

The Church Guardian.

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER

Published in the interests of the Church of England.

NON-PARTIZAN!

INDEPENDENT!

It will be fearless and outspoken on all subjects, but its effort will always be to speak what it holds to be the truth in love.

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR: REV. JOHN D. H. BROWNE, Lock Drawer 20, HALIFAX, N. S.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: REV. EDWYNS W. PENTREATH WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

A staff of correspondents in every Diocese in the Dominion. Price, ONE DOLLAR AND A HALF a year in advance.

The Cheapest Church Weekly in America, Circulation double that of any other Church paper in the Dominion.

Address: THE CHURCH GUARDIAN, Lock Drawer 20, HALIFAX, N. S.

The Editor may be found between the hours of 9 a. m., and 1 p. m., and 2 and 6 p. m., at his office, No. 54 Granville Street (up-stairs), directly over the Church of England Institute.

The Associate Editor can be found daily between 9 a. m., and 12, at the Branch Office, 515½ Main Street, Winnipeg, opposite City Hall.

EVANGELICISM.

It is a sad pity that we should have in the Church so many party names. That there are schools of varying thought in the one visible Church on earth is not remarkable, nor can it ever be avoided, nor is it indeed a cause of much regret. The existence of different schools of thought is doubtless an evidence of the want of perfect knowledge, for if all had perfect knowledge all would think alike. That the Church contains different schools of thought is no necessary evidence of weakness. On the contrary, that men of different "views" can work together on the lines of the Church's standards is an evidence of the true Catholicity of those standards. Outside the Church there are an infinitely greater number of schools of thought. The difference between these and those within the Church is that the latter hold the same essentials, and, therefore, can and do intercommune in things spiritual; while the former, differing in the essential verities of the faith, as well as in non-essentials, are at variance with the Church, and not less so with one another.

The existence of different schools of thought within the Church is, we repeat, no evidence of weakness, but rather is an indication of strength. It is a sign of life. Time was, not long ago, when all the clergy and all the congregations *appeared* to think alike, but when we looked below the surface we found the reason to be that they did not think at all. Religion in those days was not thought worthy of more than superficial consideration, so all agreed to go to sleep.

We shall, however, be reminded now of the rebuke of St. Paul to the Corinthians for their party spirit displayed in the claims, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos," &c. No text in the New Testament is more frequently misapplied than this one, unless it be the Apostle's declaration that "he would eat no meat while the earth standeth, if seeing should make his brother to offend." As the latter text is constantly trotted out to justify the man who gives way in matters of principle to the popular wish, but whose real reason is very often indolence, so the text in which St. Paul rebukes the Corinthians for following party leaders is made to do duty as a condemnation of the existence of different opinions held by men of different minds. The text cannot be fairly applied at all to what we call schools of thought within the Church. It refers to those sects who banded

themselves to the following of certain men. It has plain application to-day to those who claim men as their leaders rather than the Church, that is, to Wesleyans, Campbellites, Calvinists, Arminians, Lutherans, as it well might have been to all the early sects, as Arians, Macedonians, Sabellianites, and a host of others. The only party names derived from leaders in the Church to-day have been given by others as nicknames, not claimed by the accused, as for instance, Puseyites. This name, however, has died away, because being no longer, since the knowledge of Dr. Pusey's faithful life has got abroad, a nickname, the bestowers of the name upon an opposite school of thought no longer find it to be a satisfactory weapon of offence. It is a fact, to which we may give more or less attention, according to the bent of our mind, that such a nickname as Rylite has never been applied to the opposite school of thought. The term Puseyite has passed away, because to admire the beautiful character and lifelong faithfulness to the Church of England of the late Dr. Pusey is no longer a mark of reproach.

