

Religious miscellany.

"Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning."

Wait till the morning comes, Wait till the heavenly homes Open at his command.

His arm to lean upon, His rest when work is done, His smile to light thy way.

His blessing for thy stay, With these canst thou not part Thy little load of care.

What though some flowers fade, What though some hoary shade Makes all the future dim;

When human hopes depart, Draw closer to His heart, His voice bids sorrow fly.

Then live and do His work! Let no repentings lurk Within that heart which He Loveth so faithfully.

Then when the work is done, The crown, the rest all won, Not crown nor rest shall be; What most delighteth there; But gladness most divine.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST.

ARTICLE I.

The Declaration relative to the doctrine of the Eucharist, signed by twenty-one clergymen, and forwarded by Archbishop Denison to the Archbishop of Canterbury, raises two questions—what is the Scriptural doctrine on the subject? and what the doctrine of the Church of England? On the present occasion the latter is the primary, and the former the secondary question.

Our readers must not mistake us. In deciding whether the Church of England be a true Church founded on Apostolic doctrine, the inspired Scriptures are the one supreme and only authority to which appeal can be made. But in the present case the issue raised by the twenty-one clergymen affects the doctrine of the Church in the first place. The position they stand forward to defend is that a certain given doctrine of the Eucharist is consistent with loyalty to the Church of England—i.e. in point of fact, her doctrine, in the words of the subscribers to the Declaration, "received by the Council of England in conformity with the teaching of the Catholic Church in those ages to which the Church of England directs us as most pure and uncorrupted, and of the old godly doctors, to whom she has in many ways referred us."

are justified in construing it into a tacit admission that the objective presence of the body and blood of CHRIST in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper cannot be maintained on the ground of Scripture alone, an argument is at once placed in our hands too important to be omitted. It is absurd to suppose that the Church adopts the Word of God alone as her rule of faith, so that, "whatsoever is not read therein, nor can be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith," and yet in the self-same form of belief should teach a doctrine of the sacrament which is not read therein, and cannot be proved thereby.

We believe the objective presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be equally contrary to the language of Scripture and of the Church. It is very skillfully stated in the Declaration, which is drawn up with great ability, and is at once more specific and more concise than the late Charge of the Bishop of Salisbury. The theology, however, is unmistakably and avowedly the same, for the object of the subscribers to the Declaration is identical with that of the Bishop, and the Declaration and the Charge themselves are evidently part of the same policy.

It is thus a new effort in the old direction to maintain the Real Presence of the Church of Rome without involving the absurdities and contradictions of Transubstantiation. The teaching of Paschasius Radbert, was too gross for the dawning light of the thirteenth century, and Consubstantiation was invented to meet the difficulty. The subtle refinements of the present view indicate the renewal of the same effort. If we mistake not, this view of the subscribers will be found to contradict the positive language of the Articles, both directly and indirectly, and most certainly if it avoids the grossness of Transubstantiation it only intensifies its philosophical absurdities. For the body and blood are present, and yet they are not present "corporally"; they are his "body and blood," yet not his natural flesh and blood, not "such as they are in heaven." His, then, our Lord two bodies, or is any reason to believe that the properties of body are not as true of our flesh and blood in heaven as of our flesh and blood on earth? The properties of body are to occupy space and to be limited by limits. An infinite all-pervading substance is Panteism. The Declaration says that the presence

of our Lord's body and blood is not "after the manner of laws of a body," and goes on to describe it as "supernatural, heavenly, invisible, incomprehensible, and therefore spiritual." Is not this a mass of confusion? Scripture speaks no doubt of a "natural body," and of a "spiritual body." But the spiritual body is a body as much as the natural body, and follows the laws of a body. To suppose that body can be presented after the manner of spirit is a contradiction, for then it is body no longer, but spirit. It is, we take it, a total and gross blunder to suppose that "spiritual body" means a body which is a spirit, not a body. Moreover, spirit is not infinite, or the angels would be infinite. Infinity can be predicated of Deity alone, and as the Bishop explains that our Lord's body in heaven is not "the actual properties of Godhead, how can it have ubiquity, or be in more than one place at one time? Such a body is certainly incomprehensible, but are the words incomprehensible and spiritual synonymous? The whole scheme is contrary to plain reason and plain sense, and carries philosophical absurdities upon the face of it.

IS PROTESTANTISM DEAD?

[The annexed paper, which has been lately put into circulation, will interest our readers.]

