

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We must beg our friends to write the names of persons and places as distinctly as possible. This will save much annoyance. Communications received later than Wednesday morning must stand over till our next issue. We cannot undertake to return rejected manuscripts. Back numbers will be sent only on application. Subscribers are especially requested to make complaint at once to the office of any irregularity in mailing or delivery of their papers.

VISIT A. J. PELL'S GALLERY OF ART, 345 NOTRE DAME STREET, In rear of Post Office, MONTREAL.

Church Observer.

"THIS PROTESTANT KINGDOM."—Bill of Rights, 1868. MONTREAL, 15TH OCTOBER, 1868.

SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE

However keen a war may at the present be raging about the ceremonial of the Church of England, it must be transcendently evident to the thoughtful mind that the question of simple or extreme ritual is of minor consequence, compared with the dogmatic teaching of the pulpit. The opponents of a highly ornate service urge, apparently with logical sequence, that if the ministers of the church forsake a severe for a gorgeous and highly imposing ritual, it cannot be, as they are sentient beings, that they wish merely to indicate thereby their abstract love of ceremonial, but rather, that they desire to symbolize certain great doctrines to them of paramount importance. As this view, however, is indignantly denied by some, the matter must be left entirely to their own conscience; and it only remains to examine, as carefully as we can, the published opinions of certain prominent writers on the admitted doctrines of the Church.

The XXXIX Articles have since their authoritative publication in 1571, been the grand repertoire of the doctrines of the Church of England. Various works of more or less merit have from time to time appeared as expositions of them; but it is now admitted that one of the very best is that by Edward Harold Browne, Lord Bishop of Ely. We do not mean to say that the reader will agree with him in all respects, but the impartial critic will admit that it is a work of great ability, exhibiting remarkable fairness on the one hand, with profound scholarship on the other. An exposition of the Articles has, however, of late years, attracted more prominently or its sentiments cannot fail to arrest public attention. We refer to the work of A. P. Forbes, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin. That the learned writer has the most indisputable right to advocate his own views, no one, we fancy, will deny; but at the same time we are equally at liberty to comment on them, not only because he appears before us as one of the leaders of thought, but because his opinions will, no doubt, decide many who up to this time may be wavering in their faith. In his remarks on the XV Article "of Christ alone without sin," the Bishop says: "The Virgin and some of the saints are exceptions to the statement of the Article." Now, while in charity we must admit a certain latitude of thought to all writers, surely this is opposed to the whole tenor of Church of England doctrine. True, the prayer book does speak of our Lord as being born of a pure Virgin, but no one, but the most perverse of men, will insist that its meaning is that she was sinless; and, indeed, the Bishop's remarks on the Article simply amount to a flat contradiction of the doctrine it enunciates. On the VI Article the Bishop says: "This says nothing against the acceptance of whatever the church proposes for our belief, because whatsoever is so proposed to rest as ultimately on the authority of Scripture, of which the church is the guardian and expounder. All that it seeks to protect the faithful against is the enforcement on them, as requisite to salvation, of individual opinions which, being without the authentication of church authority have no Scriptural authority." Now this sentence is extremely involved, but if it means anything, it means that the church's statement of a doctrine proves that doctrine to be Scriptural. He seems, however, to argue in a vicious circle: nothing is to be believed as an article of faith except it be Scriptural, but nothing can be Scriptural except it be authenticated by the church, consequently no article can be known to have Scriptural authority unless so decided by the church. Of course if this be true, we need not read our bibles except for devotion, and as it implies the impossibility of the church being in error, it follows we are to believe whatever she teaches; understanding, the meanwhile, that it must of necessity be Scriptural. On the XXV Article, which says, "the sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them," the Bishop makes the following remarks: "In this sentence the stress is upon the words 'were not

