

(b.) The power of the world will make itself felt in different ways, at different periods of your life. I think that in earlier youth most probably this temptation will come to you in the form of a too great regard for the opinions and practices of others. I do not of course refer to that proper deference which not the young alone should pay to those whose example is worthy of imitation. I speak of the "wicked world"—of your finding yourself among those whose standard of conduct is not that of God's Will; and then of your being afraid and ashamed to differ from it. But if your life is going to be worth anything, if you are going to use the spirit of "ghostly strength" to be given to you, if you are going to have any independence, any true manliness of character at all, you will often have to act differently from others—often, too, when so to do will be most difficult. Make up your mind to this. If you will not do it, you cannot lead a Christian life. Read in Daniel iii. 16, 17, 18, the noble words of the three youths who went one way, while all people, nations and languages went another.

Later in life the world will come in another form; you may have, [through God's grace] formed a character of some independence; then the cares of this life [if you have to earn your living], or the deceitfulness of riches [if you have wealth or are making haste to be rich], will choke the good seed. Remember what was said about the Spirit of Wisdom; that it taught us what life was for; the Spirit of the world, with its narrow interests, its empty pretences or its vain shows, will try to make you live for lower aims. If you, in truth, renounce the pomps and vanities of the world, you will not lose your soul for the sake of getting rich, or to make a great show in fashionable society, or to gain some high position. Yet men and women do lose their souls for such petty things as these. You are not required to renounce rational, moderate and innocent recreations and pleasures. You must renounce all pleasures in themselves sinful, or that may happen to lead you into sin, and you must allow yourself in none at such times or in such a degree as to interfere with your duty. In this matter look for the guidance of the Spirit of Counsel.

(c.) The Flesh.—God has given us certain natural feelings, desires, appetites, and has given them for our own good, and joined pleasure with their due satisfaction. But if I follow their lead for pleasure alone, seeking that pleasure for its own sake, the flesh will gain the mastery over me. On this, as on all these subjects, I will afterwards speak specifically, but now just take an example or two to see what is meant. I must take rest, and rest is very pleasant; but if, because it is pleasant, I take rest when I should be at work, I fall into the sin of sloth; I must eat, and it is pleasant to do so, hence the danger of the sin of gluttony. But to come to a principle, I must make up my mind that "Because I like to do so and so, because it is very pleasant so to act; because I want to, because it is natural," are not valid excuses for a Christian who has renounced the flesh. Here again you must quite make up your mind that if you are going to live a real, earnest Christian life, you must do a great deal that you don't like to do, and have undone much that you would like to do. Unless you are prepared for this you cannot live a good life. Look in Galatians v. 19, 20, 21. You see that some sins that you would expect to see spoken of as works of the flesh; but there are others, e. g., variance, strife, heresies, which you would not expect to see in such a list. But think a little while and you will see that they all spring from taking our own likings and dislikes for our guide instead of the Will of God.

Let us then recapitulate. I will shun presumption and pride, I will be scrupulously careful in no way to influence another for evil, but will try to influence others for good. The Will of God shall be my rule of conduct, and not either the opinions of the world or my own inclinations. This I mean when I say I renounce the Devil, the world and the flesh.

CORRIGENDUM.

In first paper, last paragraph but one, third line from the end, "morning and evening prayers," for "and" read "or."

Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church, will not be admitted.

THE FUNERAL BELL.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Will any of your readers inform me how, when a death occurs in a Parish, the Church bell should be rung? That is as announcing a death. For, I assume, that the "Passing Bell" that we find alluded to sometimes in our reading is that referred to in one of the Canons of 1603, and which is ordered to be rung at or about the time the soul of some one of the faithful is passing away. The same Canon says "that one short peal only be rung" upon the death, if it so fall out, of that person. But is it not customary to signify by the bell the sex and the age? How is the former done, i. e.,

how many strokes for each, and is the peal to be rung after?

