

The Church Times.

"Evangelical Truth--Apostolic Order."

VOL. VIII. HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA, SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 1856. NO. 84.

Calendar.

CALENDAR WITH LESSONS.

| Day | Date | MOORNING. | EVENING. |
|-----|---------|-----------------|-------------------|
| S. | June 18 | 1. S. Mt. Trin. | 1. Judges 2. Gal. |
| M. | 19 | 2. Job | 2. Job. 33 |
| T. | 20 | 3. Job | 3. Job. 34 |
| W. | 21 | 4. Job | 4. Job. 35 |
| T. | 22 | 5. Job | 5. Job. 36 |
| F. | 23 | 6. Job | 6. Job. 37 |
| S. | 24 | 7. Job | 7. Job. 38 |

Poetry.

THE THREE SONS.

I HAVE a son, a little son, a boy just five years old,
With eyes of thoughtful earnestness and mind of gentle
mould,
They tell me that unusual grace in all his ways appears,
That my child is grave and wise of heart beyond his
childish years.
I cannot say how this may be, I know his face is fair,
And yet his chiefest comeliness is his sweet and serious
air.
I know his heart is kind and fond, I know he loveth me,
But loveth yet his mother more with grateful fervency,
But that which others most admire is the thought which
fills his mind,
The food for grave inquiring speech he everywhere doth
find.
Strange questions doth he ask of me, when we together
walk;
He scarcely thinks as children think, or talks as chil-
dren talk.
Nor cares he much for childish sports, dotes not on bat
or ball,
But looks on manhood's ways and works, and aptly
mimics all.
His little heart is busy still, and oftentimes perplexed,
With thoughts about this world of ours, and thoughts
about the next;
He kneels at his dear mother's knee, she teacheth him
to pray,
And strange, and sweet, and solemn then are the words
which he will say.
Oh, should my gentle child be spared to manhood's
years, like me,
A holier and a wiser man I trust that he will be:
And when I look into his eyes and stroke his thought-
ful brow,
I dare not think what I should feel, were I to lose him
now!

I have a son—a second son, a simple child of three;
I'll not declare how bright and fair his little features be—
How silver-sweet those tones of his, when he prattles on
my knee.
I do not think his light blue eye is, like his brother's,
keen,
Nor his brow so full of childish thought as his hath ever
been;
But his little heart's a fountain pure of kind and tender
feeling,
And his every look's a gleam of light, rich depths of
love revealing.

When he walks with me, the country folk, who pass us
in the street,
Will shout for joy, and bless my boy, he looks so mild
and sweet.
A playfellow is he to all, and yet with cheerful tone,
Will sing his little songs of love, when left to sport
alone.
His presence is like sunshine sent to gladden home
and hearth,
To comfort us in all our griefs, and sweeten all our
mirth.
Should he grow up to riper years, God grant his heart
may prove,
As sweet a home for heavenly grace, as now for earth-
ly love.
And if beside his grave the tears our sobbing eyes must
dim,
God comfort us for all the love which we shall lose in
him.

I have a son—a third sweet son—his age I cannot tell,
For they reckon not by years and months where he
has gone to dwell.
To us, for fourteen anxious months, his infant smiles
were given,
And he bade farewell to earth, and went to live in
Heaven.
I cannot tell what form is his, what look he weareth
now,
Nor guess how bright a glory crowns his shining
seraph brow:
The thoughts that fill his sinless soul, the bliss which
he doth feel,
Are numbered with the secret things which God will not
reveal;
But I know (for God hath told me this) that he is now
at rest,
Where other blessed infants be, on their Saviour's
loving breast.
I know his spirit feels no more this weary load of flesh,
But his sleep is blessed with endless dreams of joy for
ever fresh.
I know the Angels fold him close beneath their glitter-
ing wings,
And soothe him with a song that breathes of Heaven's
divest things.

I know that we shall meet our babe, (his mother dear
and I)
Where God for aye shall wipe away all tears from every
eye.

Whate'er befalls his brother swain, His bliss can never
cease:
Their lot may here be grief and fear, but His is certain
peace,
It may be that the tempter's wiles their souls from
bliss may sever,
But, if our own poor faith fail not, He must be ours
forever.
When we think of what our darling is, and what we
still must be;
When we muse on that world's perfect bliss, and this
world's misery;
When we groan beneath this load of sin, and feel this
grief and pain;
Oh! we'd rather lose our other two than have him here
again.
—Rev. Thomas Moultrie.

Religious Miscellany.

THE NEW DOGMA.

From a Sermon by Dr. Rice.

THE first strange fact in relation to this subject,
is that the Bible is profoundly silent in relation there-
to. If the Virgin Mary is entitled to the honor thus
given, then the apostles erred in not mentioning it,
or advising, or making one prayer to the Virgin
Mary. Even in the day of their calamity, the early
Christians never placed on record, or so far as we
know, ever discovered her merits. This we regard
as remarkable, and not likely to have occurred, if
there had been any foundation for this doctrine.

The second remarkable fact relative to this subject,
is that it is in direct contradiction to the Bible.
We know from the Bible, that the Virgin Mary was
engaged to be married, and afterward actually was
married: and if, as Catholics assert, celibacy is
the most holy state, she must have entered a less
holy state while sinless.

Again, the fact that the Virgin Mary suffered
and died, proves either that she sinned, or that she
suffered unjustly. If neither of those, then she
must have suffered vicariously, and that is not
claimed.