ordained of Christ to be, etc.' The Article does not say that the things spoken of may not be done, but that they were not the object for which Christ ordained them." Now if this be not wresting the words of the Article, we know not what is. The Bishop states that by carrying the sacraments about we are probably to understand the procession of Corpus Domini. Now, in answer to this, we would simply ask whether the Bishop really believes that Cranmer, Ridley or Parker, the men who drew up our Articles, wished his meaning of the words to be conveyed by the XXV Article. We are confident that he cannot think so; and, therefore, are compelled to believe that it is a mere party effort to give a forced and unnatural meaning to plain words. That this deduction is allowable, no one will deny when he is told that the Bishop calls Extreme Unction the "lost plea" of the Anglican firmament," for by doing so he boldly avers that the fathers of the reformation injured the cause of truth, and therefore forfeits his claim to be considered a calm and dispassionate enquirer after truth. The only other points we will mention are the Bishop's remarks on Articles XXXI and XXXII, which we quote from Professor Conington: "Bishop Forbes maintains that the Eucharist is a commemorative service, available for the dead as well as for the living, and that the thirty-first Article does not contradict this; and finally declares that the Church of England has judicially ruled in her supreme tribunal that prayer for the dead is not unlawful." These, then, are some of the views advanced by a learned and able writer of the day, and surely all will admit that if these ideas are carried out to their legitimate conclusion, they will change the whole nature of the Church of England teaching. The articles should be changed so as to express the views of her people, and every vestige of the reformation be removed as speedily and as effectually as possible.

A REJOINDER.

A monthly cotemporary, published in this city in the interests of the ritualistic party, (we mean no offence and will take back the word if our cotemporary repudiates the name and turns his back upon the party) calls the *Church Observer* to account, in his number for October, with some degree of severity, and it is to be feared with some little loss of temper.

We are sorry that we have incurred his displeasure, and we intend meekly to submit to his castigation, seeing that it is not that "personal castigation," which he seems to think we have deserved. Peradventure we might have said as much or more before this, if an opportunity had been afforded us; but it is not generally regarded as an opportunity when, metaphorically of course, a pistol is placed at a man's head and he is commanded to apologize; nor, it is to be presumed, would such an apology be considered of much value. Submitting then to the castigation with as good a grace as we can command, we would humbly beg our castigator to reflect, and then say whether or not he has pursued the best course to produce in us the desired amendment; whether his temper may not have become so warmed by the exercise of chastising us, as to destroy the good effect his advice and exhortation might have produced, by the subsequent evil of an example not quite in accordance with the love and unity he is professedly endeavouring to enforce.

We must give one or two illustrations of what we mean. With most praiseworthy charity the low churchmen—"revolutionists" they are called in the same paragraph—are invited to join with those who are admonishing them, in meeting the phalanx of infidelity; and they are exhorted with fraternal words to charity, &c. Now this was pleasant reading, and we do not say what effect it might have had upon the "low churchmen," if it had not been followed up by such a scolding, that it is to be feared put out of their minds all the kind words that went before. The *Church Observer*, their organ, is said to have "surpassed, if possible, the *Record* and the *Rev* in virulence of spirit and absence of veracity," that is if the passage adverted to means anything; and then it is rated in language which, we think upon reflection, the editor will regret to see forming part of a lesson on the duty of unity. Nor do the committee of the *Church Observer* escape.

It may be admitted that they were guilty of some remissness, that they were not sufficiently conversant with their duties;—"ignorance" is the word our cotemporary, with questionable taste, is pleased frequently to apply to those who do not agree with him—that they assumed responsibilities which experience alone warned them they could not properly meet; and our cotemporary loftily says "they must take the consequences."

Well, and the consequences they certainly have to take from the pen of our cotemporary. He does not spare them, and we must confess we do not care to reproduce on our pages the language which he applies to them.

Now, will our cotemporary receive with

good temper what in good temper, we will now say when we suppose the metaphorical pistol has exploded, leaving us unharmed, or has been withdrawn from our head? We were as much pained whenever personalities crept into our columns as those who were assailed; and it has always been our aim, and ever will be, to prevent personal attacks; moreover, we believe we have never shrunk from acknowledging any error into which we may have been led, and make due amends; nevertheless we would respectfully suggest to our cotemporary that we, even we, in contending with an enemy, much more with a brother, would have been ashamed to assail him with the language contained in the article now under notice.

Our cotemporary must not suppose because we eschew personalities that we shall designate error with soft names. We hope to speak plainly; but, to-day, having endeavoured to give a lesson on brotherly love, we will refrain from comment, and only ask our cotemporary to enlighten those who, with singular humility, he calls "ignorant" upon the theology of a passage from an article, in his last number, marked "communicated," which reads as follows:—"The externals of the service certainly do not as a rule help us to realize the fact, that the now lifeless corpse was made in holy baptism and confirmation the temple of God the Holy Ghost; that it often had received the sacrament of the body and blood of the Son of Man, and that, therefore, it will one day rise again in glory to dwell forever in the presence of the Lord." It is detached from the context, and is stated as a general proposition. And we may further ask a name for the doctrine contained in the following citation from S. Cyril, approved, we suppose, by our cotemporary:—"He once in Cana of Galilee turned water into wine, which is akin to blood; and is it incredible that He should have turned wine into blood? For the bread and wine before the invocation of the adorable Trinity was simple bread and wine; while after the invocation, the bread becomes the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ." This, with several other citations, must have a meaning, and the doctrine a name.

