

Church Work.

We speak concerning Christ and the Church.

A MONTHLY PAMPHLET OF FACTS, NOTES, AND INSTRUCTION.

Vol. III.

MAY, 1878.

No. 3.

JOHN D. H. BROWNE, } P. O. Box 64, HALIFAX, N. S., { EDITORS.
EDWYN S. W. PENTREATH, } DORCHESTER, N. B., }

"The Communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Papal and Puritan innovations, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the Cross."—*From the will of Bishop Ken, A.D. 1710.*

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

THE managing editor of CHURCH WORK having recently removed from Dorchester, N. B., to Halifax, N. S., all communications should be addressed: REV. JOHN D. H. BROWNE, P. O. Box 64, HALIFAX, N. S.

REGENERATION.

"IN primitive times regeneration was a synonym for baptism, implying that a *change of state* had taken place, whereby the baptized person, from a servant of Satan had become a servant and a child of God. At, and since the Reformation, the term has been understood by some persons to signify conversion or a *change of heart*; and charges of gross error have been brought against the Church for continuing to retain not only the doctrine but the name used in primitive times."

Nevertheless foreign Churches, the continental Reformers, and the founders of the very bodies of Christians who most bitterly oppose the Church of England because she does not believe in the modern notion that regeneration—the *change of*

state is the same as conversion—the *change of heart*, are entirely in accord with her on this point. The testimony of the Church to this doctrine is open to every one in the pages of the Prayer Book—it is unchanged.—It would be well for our brethren of the Denominations to glance over "buried Confessions of Faith," and see what their forefathers held on Baptism. They believed in the scriptural doctrine that regeneration meant simply baptism—a change of state—that conversion was a totally different thing. Their descendants confound the two things. Imagine the controversial abuse, the ridicule, the charges of false doctrine and ignorance that would be heaped upon an unfortunate clergyman who should, publicly, in a community composed largely of Nonconformists, challenge attention to such a doctrine of Baptism as may be found in the appended statements, and claim that it was not only *Church doctrine* but *Bible truth*. Of course the opinions of these men are only valuable as showing what was the unanimous belief on Baptism at the time of the Reformation.