

# The Church Guardian.

Upholds the Doctrines and Rubrics of the Prayer Book.

"Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."—Eph. vi. 24.  
"Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."—Jude: 3.

Vol. IV.—No. 25.]

HALIFAX.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1882.

WINNIPEG.

[One Dollar and a Half a Year.]

## FORMS.

Our Presbyterian friends are finding out that a religion without form is a decadent religion; that if there is life and beauty and power in any religious life or character, they must array themselves in forms. Let us think of it for a moment. Nature and religion coincide and mutually illustrate each other; so that whatever is contrary to the analogy of the former, has no foundation in the latter. It is a powerful argument for any tenet that it falls in with the course of nature—and as powerful an argument against it—that it is at variance with that course. As life refines, deepens and strengthens, it flows along in forms. The forms of cultivated society are numerous and elegant; of uncultivated, rude and few. They are implied in the improvement and embellishment of our social existence. As civilization advances they are multiplied; when it retrogrades they are diminished. Now, not only does a close analogy exist between our daily and religious life, but they run into each other, and are, in many respects, the same. Hence, the argument for forms has its basis in the life, and so, in the common sense of men; and if it would be unreasonable to do away with the common forms of politeness because many rest in them alone, without possessing that kindness and feeling of which they are the moulds and types, not less unreasonable would it be to undervalue and reject the forms of religion because many use them who have little or no claim to the deep glowing spirit of the Christian life.

If we look at the development of intellectual life, we reach the same conclusion. As it progresses, it clothes itself in the complex and constantly recurring forms of grammar, rhetoric, logic, etc. Among the sciences, mathematics, abounds in forms and symbols. Among the professions, law is a striking example; and literature is but an outpouring of the soul and heart in suitable forms. Forms, therefore, are essential in unfolding and perfecting our intellectual life; and since this bears a close analogy to our religious life—is, in a certain sense, one with it—we may infer the same respecting the latter.

Look at the world around us. Its hidden life is always working in and displaying itself through material forms. God reveals Himself by them. His eternal power and God-head are seen, being understood by the things that are made. All around us, nature is full of types and symbols of His goodness, and glory, and power. Her forms are blessings. In them, He comes; through them, He purifies and strengthens. How can we deny her impressive teaching—that the soul rises to its Heavenly Father through forms, and is blessed in them? Is the instruction of the Church different from hers? Do they not harmonize? Do they not bear the marks of the same divine original? Surely they do. They advance along the same line towards the Infinite. What conflicts with the one, is at variance with the other. Consistency calls upon us either to hold fast to forms, or to abandon the wonderful ritual of nature—that glorious service which, morning and evening, recurs in her gorgeous temple; where the incense rises from countless flower-censers waving over her teeming breast; where the same lessons of the stones, and the trees, and the stars are constantly read; where the same chants of leafy woods, breathing airs, painted birds, murmuring streams, and swelling ocean with its deep diapason, unceas-

ingly charm with melodies, infinitely deep, and sweet as those of the angel choirs.—*From the Chimes.*

## DARWINISM AT A DISCOUNT.

The prospects of Mr. Darwin's theory of the ascent of man from the ape, and the gradual procession of the higher species of animals from the lower, are decidedly discouraging to the author of the theory. Not a few of the eminent scientists, who at first seem to regard this ancestry of man with a great degree of veneration, have latterly lost much of their reverence for the ape theory, and show a marked unwillingness to acknowledge the family relationship, while the absurd theory is receiving heavy blows from outsiders who were never ashamed to call God their Father.

A late London paper has an interesting report of a paper recently read before the Victoria (Philosophical) Institute, upon "Breaks in the Continuity of Mammalian Life at Certain Geological Periods Fatal to the Darwinian Theory of Evolution," by Mr. T. K. Callard, F. G. S., which is spoken of as throwing much light on the subject of the comparatively recent origin of man, and being among the most important contributions to the philosophical and scientific disquisitions of the Institute. An important discussion followed, in which a number of eminent scientists participated, and which was altogether favorable to the position taken by the author of the paper. The well-known geologist and paleontologist, E. Charlesworth, remarked in the progress of the discussion, "that while the theory of evolution, according to Darwin, gets rid of many difficulties, it at the same time raises a large number."