The following startling announcement has been made by Dr. Manning, the pseudo-Archbishop of Westminster, on Romanism:—"Protestantism is dead in England. We may save the time which controversy wastes, and instead of going into the battle-field, we may go into the harvest-field, to reap and to bind, and to gather our sheaves, into our garner."

Should not this daring assertion arouse the indignation, apathy, and indifference of every true Protestant, to confute by word, deed, and every active exertion, this false assertion? Protestantism dead! No! the undying remembrance of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper, will elicit vital sparks from their ashes, and kindle a heavenly flame throughout the whole length and breadth of this favoured Happy Land, to consume and bring to nought the machinations of Popery, and thus in fulfilment of Scripture prophecy, terminate the short triumph they are to enjoy, before the final downfall of Antichrist.

Be not therefore double-minded, but firmly adhere to our glorious Reformation; by boldly resisting any attempt to assimilate our Church or Church services to that of Rome—from the idolatry, superstition and errors of which, our clergy are solemnly bound to defend us—NEVER TO REMAIN PROTESTANT ENGLAND.

THE CENTRAL FALSEHOOD.—There is a vital and fundamental point which, in fact must decide the whole ritualistic controversy. Once let it be settled, that there is no sacrificing priest; no altar, no sacrifice, no supernatural combination with the elements, and as Archbishop Howe forcibly observes, "there will be no need of reference to the innovations in dress, in the furniture of the communion table, and in other things of like nature which have engaged public attention through the last few months." Around the great central falsehood, all exaggerations of ritual are but satellites. The greater necessity involves the less; and the follies of these ritualistic ornaments of Church or ministers is best displayed by disproving the assumed title of those who adopt them to the name or functions of sacrificing priests, which alone can give them any significance whatever. Our readers, we trust, will observe and grasp this main point of the subject. It is most important to understand and maintain this sacred Reformation principle and fact.

THE TWO SYSTEMS.—According to one system, religion is very much a corporate business. You are to belong to a certain body of people. By virtue of your membership of this body, vast privileges, both for time and eternity, are conferred upon you. It matters little what you are, and what you feel. You are not to try yourself by your feelings. You are a member of a great ecclesiastical corporation. Then all its privileges and immunities are your own. Do you belong to the one "true visible ecclesiastical corporation"? That is the grand question. According to the other system, religion is eminently a personal business between yourself and Christ. It will not save your soul to be an outward member of any ecclesiastical body whatever, however sound that body may be. Such membership will not wash away one sin, or give you confidence in the day of judgment. There must be personal faith in Christ—personal deal-

ings between yourself and God—personal felt communion between your own heart and the Holy Ghost. Have you this personal faith? Have you this felt work of the Spirit in your soul? This is the grand question. If not, you will be lost.

Reader, this last system is the system which those who are called Evangelical ministers, cleave to and teach. They do so, because they are satisfied that it is the system of Holy Scripture. They do so, because they are convinced that any other system is productive of most dangerous consequences, and calculated to delude men fatally as to their actual state.—Rev. J. C. Kyle.

Church Intelligence.

Canada.

DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

NEW CHURCH AT PORT DALHOUSIE.—The members of the Episcopal Church in Port Dalhousie are now about to proceed with the erection of their new church. We have examined the plans, and have no hesitation in asserting our conviction that there is no country church in Western Canada that we have seen that will surpass it in beauty and convenience, combined with economy in its construction. The body of the church is 60 feet long, the chancel 19 feet and the porch 6 feet, thus presenting a side view of 86 feet. It is 37 feet wide, and the front elevation, which will be towards the street, has a large rose window in the centre and two lancet windows at the sides. The porch and buttresses under the rose window, give a bold effect to the front view. There are few churches in this town that have commenced operations with as strong a subscription list, and from the manner in which the children and ladies are uniting in the good work with generous husbands, brothers and fathers, we augur the most favorable results. Several little children are exercising self-denial in the article of sugar and in other ways, in order to subscribe 5 or 10 cents a week towards the large rose window, which they have determined to pay for themselves.—St. Catherine's Constitutional.

DIOCESE OF MONTREAL.

CONVOCATION OF LENOXVILLE UNIVERSITY.—The Convocation on 27th June, attracted a large attendance, many coming from Montreal and other distant places. At half-past seven a.m., Holy Communion was administered in the College Chapel. At the forenoon service, Rev. Mr. Walker, the new Rector of the University, read lessons and prayers; Archdeacon Leach preaching an able sermon. In the afternoon the school-room was crowded by clergy, ladies and gentlemen, including the students.

DIOCESE OF HURON.