Moreover, the ritualists with extraordinary lack of memory and characteristic modesty, call low churchmen "revolutionists," and speak of them as though they were chargeable with the strife of the day. They ought certainly to receive credit for their audacity. It is equal to that of the wolf when he charged the lamb with muddying the water that the wolf was drinking, although the water flowed from the wolf to the lamb.

If the ritualists have reference to this Diocese in their statement, they are most unfortunate; some of the low churchmen have now been working therein for more than a quarter of a century; and, guided by good and holy bishops, they to-day conduct the services of the church as they have been taught during that time by charge and by example; and because they desire to keep to the rubrics and the prayer book as they have been thus instructed, and to resist vigorously those who would introduce the practices of Rome, they are called "revolutionists!" Such is the logic of these men; and somewhat similar was their reasoning in the Provincial Synod, and they expect "the gullible public," as they call the laity, to submit blindly to this teaching.

We should like to offer our friend two pieces of advice, they are gratuitous:—

It is not well so incessantly to be charging with ignorance those who differ with us; people will begin to suspect you friend. A word to the wise.—It is not well to taunt an adversary with not daring to do a thing. It is childish. We dare do what we believe to be right, we dare not do what we believe to be wrong.

OBITUARY.—We regret to learn of the sudden death, on Friday last, of Mrs. Reid, the aged widow of the late venerable Canon Reid, of Freilighsburg; an event of sorrowful interest for a large portion of the Eastern Townships, and the breaking of another link connecting the present with past times. The mission of Freilighsburg was founded by the late Bishop Stuart, and held by the late Canon Reid till the time of his death some months ago. The sojourn of the Reids in that village covers a period of two generations.

PERSONALITIES.—It has been our resolve from the very inception of the *Observer*, to keep the paper free from all personalities. We regret that we have not altogether succeeded, and that we find it in the warmth of controversy so difficult a task. Our last number contained a letter, reflecting by insinuation, upon a clergyman in this city in a way which we cannot approve of. It was neither fair nor correct; and would not have been admitted if it had been seen by the committee before it appeared in our columns. While we shall strive to be fearless and faithful, we hope also to succeed in avoiding personalities.

THE LATE LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL.—In the Protestant Episcopal Convention of New York, on Thursday, the Rev. Dr. Haigh moved the

following, which was unanimously passed, the members rising:—"Resolved.—That this House has heard with deep regret of the death of the Most Reverend Dr. Fulford, Bishop of Montreal, whose presence and services at the last General Convention gave so much pleasure; and that this House do communicate to the House of Bishops its desire to join with them in such expressions of regard for the departed Bishop, and respect for his memory, as they shall see fit to prepare."

Correspondence.

We are not responsible for any opinions expressed by our correspondents.

CONTINUING INSTANT IN PRAYER.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.]

No facts need be cited, no argument brought forward, to prove the benefit of prayer to the Christian individually and to the Church Catholic; history attests that the vitality of Christianity has in the past been greatest when its professors have most abounded in this blessed exercise, and personal experience proves that

"Prayer makes the darkened cloud withdraw, Prayer climbs the ladder Jacob saw; Gives exercise to faith and love, Brings every blessing from above"

As a member of the Anglican Church, from conviction and choice, not education, loving its simple and yet sublime liturgy, firmly believing its truly scriptural articles, and desiring to follow its teachings, it still appears to me that a want exists for a means of better cementing the hearts of believers together and causing them to abound in good works. This want can, to my mind, be only met by the prayer meeting. But is there not a weekly prayer meeting held in many of our churches, and daily service in our cathedral? I may be asked, True and blessed privileges these means of grace are; but would it not be well for occasional prayer meetings to be held, presided over by the pastor, in which the spiritual gifts of the lay brethren there present might under his direction be exercised and strengthened in extempore prayer? I am not aware of any interdiction being placed by the prayer book or by the canons of the Church upon services so conducted, and I rejoice to know that such gatherings are not unknown amongst us, but, alas! they are rarely held. When once frequent, as I firmly believe and humbly pray they may ere long be, we will see our church arise and shine in the fuller splendour of her great King and Head—worldliness and want of charity amongst us less apparent a greater number of souls will be added unto the Church—and the body of believers be increased in the stature and fullness of Christ. That this subject may be prayerfully considered by our clergy and laity is the hope of one desiring to walk in the Spirit.