The author has been hunting in Mr. Darwin's own preserves, or in those of his brothers, the geologists, and shows, as the result of his investigations, that in the geological history of the past, the links necessary to establish the theory of evolution by gradual development, are utterly wanting, while, on the other hand, all scientific history brings us up to the point of the sudden development, or, in other words, the actual creation of man.—*New York Observer.*

## CHRISTIANITY VS. ATHEISM.

The Bishop of Manchester, in one of his recent Addresses, drew this striking contrast between the demands on men's faith in regard to Christianity and Atheism. He said:

He would admit that Christianity had its difficulties, and there were points on which they might desire that the revelation had been fuller and more clear; but those things were ordered for them by One whom they believed to be wiser and whom they knew to be stronger than themselves. There was sufficient light for a man to walk by who did not deliberately choose darkness, and he was not going to try to escape from those small difficulties by plunging into and accepting the infinitely greater difficulties and perplexities of the creed of atheism. To call upon him to believe that this wonderful universe, with its varied courses and wonderful controlling mechanism, these worlds upon worlds in space, until he was lost and his mind and brain became dazed in the contemplation of them—to ask him to believe that all these things came by chance, and that he himself, with all the

wonderful faculties with which God had endowed every human being, was developed by protoplasm from a germ without any designing providence of God governing him, was asking him to believe what to his mind was absurd and impossible. And so because there were difficulties in his faith which he could not explain, he was not going to accept the infinitely greater difficulties of the creed of atheism, for it did not make the theory of life easier, but a thousand times more difficult to say there was no God, no Christ, no Holy Spirit, no soul, no life beyond.

## SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

If you want to put the claim of the Supremacy of the Pope to a test, ask for historical Proof, such as would be accepted in a matter of secular history, or by a court in any law-suit about succession to a peerage, (1) that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome; (2) that he conveyed his special privilege to the Bishops of Rome exclusively, as his successors; (3) that no such irregularities have ever taken place in elections to the Papacy as to break the line of Petrine succession, supposing it to have ever existed at all. Remember, the whole Roman position is staked on the demonstrable truth of these three matters; but if they be true, some proof must be forthcoming. Remember also that a mere statement made by some one three hundred years later than any alleged event is no proof of it, unless he be expressly quoting contemporary documents. And if you do obtain this proof, kindly communicate it to us, for we do not find it. Do not let yourself be drawn away to any side-issues, but keep fast to the three main points as above. Any attempt to avoid them, or to put you off with something else, is a confession that there is no case.

## DERIVATION OF THE WORD "CANON."

If we go back into the early history and practice of all religions, we find that thousands of years before the invention of printing, the priests of Greece and Rome, as well as those of Babylon and Assyria, and of the Druids—perhaps more ancient than the former, and quite as ancient as the latter—chanted or sang the laws and ordinances of the faith, the better by the means of rhythm, and perhaps of rhyme, to impress them upon the memory of the people. With this clue we find that a *canon* is a *chant*, a law, a maxim, a precept, promulgated in the temples by the priests, intoning them in solemn recitation or chant, as is now done in the Cathedral service, and that the root of the word is the Celtic *can*, to sing, to rehearse, and *sona* (*shona*, pronounced *hona*) fortunate, happy, holy, whence *can-on* or *cauhon*, a holy song. The word *canon* in secular music seems to be derivable from the same root, as well as the Italian *canzone* and the French *chanson*.—*Mr. Walford's Antiquarian Magazine.*

THERE are not less than six millions Moslems in Europe, while the number in the whole world is estimated at about one hundred and seventy-five millions, so that not far from one-eighth of the population of our globe acknowledge the false Prophet. At the great Mohammedan Missionary University at Cairo, in Egypt, there are at this day ten thousand students under training, ready to go to any part of the world to teach the doctrines of Islam.