

116 m. 11 3

# The Church Times.

"Evangelical Truth--Apostolic Order."

VOL. IX.

HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA, SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1880.

NO. 23.

## Calendar.

### CALENDAR WITH LESSONS.

Day	Date	MORNING.	EVENING.
S. M.	1	Judges	1 Co. 16
T. W.	2	Leviticus	2 Cor. 1
W. T.	3	Job	3
T. F.	4	—	4
F. S.	5	—	5
S. S.	6	—	6

## Poetry.

### THE BEAUTY OF DEATH.

Wring not the dying bed in gloom,  
As though alone the sinners doom  
Were being spoken there;  
Nor think thee that the death-bed sigh  
Is one which heavenly watchers nigh,  
Hear, and avert a saddened eye,  
And mournful glances wear.

The swan, as ancient legends say,  
In death pours forth her sweetest lay—  
The finest note the last;  
As though to every breeze she'd tell  
That music had a power to swell,  
E'en on the bosom of the knell  
Of life's tide ebbing fast.

The dolphin, mid expiring throes,  
More exquisite in beauty grows,  
As fades the strength of life:  
And tints bright of sapphires blue,  
And rainbow lights of every hue,  
More exquisite each moment show,  
As fainter grows the strife.

The sun has garments far more bright,  
With all the harmonies of light,  
As he descends to rest;  
And then he seems to bid us gaze,  
Undazzled on his parting rays;  
And softer far than morning's blaze,  
We love that time the best.

Thus, too, when Autumn's gentle breeze  
Steals through the glads of forest trees,  
With softly rustling breath;  
She whispers them that they must wear  
Their brightest dyes and vestments rare,  
Most lovely they appear and fair,  
Yielding themselves to death.

'Tis thus the Christian bows his head,  
And conq'ring on his dying bed,  
Pours forth his sweetest lays;  
Thus have we seen the Christian die,  
With hope assured, and glistening eye,  
Flashing the immortality  
Of countless holy days.

And as the spirit's loos'ning hold  
Shrinks from the uncongenial cold  
Of the poor body's clay;  
Beauties most exquisitely bright,  
Rays of the true celestial light,  
Fall on the trance and new-born sight,  
Opening on endless days.

The spirit now with choicest grace,  
Arrays herself for that high place,  
She owns in yonder sphere;  
And round her draws her nuptial dress,  
Of heaven's own perfect holiness,  
The shadow of that loveliness,  
She lets you gaze on here.

## Religious Miscellany.

### THE CHURCH'S BROKEN UNITY.

Concerning most of the Sects, two great subjects may be set forth on which their errors are based—1, the corporate unity of the Church; and 2, the Apostolic succession of the Priesthood. It is clear that in neither of these points are they in unison with Holy Scripture, or with the primitive usage of the Church in the first ages of Christianity. But while they evidently fail, and must see that they fail, when trying themselves honestly by God's Word, yet it is singular to perceive how adroitly they defend themselves by arguments of great speciousness and apparent weight.

It is necessary in the proof of any truth to be maintained, that the whole, not a part is to be proved. A likeness, or similarity in some things, is not sufficient to prove a truth. It must be identical in all things. But the sects are guilty of both these errors in argument in many ways. For instance, they are shown from God's Word, that the Church must of necessity be one body; and that con-

gregations of separate meetings in separate places cannot be according to the will of Christ; but they got rid of this by doing away with the name of congregation, and call each meeting "a Church," as if the name which they give their meetings could alter the meaning of the thing. They are shown that it is absolutely essential for the right exercise of the Ministry, that there should be authority—they acknowledge it; but they reply, We have authority as well as you, for we practice the "laying on of hands;"—not seeing that the fact of laying on of hands is, in itself, nothing, unless we know who the persons are who lay on hands—i. e., whether they themselves have authority thus to do.

Again, when they are told of Apostolic succession as a note of the true Church, and that no ministers of Christ can possibly venture to exercise their office of preaching or of administering Sacraments, except they can show a linear descent from the Apostles—knowing they cannot do this, they turn round and say, Well we can show it at any rate as clearly as you; for your Church (meaning the Church in England) can only date from the Reformation after all: or they turn round and say—Well, what is this Apostolic succession of which you speak? It is a mere idea—an empty dream. Suppose it be proved that your Bishops have come down from the Apostles, through whom have they come? Through the corrupt and idolatrous "mother of harlots," to wit Rome. Look at the Popes of that wicked Church,—see how many monsters of impiety have stained the papal chair. Look at Alexander VI. for instance, and then say what sort of value can be attached to the idea of descending through such a pollution as that.