There remain, however, the terms *High Church*, *Low Church*, *Evangelical*, *Ritualist*. These terms are in themselves quite inoffensive; none of them reflect on the primary importance of Holy Scripture, the Church, or the Great Head of the Church, Jesus Christ our Lord. It need be no more a cause of offence to be known as an adherent of one of these schools of thought than for a loyal subject of Canada to belong to Conservative, Liberal, Tory or Whig. The evil does not lie in the classification of opinions, but in the illiberality of men of one school in their reflections on those who differ from them. Unfortunately we hear High Churchmen speaking unkindly and in a cynical spirit of Evangelicals, and we fear justice impels us to say that still more harsh and uncharitable are the reflections made by the Low Church school on their brethren of the High and Ritualist wings.

The terms High and Low are easily understood as applied to men who, on the one hand, present frequently and fearlessly the Scriptural teaching of a corporate Church as the pillar and guardian of the sacred writings and on the other, of those who, in their anxiety to present the very text and morality of Holy Scripture, give but little prominence to the casket in which the pearl of great price is by God's will and way preserved in this world. Catholic and Protestant are also terms which ought to be readily and fully understood, but the term which forms the title of this article is on every side much perverted from its simple meaning. Every school of thought bases its claim to favorable consideration on its Evangelical character—every claim is appealed to the sacred Evangel. The word Evangelical is applied to-day by the sects and the world to those several bodies who, disagreeing with one another in necessary and fundamental doctrines of the Faith, are united in antagonism to the whole Church in which we allow one party to be dubbed Evangelical. Unitarians, Universalists, Christadelphians, Antiochian Baptists, Calvinists, &c., all range themselves spasmodically in union—not unity—beneath a banner on which is inscribed Evangelical Alliance. On the other hand, the Prayer Book, the common heritage of every party in the Church, all of whom have promised obedience thereto and solemnly given profession of belief therein, distinctly repudiates the various heresies above

named as being contrary to the Faith of the Evangel.

What is meant by the term Evangelical Churches? They who recognize the Bible as the court of appeal for all doctrines? Then the Church of England may claim the chief place in such a declaration. Compare the Lutheran Profession of Faith, the Westminster Confession, which is now in many quarters under process, not so much of revision as of total dissolution, any sectarian book of discipline, with the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, and let the Evangelical character be adjudged to that which has the most plain and distinct Gospel teaching in it. We hear of Evangelical churches, by which phrase is meant to be conveyed bodies of Christians, severed from one another in doctrine and discipline and communion with the Church of England, in which one school of thought monopolizes the title Evangelical. Compare the prayers, the hymns, the sermons of these churches with the Prayer Book and the hymnals and the pulpit utterances of the Church of England, and let the title "*Evangelical*" be awarded to that which teaches most distinctly and constantly Evangelical truths, for instance, the Incarnation, the Life, Death, Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, or the *Bible* doctrines of Repentance, Faith, Justification and Sanctification. If the title Evangelical is to be applied within the Church as *par excellence* belonging to any single school of thought, let the claims of varying schools be sifted and tested, not by the favour of the world who hears, nor by the *vox populi*, but by the *vox Dei*, the very words of the Holy Bible. Let the claims of each school be brought to the bar of Scripture, and let that school of thought, whose *teaching and practice* are most closely in accordance with the doctrines of our Blessed Lord and the self-denying practice of the holy life of Jesus Christ and His Apostles, be accounted as in the sight of God, most truly Evangelical.

PAPERS ON MUSIC.

No. III.—CONTINUED.

THE Psalms themselves are full of exhortations to sing. "O come let us sing unto the Lord," is the invitation of the 95th Psalm, which we address to each other whenever we assemble for public worship, and we comply with the invitation to "sing" by saying the Psalms or songs which follow. How any one can "search the Scriptures" on this point, and fail to see that singing the Psalms is the proper mode of using them in public worship is incomprehensible. When from Scripture testimony we turn to the custom and usage of the Christian Church, we find that in every age and in every country the singing of the Psalms of David has been sanctioned and practised. The Church of England speaks definitely upon the subject; her Prayer Book contains the Psalms of David printed as they are to be sung, or, where that is not practicable, said in Churches. On which expression, Archbishop King, in his "Inventions of men in the worship of God," says, where persons *can* sing they are obliged to do so in obedience to God's command, but where through any defect of nature they *can not* sing they may be dispensed with saying.

An opinion has gained ground in consequence