

A  
215  
N85

# NOVA SCOTIA Church Chronicle.

VOL. IV.

HALIFAX, DECEMBER, 1868.

No. 12

*"Ad profectum sacrosanctæ matris ecclesiæ."*

## EXTREMES vs. SINCERITY.

"ARE THERE ROMANIZING GERMS IN THE PRAYER BOOK?" is the title of a pamphlet, published at the offices of the *Protestant Churchman*, New York, and the *Episcopalian*, New York and Philadelphia, which has just reached us. It is the one of which mention was made in our October No. in connection with the perversion to dissent of the Rev. Mr. Cracraft, of Ohio. As we have neither time or space for a lengthened refutation of the extraordinary assertions of this pamphlet, we shall merely set before loyal churchmen a few paragraphs as specimens of its contents. It is necessary to premise that the unlimited right of private judgment in matters of faith and practice is the *singula non* of the present, as of all former, objectors to the Prayer Book, and therefore any—the slightest—encroachment on this Final Court of Appeal is an intolerable burden to the "conscience." "The Bible, as I understand it," is to be the rule of faith to each individual, to which must be added the right to vilify and persecute all who believe more than one's self, and infallibility and the right of anathematizing others is to be the prerogative of every pope, i. e. "believer," male and female, in Christendom.

The first Romanizing Germ in the Prayer Book, it seems, is the Rule of Faith. The pamphlet claims that "no doctrine is to be believed and no law is to be obeyed which may seem to any one seriously exercising the right of private judgment to offend God's Word." But because the Church will not cast away her Catholic birthright, but is willing to leave her decisions on the meaning of Holy Scripture, compared with the ruling of pure and primitive Christianity, and cites the testimony of the Apocrypha, the Homilies, the Ancient Authors and Ancient Canons, straightway our sticklers for the rights of modern human judgment are offended. Among other offensive expressions under this head in our formularies, the following from the form of consecrating a bishop is quoted:—"Brother, for as much as the Holy Scripture and the Ancient Canons command that we should not be hasty in laying on hands," &c.

This is condemned, as linking Holy Scripture with the traditions of men. This critic is not only too pure-minded for the Prayer Book, but herein condemns the Bible itself, seeing that the heathen poet, Epimenides, is quoted with approbation in the first chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to Titus, and Aratus, another heathen poet, in Acts xvii. Colenso, pure-minded man, was shocked out of all faith by the cruelties and impurities of the Mosaic Law. Verily, ultra-puritanism is near to infidelity, and this accounts for much otherwise unaccountable sympathy with our modern infidels, and deprecators of Bible and Church authority.