ELECTIONS OF BISHOP.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.]

Sir,—The election of a bishop is a subject which at present is very deeply engaging the attention of the members of the Church of England in the Diocese of Montreal.

The House of Bishops has the right of nominating, but the Synod has the right of rejecting until a desirable name is presented.

There is a question being considered, whether it is desirable to fill the office from the ranks of the ministry in the country, or to send to England. It has been suggested to send to the Propagation Society which has so greatly aided in our mission work. Supposing this were done. It is a work which that Society has no organization to accomplish. It will be referred to the Archbishop of Canterbury as its President. If he sends out two names and they are both rejected, it will be very ungracious. It is said that our late beloved Bishop was so sent, and that we cannot hope for a better man than he was. Our circumstances are entirely different. When he came out, in 1850, our church was purely missionary, without any organization except the Church Society. All the funds of the church were in his control. He had more power than any English Bishop. Our growth and increase have required the inauguration of the Synodical system, which our late Bishop worked out so successfully. In doing this we have had to look for experience to the working of the church in the United States, where the position is precisely like ours dependent on the people. That of the Church in England we cannot follow. We are adapting ourselves to circumstances entirely different. A person of middle age coming from England now would find himself in a very different position to Bishop Fulford when he came.

The working of the Synods, the gradual withdrawal of the Propagation Society's funds have greatly altered the power of the Bishop, and require the development of our own resources which can only be done by a good understanding and hearty co-operation between clergy and laity. A person who has served in the ministry in Canada, and understands most experience the position which the laity must take, and the workings of our organizations, is more likely to keep things moving quietly than a stranger brought up all his life under a totally different system.

Then again, is it the best way to develop our Church in this country, to say to those who have laboured in the ministry,—You are not capable of filling the position of responsibility, to be leader of the mission work of the diocese? Is it encouraging to the ministry? Does it tend to promote high attainments? All the other four dioceses in Canada, in electing their bishops have elected from the ministry in Canada. The office of a Metropolitan is so limited in its duties that it is of very minor importance to the great work of the Diocese to consider if it is wise, if it is safe, to give up the responsibility of electing one whom they know, in whom they have had experience, and accept a stranger (nominated by as good a man as the Archbishop of Canterbury), who can know but little of our circumstances, less of our people, and still less of those peculiar difficulties through which our church is now passing in her struggle to carry on, unaided, her great work in the mission field.

A CHURCHMAN.

THE SABREVOIS MISSION.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.]

Sir,—In St. James Cathedral, last Sabbath morning, the Rev. Mr. Carmichael made an excellent and eloquent appeal on behalf of the above-named mission, which cannot fail to produce good results as well as to remove many absurd objections to missionary efforts among Romanists under the auspices of our church. He preached from St. Paul's words: "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably

