Dominion Churchman.

THURSDAY, FEB. 17, 1876.

ARY 10th, 1876

the god. On birth of the

rily assemble the godden if her child is

re; but if it extend her

or a month, shild's nativ.

, and its for-

erious, non-ach in force

world over.

n the infant

prerogative, mmonly one

such as that

imes, if the

is given to will give pames alter-

ate the envy

d pleasant

e Races of

selfishness!

f riches, of

dolence, of

your own,

onts of the in you, in re demon-a not dead.

s to them as of holi-

tivity and

he father-

the prin-

trembled

with the

princes.

in medile

es, which

eaten by to drop tows both

is quite is quite i, and is g through

noments.
I has the

rees dur-

aken off

s boughs had this ho slept awaken

the ef-

e known

and two

ed with

or offer

BADGES OF PARTY.

That, in some degree and in one way or another, different parties will spring up in every community, either pursuing different objects or pursuing the same object by different means, or it may be sometimes only by the use of different names, seems to be almost a necessary consequence of the various constitutions of men's minds, and of the different circumstances in which they are placed. We might indeed expect this result, were there no moral obliquity to complain of in human nature. But selfishness and pride are two great stimulants to the development and increase of parties both in politics and religion. In politics it has been argued that parties are necessary, if it were only that they may act as a watch upon each other; and a more powerful testimony was never borne to the corruption of human nature. But in religion, having something of greater authority, having a standard both of faith and practice, a standard both of theology and of ecclesiastical organization, it might have been supposed that we could have dispensed with a very large amount of the party feeling, party badges, and party organizations we find in the world around us. But unfortunately for the triumph of Christianity, the unbeliever is able to point to so vast an accumulation of party strife and party prejudice that he can boldly allege that no subjects on earth have been known to produce a larger amount of bitterness than those of religious controversy. It is true that where this is the case, the essential principles of Christianity are ignored, and it is no less a fact that the greatest part of this strife has arisen in consequence of the "grievous wolves" which enter in and disturb the flock. Among those who would otherwise be less disposed to yield to the bitterness of party strife, perhaps one of the causes of that strife may be found in the conventional use of words which ultimately become badges of a party, and round which words and badges, sometimes senselessly enough, the battle rages more furiously than around the things they were originally intended to mean. So that after the words have changed their meaning, or when they are used in different acceptations, the battle is still over the words. The filioque question, as it now turns out, is an instance in which the most perfect agreement exists among the leading ecclesiastics of the eastern and the western Church as to the doctrine itself, but from the superior accuracy and precision of the Greek language, it is alleged that the Latin term when translated into Greek might bear a heterodox interpretation. The Bishop of Winchester, in his recent Pastoral, remarks that "it is much to be deplored that words

are used, and often pressed by one party, which convey a very different signification to the other party." And he alludes to the fact that a quarter of a century ago the two schools in the Church quarrelled over the term "regenerate" in baptism, and a great part of the quarrel he thinks arose from two different meanings attached to the word. Perhaps, however, the strongest objections to the use of the term spring from some remote corners of the Church where Calvinism still lingers; although those who have studied the extant writings of the Rev. Charles Simeon of Cambridge, are well aware that he contended both for the term and for the doctrine

The Bishop refers however more particularly to later controversies about the Eucharist in the use of such terms as "Real presence" "Altar," "Sacrifice," "Priest," and he remarks that probably no one in the English Church, when he claims to hold the "Real Presence" in the Eucharist, means that the consecrated bread and wine have literally become the Body and Blood of the Lord. And yet those on the other side of the controversy persistently attribute this view to those who use the term. There are man, he remarks, who understand the term. Eucharistic Sacrifice "to mean of necessity that the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross was but partial, and not in any way "full, perfect, and sufficient," unless supplemented by the sacrifice "offered day by day continually' in the Eucharist by the priest. And therefore some object to use the term on that account, although this opinion may not be entertained by any one in our Church who uses the expression. The Bishop says that:—"Probably the word 'sacrifice' of the Holy Communion is used by many persons who do not altogether agree among themselves as to what they mean by it. The Fathers, undoubtedly, from very early times spoke of 'offering,' and of the Sacrificium incruentum as applicable to the Hely Eucharist; but there has been much difference of opinion as to the sense in which these terms were used; and there is indeed every degree of significance attributable to them even from the simple Zwinglian commemoration of the great sacrifice up to the highest Roman belief, that the elements have been changed into the very crucified Body of Christ, and are offered afresh by the Priest each time the mass is celebrated. I cannot help thinking that the rule of charity should make us careful to explain our language when we use that which may be thus interpreted."

TO ROME OR NOT.

The statement that "a proposition has been made to the authorities at Rome—to the Vatican—asking them to loose the rules of the Romish Church in order that a large body of the members

of the Church of England might join the Romish Church," has been too often and too extensively denied for any one now to be able to say that he does not know such an assertion to be absolutely false. The story bears upon the face of it every indication of being a hoax, got up both for sensational and for party purposes, when truth itself would fail to answer those purposes. The statement has been publicly and officially denied by Cardinal Manning; it has been publicly denied by the clergyman said to have been instrumental in forwarding the request to the Cardinal, and it has been indignantly repudiated as a thing impossible by one hundred of the principal parties said to be concerned in it. All this is well known to every one who picks up a newspaper, even if the story were not too absurd to be believed. It is, therefore, with some surprise that we find substantially the same statement still repeated by men whose public position ought to guarantee some-thing more reliable. When such statements as these are persistently made for party purposes, they can only recoil on those who use them. If truth will not answeis ant postrose, we may rest assured an anomical will never be of perman ut service, either to ourselves or to any party whose cause we may

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

Her Majesty attended Parliament in person on the 8th inst., but did notgo in state. The Lord Chancellor Cairns read the speech, which is of the usual character. Some of our Canadian contemporaries appear rather surprised to find they can learn nothing from the speech which they did not know before. But speeches from the Throne are never meant to convey more than one or two items of information, and sometimas not so much as that. Unless the treasury needs replenishing for an expensive war, royal speeches are rather meant to be quieting, assuring, and soothing in their effects upon the Empire, and to furnish just as many pegs for the ministry to hang a bill upon as there are subjects referred to. In this speech, the Queen states that her relations with all foreign powers are of a cordial character. The insurrectionary movement in Bosnia and Herzegovina is referred to; and Her Majesty states that she has felt it her duty not to stand aloof from efforts that are being made "by allied and friendly governments to bring about the pacification of the disturbed districts," and she has accordingly, "while respecting the independence of the Porte, joined in preging on the Sultan the expedience in urging on the Sultan the expediency of adopting such measures of administrative reform as may remove all reasonable cause of discontent on the part of his Christian subjects." Confidence is next expressed that Parliament will enable her to complete the purchase of