Rome is now moving, and not, as has been sup-
posed, standing still. She is not progressing but
retrograding. She will, to be logical, have to make
one more step and declare that the Virgin Mary suf-
fered vicariously, and then Mary, not Christ, will
be our Saviour. The apostles uniformly declare
"all have sinned." "There is none good, no out-
one." How could they say so, if Mary was sinless,
and yet suffered and died? Paul could not have
believed this doctrine, nor could Mary have known it
herself, for she praises God, her Saviour.

Rome in this is directly contrary to the Bible.
In the fifth century men began to talk of the sinless
Virgin Mary, then some began to deny her actual
sin, and then others to deny her original sin; and
the fight upon her Immaculate Conception began,
and has lasted from the 12th century ever since. A
feast was afterward established at Lyons in com-
memoration of the doctrine. The Dominicans re-
ceived it, and the Franciscans sustained it, and the
Popes maintained the peace and enjoined both par-
ties to keep quiet.

Pope Clement the 11th, favored the doctrine,
but recommended peace. The Council of Trent did
not decide it. This doctrine has now been estab-
lished after 600 years of controversy. If Rome can
now, after this long time of controversy, pronounce
this new doctrine, she may have many other new
doctrines yet to reserve. An infallible Pope should
be able to decide sooner. The meeting that declared
this doctrine was not a General Council. It was cal-
led by the Pope to aid him to decide. According
to the Roman Catholic Church, she has withheld for
1800 years the honors due to the Virgin Mary. Is
this not a curious infallibility, that for 1800 years
she has refused the honors due Mary, and has con-
sidered her a sinful woman?

If this is true, then instead of rejoicing, Rome
should in sack-cloth be doing penance for this 1800
years of sin. If this is true, a Dominican who died on
December 8th, in the morning, denying his doctrine,
might have been saved; yet, if he died on the
same day in the afternoon after the Pope spoke,
then it was damnable to have denied it. If a doc-
trine is essential to salvation, the Pope's decree can-
not render it non-essential. In this case Catholics
hold that though a man denied the doctrine,
God declares he may be saved; yet, when the Pope
declared it, then all who denied it afterward should
be damned. Is this not placing the Pope as God before
God Himself? If the Pope or the Church was in-

fallible, then keeping back the doctrine for 1800 years
was criminal. If the Pope is infallible, why should
he not have declared it in last December, ask the prayers of
those he had called to his Council, that he might
discover the truth.

Why does Rome find it necessary to publish this
new doctrine and make a great fuss about it? It is
not true that Rome is declining? To show this,
look what Spain was in the days of the invincible
Armada, and what she is now! The Spanish peo-
ple and Rome herself is divided. Even the Catho-
lics of Spain have lost their fear of the Pope's inter-
dict, and clamor for reorganization of Church property;
Rome has lost their hold on Sardinia, of which the
majority of the people must be anti-Papal, or the
Pope could enforce his claims, and persecute the
Waldenses. Another revolution is coming in Europe,
and it will stand on a broader platform than the last.
Italy is now infidel, rather than Catholic, and her
people, if not kept down by military force, would
cut the priests' throats in revenge for long oppres-
sion.

It may be that one important subject of delibera-
tion of the Roman Council, was the place to which
the Pope could flee if driven out by his people.
The faith of Roman Catholics all over the world, is
under an eclipse. Even the petty South American
States treat the Pope's orders with contempt. This
new doctrine is given to excite the blunted sensibili-
ty of Catholicity. It is, then, the desperate remedy
for a desperate case. This must weaken the faith
and open the eyes of many Catholics. It has struck
hard at Papal infallibility. It will render the con-
version of Protestants difficult, and it foreshad-
ows Rome's final downfall.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S VIEWS OF BAP- TISMAL REGENERATION

(Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chester, 1844.)

THE subject of Baptismal Regeneration, which
seems to have its periodical seasons of recurrence, is
again perplexing our religious system, and furnish-
ing material for attack and reformation. In the
few remarks which follow, I am not so presump-
tuous as to suppose that I can settle such a question.
Indeed, I see no means by which it ever can be set-
tled. We have not the data, either from Scripture
or experience, by which the actual effect of Baptism
can be placed beyond the reach of discussion. We
know the language of the ancient fathers. But we
also know the nature of that Baptism to which their
language was applied: Baptism, such as Justin de-
scribes in the well known passage, where he says,
"As many as have been persuaded that the things
spoken by us are true, and undertake to live ac-
cordingly, are instructed to pray with fasting, and
ask remission of their former sins, whilst we fast and
pray with them. They are thus led by us to a place
where is water, and are regenerated with the same
regeneration by which we have been ourselves made
regenerate. For this washing with water in the
name of God the Father and Governor of all things,
and of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spi-
rit. For Christ himself said, "except a man be
born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."—
Our own Church, in her complete service, presumes
the like preparation; presumes that baptism is the
result of faith, and attended by repentance, and pro-
nounces infants regenerate after faith and repen-
tance have been promised for them by their sureties,
and expressly required of themselves when come to
age.

Still our Church does pronounce the child regen-
erate. Now, if one party maintains that this is the
judgment of charity, as belonging to the principle
which pervades and must pervade all general ser-
vices, but that the individual, now become account-
able, and evidently not living in the faith of the Son
of God, was never really endowed with the Holy
Spirit, that party can never be absolutely silenced.
Neither can the opposite party, who affirm, on the o-
ther side, that those whom we now unhappily see liv-
ing in sin, were once in a state of grace, and fell
from it through their own wilfulness or the neglect
of others. The dispute is one that never can be closed.
Our Church declares further, that "they
which receive baptism rightly, are partakers of the
blessings conveyed in baptism. And who can ven-
ture to decide with confidence, whether original sin,