with all men." From this and other kindred passages, he clearly shewed that whilst it is the Christian's duty to live at peace with all men and in all ways; still the text pointed to the fact that in some cases it was impossible to do so. This is implied in the apostle's injunction, and doubtless referred to the propagation of the gospel. It is impossible, said he, for the earnest Protestant to live at peace with Rome so long as the Tridentine Creed and the Creed of Pope Pius the IV. are taught by her. He did not know how far he would injure his cause by openly and plainly discussing this subject; but he felt it his duty to be candid at the outset, and hoped that after he was heard, the cause of truth would suffer nothing in consequence. And then he proceeded in a clear and able manner to point out the fundamental differences of the respective teachings of the churches of Rome and England, dwelling particularly and forcibly on the prominent doctrines of our church, namely—salvation through Christ alone; the Bible as the sole rule of faith and practice; one intercession, one sacrifice, and the believer's complete righteousness in Christ. With these he contrasted Romish falsehoods, namely, salvation by works; many intercessions; making tradition of equal authority with the Bible; teaching that one man may acquire a double righteousness, part of which is bestowed on another; endless sacrifices and dogmas that the priest has power to forgive sins &c. These, said he, are fundamental doctrines, and if we hold that we are right and that Rome is wrong, there can be no peace between us. If we hold that Rome is dangerous and that no real compromise can be made with her, it is our bounden duty to spread the truth among Roman Catholics. Romans do not hesitate—nay, they leave no stone unturned to spread their views among Protestants; and why should Protestants hesitate or neglect to spread better principles among Romanists. This view of the case he argued in a conclusive and satisfactory manner, and deprecated the objection raised by some to the effect that every man should be allowed, without interference, to worship God as he thought best, and that any outside interference was only the stirring up of strife. The voice, said he, is the voice of Jacob, raised in the spirit of false charity, but the hand is the hand of Esau. The Rev. gentleman briefly referred to the poverty and lack of zeal which they had to encounter in prosecuting the work of this mission, calling attention to the fact that they had to contend against the boundless wealth and untiring zeal of Rome. Still their labours were crowned with success—being blessed by many converts from the Church of Rome. He felt that the present age was one in which every earnest Protestant should contend for the pure scriptural faith of the church. There should be no uncertain sound going forth from her. The apostles' motto in the early age of the church was, no peace with Paganism; and what Paganism was to them, Romanism is to us. It is impossible in a brief summary like this, to give your readers anything like a fair report of this reasonable and most excellent sermon, or to do justice to the earnestness, talents and theological learning of the preacher as manifested therein. Suffice it to say that the mission board could not have made a better selection, or have sent a more able advocate to plead its cause; and sure we are, that its interests and usefulness must steadily increase and prosper in the hands of such men as the Rev. Mr. Carmichael. His masterly sermon was listened to with breathless attention by a large congregation; and every one of his hearers wished him God-speed in his noble work.

Toronto, October 12th, 1868.

WESLEYAN DISPARAGEMENT.

We have been informed that some of our brethren of the Wesleyan body have taken advantage of our reference to Dr. Jackson's letter and to the remarks of the *Times* upon it, to speak very disparagingly of the condition of our church, as though it were wholly given up to ritualism and rationalism, and thoroughly justified them in their strenuous opposition to it. We are sorry that such a course should be pursued by any of our Protestant brethren; for however deplorable are the efforts made by some of her unfaithful sons to introduce their erroneous views and practices, we think the brethren to whom we allude ought rather to sympathize with those who still remain faithful to their church, and to encourage them in their counter efforts to vindicate its laws, and to preserve it pure and unadulterated, by casting out that by which some are seeking to betray us. The fact is, that the Church of England, as a church, has not changed since Wesley's times. Its articles are as scriptural, its liturgy is as devotional, and its doctrines are as saving now as then. And our belief is that there is far more vitality infused, by the grace of God, into the hearts of thousands of her ministers and members now than there was then. But there have been times when churches have been called to pass through trials such as our church is now called upon to endure; but we still have confidence that God will spare her, and enable her to thrust out those who traitorously wish to introduce the novelties of Rome and of scepticism also. And in this struggle all faithful men, to whom the interests of God's truth and our common Protestantism are dear, should seek to encourage, not dishearten us—to strengthen and not weaken us. When will Protestants learn that in union there is strength, and that it is their duty as well as advantage to endeavour to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace? Take a city in which there are several Protestant churches, and who does not know that the more spiritually minded the members of these churches are, the more faithful and conscientious, the more constrained by the love of Christ, the better it is for all of them? If scepticism abounds in one, if formalism rules in another, and worldliness in a third, how injurious would be the effect upon all? It should therefore be the desire of each for the others that more and more of truth should prevail in them, that God may be worshipped in spirit and in truth, and to grieve where it is otherwise; but alas, too often charity is sacrificed, and something very like rejoicing in iniquity is heard instead. And we would ask, of what is this a sign, but that the poison of doctrinal unfaithfulness is not confined to the Church of England? Everywhere we see the outbreak of the anti-Christian spirit of the world manifesting itself against the Gospel of Christ; and Wesleyanism is not free from the poison, or its own spiritual life unaffected by its influence, as indeed we have heard some of its best members deeply deplore. We share in their grief, and long that the time may return when our Protestant brethren shall walk more consistently in the good old paths of evangelical truth and love, and in a hearty co-operation with the faithful members of our church in support of real religious progress, such as Wesley himself always inculcated.—*St. John, N.B. Church Witness.*