having triumphed over His foes, now prepares to take charge of the flock for whose sake He had been content to suffer and to die, and for the advancement of which, to the highest state of blessedness of which their natures should be capable, He had risen from the dead and was soon to ascend up far above all principality and power that He might fill all things. As the Chief Pastor and as the High Priest of the New Dispensation He gave His final directions to the Twelve, who were, after His departure from earth, to carry on these offices, but in a lower and subordinate capacity.

Of Messiah it was prophesied: "He shall feed His flock like a shepherd: He shall gather the lambs with His arm, and carry them in His bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young." The entire circuit and the full measure of the pastoral office belong to Him Who died for our sins and rose again for our justification. Whether it be required to feed and nourish the flock, to guide its movements and lead it to living pastures and perennial springs, to govern and control its procedure, to protect it from attacks from without as well as to preserve peace within, to vary the attentions demanded by the differing circumstances and abilities of the flock—all these are to be found in Him, as well as that other qualification mentioned by the Lord Himself, that the good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep. And the idea of the pastoral office sustained by Christ equally involves the existence of a flock, and the characteristic features required in the flock for the due exercise of the office. It supposes docility, gentleness, reception of the means of sustenance provided, and all the dependence, submissiveness and unity which would ensure the efficiency of the means and agencies the Chief Shepherd should think fit to furnish.

The same remarks will, in a large measure, apply to the pastoral office as that office was delegated by the Lord to those whom He left on earth to extend His Church, and by them and their successors down to the present time, to be carried onward to the end of the present Dispensation, when the Lord Himself shall come and take account of the labors of His servants and of the results of their work. For the fact that, in the exercise of the pastoral office, those who were appointed by Christ Himself to guide and govern and feed

His Church, must have successors to the end of time is undeniable, both from the nature and universality of the commission as He gave it, and also from the promise He added thereto: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world;" connecting therewith the fact that the longest lived of the Twelve did not survive the first century of the Christian era. No Christian can suppose that the Lord's promise will ever come to nought; and if so, the Apostolic commission and the Pastoral office must have been transmitted downward through the ages that have intervened between the first promulgation of the Gospel and the present day. And this transmission, to have any validity, must take place, not as one Pope occupies the Papal chair after another, in consequence of an election to that office by those who do not claim the right to exercise its functions themselves. For there is no true succession in that case—no transmission of an authority and a power which have been received from a predecessor who had the rights belonging thereto, in consequence of having received them in direct lineal descent from Him Who is the Head. No other attempt has ever been made to transmit the authority of the Pastoral Office in the Church of Christ from one age to another except in connection with the Episcopate. And the Church has ever been very careful about this matter. In the very earliest times we find every precaution adopted in order to secure a regular succession; and from an early age the consecration of a Bishop as a Pastor of the Church has only been regarded as valid when it has been performed by three persons holding the Episcopal office, in order that no doubt might exist as to its validity. No branch of the Church has been more particular in this respect than our own beloved Church of England; and in this particular she differs widely from the Church of Rome—the object of which for many years has been to depreciate the Episcopal office.

To teach, to reprove, rebuke, exhort, to guide, to feed, and to govern the Church, is in a lower measure, yet in a most true sense, still the prerogative of the Pastors of the Church whether they are bishops or priests—both of these exercising many of the same functions, but in different degrees. The Pastor is not to deal in smooth matters only, or present only that which is most palatable, however poisonous it may be for the flock; for if he did so, how should he be able to stand when the Chief Shepherd shall appear? He is to exercise that measure and that kind of control which is needed for the well-being of the flock—not for his own aggrandizement, but for their benefit. He is to feed the Church not only with the word for their instruction, but also with the Sacraments for their soul's health; for the Sacraments are the means of grace appointed by the Chief Shepherd Himself. He is also to give his life for the flock—not as a ransom or atonement—but in the way of a complete devotion and entire consecration of all his powers to the nourishing and the governing of the flock. And the performance of these functions and duties imply the corresponding

duties on the part of the flock, however contrary this may be to the spirit of the age, or to the headstrong self-will of men who have never sufficiently humbled themselves before the cross of the Redeemer to enable them to submit to the yoke He has imposed upon them. They are to feed on the sincere milk of the Word; to use the ministrations of the Church—the Church which is the body of Christ, the Church of the Lord, to which He attaches so much importance that he has purchased it with His own blood; they are to obey those that have the rule over them, and to form one united and submissive flock, however much they may desire to wander into strange pastures, or that everyone may do only that which is right in his own eyes.

This submission to human pastors is nothing which interferes with the entire prostration of the whole soul before the cross of Christ, or to the obedience which is due to the One Great Head of the Church—they are rather different parts of the same thing—nor is the exercise of the pastoral office in the Church anything which derogates from the control, the instruction and the nourishing which Christ is exalted to exercise and to impart, for Himself has appointed the arrangements in His Church which are necessary for executing the functions of this Office from age to age. Hear his own words: "He that heareth you heareth Me; and "He that despiseth you despiseth Me."

One of the most mischievous attempts now being made in the Church is to represent a due attention to the means of grace, strict union with the Church, and the full exercise of the functions of the ministry as derogating from the all-sufficiency of Christ—which they cannot possibly do, because He Himself appointed the means, established the Church, and organized the ministry.

WHAT IS IN A NAME?

THERE is indeed very much in a name. While the child of the Church—the Catholic Church—is constantly called upon to say in prayer or sing in praise: I believe in the Holy Catholic Church; This is the Catholic Faith; I pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church; I believe in the Catholic and Apostolic Church, not to say anything of other expressions conveying the same idea, how can he be consistent, when, on all other occasions, he expresses that same faith in terms which, not being sanctioned by the Church itself at the beginning or since, must be much less legitimate or expressive? This is a question which has occupied the minds of many since they have been translated from the darkness of schism to the marvellous light of the One Body of Christ. The engine that manufactures so many irreligious beliefs—the right of private judgment—tells us that be a man Evangelical, Ritualistic, High, Low, or Broad Church, he is right in maintaining his sentiments. Indeed there are not only those who hold the opinion but who boast of it, that to be Evangelical or Ritualistic is preferable to being Catholic. A writer, calling himself *Layman (High)*, in a recent number of THE CHURCHMAN, speaks of this subject as a repre-

sen
tell
Chr
act
nan
thei
divi
call
of c
fanc
not
com
is th
and
und
A
a Lo
mar
Doe
valu
one
relig
Ritu
pres
othe
such
perp
Aga
have
stud
Chu
riper
parti
schis
Fath
the
repr
schis
upon
It is
now
thou
est o
true
for a
as hi
and
Chur
hand
alone
harr
equal
Scrip
four
by th
Chur

BAP

\$7
firma
TULLI
hand
"is d
which
Josep
hand
indee
other
porte