On Tuesday the members of the Episcopal Church of St. Thomas represented the Rev. W. H. Jones with a testimonial and purse of \$125, as an expression of their esteem, on his leaving St. Thomas for Tilsonburg, whither he has been appointed by the Lord Bishop of Huron. The presentation took place at the residence of G. T. Claris, Esq.

DIOCESE OF ONTARIO.

THE NEW CHURCH AT IROQUOIS

was opened lately. A correspondent of the Churchman gives a description of it from which we take the following:—"It is a plain stone Church, built of the limestone of the neighbourhood. It is in the early decorated style, with adaptations to suit the climate. It consists of chancel, 18x18, Nave 52x29, South Porch, a small tower at the south-east angle of the Nave, and vestry on the opposite side. The Chancel window consists of three lancets with cusped circles above, and is beautifully stained. The west window is a very

handsome one consisting of four lancets with circles above, surmounted by a large rose window, the whole being included under one arch on the outside. The side windows are double lancets with circle arranged alternately with trefoil cusps. They are filled with obscured cathedral glass of very chaste pattern bordered with red, green and blue, and each of the headlights has a fleur-de-lis in its centre. The Roof of the Nave is open to the ridge, and is supported by arched tresses, the wall posts resting on stone corbels projecting from the wall. The chancel roof is octagonal, with heavily moulded timbers, and a cornice decorated with the old nail-head moulding runs along at the top of the wall. The woodwork is of pine, stained a rich brown and varnished. The plan of the windows deserves mention, because it is one rarely used, although effective and not costly. It is a very successful attempt to produce much of the effect of flat stone mullions or tracery but the ornamental cups are formed in the sashes, and these fastened into the frames. They are arranged to open in two parts, as may be required, so that the means of airing the Church thoroughly are amply secured.

MEETING OF SYNOD.—Notice is hereby given that the Sixth Session of the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ontario will be held in the City of Kingston, on Wednesday, 14th August next. Morning Prayer, with Sermon and Holy Communion, will be held in St. George's Cathedral at 10 a.m. The Offering will be in aid of the Sustentation Fund of the Diocese. The Synod will meet for the despatch of business in St. George's Hall at 3 p.m.

By order of the Lord Bishop.
T. A. PARNELL,
Clerical Secretary.
H. D. SHAW,
Lay Secretary.

England.

THE RITUALISTIC COMMISSION.

(From the Times)

The composition of the Ritualistic Commission, as it has been mischievously called has naturally attracted much attention from both parties in the Church. The result appears to be that while the friends of Ritualism are perfectly content with it, and express their candid opinion of it that it is very evenly balanced, the opponents of Ritualism loudly protest that a decided majority of its members are pledged to "extreme views." All must agree that it would be a great misfortune for the Church if these complaints were well founded. The powers of the Commissioners are very large indeed, much larger, we believe, than was originally intended, or than is originally known. (This is shown by quotation.) It is evident that a Commission thus armed, while it cannot give a legislative sanction to the most trifling reform, may propose an entire revolution in the public worship of the Church of England without transgressing the spirit of its instructions. It ought, therefore, to be so constituted as to command the confidence of all reasonable partisans on both sides, and still more, of that far more numerous and important body of Churchmen who are identified neither with Ritualists nor with anti-Ritualists. It remains to be considered how far these last are justified in complaining that partiality has been shown to the cause of Ritualism, and that an unbiassed judgment on the questions at issue cannot be expected from such a tribunal.

Of the twenty-nine Commissioners, fourteen are clergymen and fifteen laymen, so that no undue predominance of clerical influence need be apprehended. The preconceived opinions of the former on the Ritualistic controversy are of course more easily ascertained than those of the latter, though in neither case should we be warranted in assuming an incapacity to bring a judicial mind to the discharge of judicial duties. Subject to this reservation, we have no scruple in expressing our belief that Ritualistic sympathies are more strongly represented on the Commission than anti-Ritualistic sympathies, and we feel assured that any unprejudiced critic would arrive at the same conclusion. Adapting for the time being the familiar though invidious nomenclature of Church parties, we find at least seven names which must be assigned without hesitation to the High Church party, and, as many would say, to the most advanced section of that party. We observe, on the other hand, but one name which is associated, in a like degree, with the Evangelical party, and but two or three others, at the most, which it could accept as representative of its own principles. Some four or five members would be regarded by High Churchmen and Evangelical alike as belonging to the Broad Church or Liberal school. The rest for the most part are men of moderate or undecided views, whose votes, in a doubtful case, would probably be given for that alter-