Or again, when they are told of the "laying on of hands," that it is not any "laying on of hands" that will suffice—that it must be by the order of Bishops—that it is vital to the existence of a corporate body, being Christ's, that it should have its members in unison with the Head, and that can only be in the manner and by the means which that Head has appointed—i. e., by the Bishops as the successors of the Apostles—then such an idea as this is scouted and ridiculed. Bishops! Who are they—from whence do they come, and how are they made? Not by the Church. And on what account are they appointed? Not for sanctity or learning—not for fitness or eminence in any way—not for any of those gifts of the Spirit for which St. Matthias or St. Barnabas, or even those of the Apostolic ages succeeding, were appointed. No; but because they are tutors, or school-masters, or brothers, or sons of some chief minister of the Crown, or have been notorious for some service done to the State in politics and elections. Talk to us of such episcopal ordination as being vital to the appointment of the Ministry! At any rate, our ordination is as good as that.

Now these are no imaginary objections. It is precisely the way in which the Church is met by those who oppose her in the present day. For instance, here are two letters, in which this kind of objection is set forth, as coming from the Sects:—

"The Church cannot prove a continued descent from the Apostles. There have been many breaks, and two or three Popes at a time—each excommunicating the other. Or, again, supposing this not to have been the case, you say I must apply to the Apostolic Church. Must I apply to the Roman Catholic, or to the 'Establishment?' as I suppose you both claim a distinct Apostolic descent; and certainly if your Established Church claims that, the Roman Church can; as you can only claim your descent through that Church; and even in your own Church there are great divisions—ono part of your Bishops holding that Baptism is Regeneration, and the other part denying it; the Roman Church holding that there are seven Sacraments, and acknowledging the Pope as head; you holding that there are only two Sacraments, and not acknowledging the Pope as head, besides other differences among you. Now your telling me to go to the Apostolic Church is saying nothing, as I should not know which division of it to believe."

Or take another, in which the writer, not really and humbly seeking after the truth, but offended by the idea of the ordinations of the Sects being treated as mere nullities—writes in the following strain:—

"Internal vocation' means bringing up young men to the Church as a profession; in many cases, because of a family living or influence, or because the young man is too soft for anything else, as a soldier or a lawyer.

"We profess, in every case, to follow the internal vocation, and before a young man is received as a student, there must be evidence of his piety, and some degree of fitness certified by a "Church," not a congregation.

"External divine appointments means episcopal ordination.

"We always practice the laying on of the hands of the brethren—not less scriptural surely—the 'brethren' being as good men as the Bishop, and those set apart by one mode, showing, say equally the fruits of the Spirit, is it not fair to conclude that one way is as good as the other, if a tree is to be known by its fruits. We would rather have the 'brethren' to ordain than a Bishop, made so by favour of a Statesman. We do think that the 'Church' is as likely to choose the right man as a patron of the usual sort, especially if he has bought it at an auction mart."

Now to what does all this amount? We are called upon to assert that, because there have been from time to time, and still are, abuses, corruptions, and weaknesses in the Church system, therefore the Church system is in itself wrong; and that another system of mere human device—in which it is supposed that there never can be any abuses, or corruptions, or weaknesses, ought to be substituted in its place. But let us consider. Has it ever been asserted, either in Holy Scripture, when speaking of any national or local Church, or by the Church herself in any canon of authority, that every national or local Church is to be free from spot, or stain or blemish? On the contrary, in the book of Revelations we have an account of several national or local Churches so stained with imperfection that they were swept away from the face of the earth. They were parts, however, of one great Catholic whole, and the fact of their falling into errors individually did not militate against the promise of Christ, that the gates of hell should not prevail against that great Catholic whole, although they might against portions of her. So, too, with divisions between national Churches. It was seen from the first that unity would be broken—that men of ambitious spirit, as wolves, would enter in and scatter the flock—that the Church never would be safe from intestine heresies, and that party would rise up against party, and nation against nation. It was foreseen, and made a subject of warning by our Lord Himself. This does not, however militate against the fact that the promise of Christ was given to His Church upon a certain and assured basis, and that His Priesthood was sent forth by His authority as a distinct order, and with a distinct promise—"As My Father hath sent Me, so send I you;" or that His prayer was made repeatedly as the great object of His heart's desire, that His Church might be one. Thus, if we find on the one hand that no promise was ever made of perfection, and absolute freedom from error, in every local spot, while there was a promise made of the building up of a corporate body—the Church, and a commissioned Priesthood to flow from His Apostles—why does the existence of error and imperfection, which was never denied to be possible, deprive us of the fact and the necessity of an Apostolic Church, which was ever asserted to be a mark of His Truth.—Abridged from the Old Church Porch.

The Bishop of Lincoln, at a recent diocesan meeting on education, expressed himself as follows in reference to secular education. Having stated objections to Lord John Russell's plan, the right rev. prelate says—

"Among the plausible reasons for a national education for the poor was this—that as it was right to secure national temporal subsistence by parochial relief to the poor, so it was equally proper the poor should be supplied at the public expense with schooling for their children. The grand problem was, could the people be supplied with a religious education without the instruction being specifically denominational? We say no; otherwise much that was

\* These two specimens of letters actually received by the Editor.