W. R. B.

PRESENTMENT TO PARISHES.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—In your number for the 24th March "D.C.M." asks that the parishioners should give up their power of appointment to the rectorship of a parish whenever a vacancy occurs, into the hands of the Bishop and a Clerical Board, to be appointed by him, "adding some Laymen if they wish." If who wish? To whom does the word *they* apply? It stands in a convenient position in the above sentence, and could be made to refer to either the Bishop and his Board or to some Laymen. Why should "D.C.M." ask or expect the laity to yield any such position? They certainly are the most interested in procuring the right sort of a person to be their spiritual adviser and guide, and would most likely take more pains about the matter than any Board, composed as it might be, and centered in Halifax or elsewhere. A wailing has been heard for the past few years from some of the clergy, to the effect that the Church is in danger from this and other powers which have been secured to the laity. At the meetings of the Synod, at parish meetings, in private society, occasionally in the pulpit, some of the clergy seem to think they are called upon to sound a note of warning that the laity are having too much to say in Church matters. Insinuations of that kind are not only in bad taste, but they are offensive. Who compose the Church?—not the clergymen only; and when the vast majority of her members are laymen, ought it to be a matter of whining or complaint that laymen are to be allowed some decision in a choice that concerns themselves so hugely? It is to be hoped that parishioners throughout the Diocese who now possess the legal right of appointment to the vacancies within their several parishes will never yield this right to any clerical or other Board. It is just as safe in their hands, and as likely to be well used by them, as by a Board outside of their parish. Presentation to parishes, in the Colonies and in the United States, is not to be compared to the practice prevailing in England; but as the discussion of the points connected with this question would be, perhaps, too long for newspaper communication, "D.C.M." and others of the clergy and laity are referred to the March number of the *Contemporary Review*, article 5, "The Lay Element in England and America," by John Henry Hopkins, Williamsport, Penn. The reprint of the *Review* by Munro, of "Seaside Library" reputation, can be had at any bookstore in Halifax or elsewhere for 20 cents.

The reviewer has thoroughly gone through the question of presentment, as it exists in England and the United States, and concludes in favour of the practice in the latter country, especially with reference to the influence of the lay element in the Church, which "D.C.M." and some others seem to think should be got rid of somehow or other. The following extracts from the article referred to above will give an impression of the line of argument made use of by the reviewer:—

"Now, if the right is not to be given to the Bishop, nor to a Central Board, nor to one private individual, to whom can it be entrusted but to a local Board—the leading persons of the congregation concerned—in other words, the Vestry? They are, personally, the most interested. They are to receive their spiritual ministrations from the Priest appointed. They are to benefit by or suffer from his personal peculiarities. They are to furnish his income by voluntary contributions out of their own pockets. They are more directly interested, therefore, than Bishop, Central Board, and all other parties put together. To entrust the selection of the Priest to them, therefore, must necessarily be the safest, and the least liable to objection, of all modes thinkable."

Again: "And let me appeal specially to the experience of advanced men at home. What would the whole movement of the Great Catholic Revival have been without the laity? Where would have been the enormous gifts for Churches, Church schools, and all manner of good works, that have made the Anglican Church, during the past forty years, the marvel of Christendom, without the laity? Where would have been your two fighting Societies, the "English Church Union" and the "Church of England Workingmen's Association," without the laity? They have proved themselves, in every way, fit to be trusted. Then trust them."

The italics are all in the original. As "D.C.M." has given his initials, it is only fair I should give mine. J. W. H. R.

BAPTISM BY IMMERSION.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—That Baptism by immersion, or dipping, is the mode prescribed by the Anglican Church, of course students of the Prayer Book are well aware; but it would be novel information to many of our laity, and to those of the so-called Baptist sect astonishing. Now, in our ministry we do come across candidates for Baptism who desire us strongly to follow the preferred mode, that of immersion. I would like to know how is it performed by a clergyman in surplice, and with the service he is bound to use? If he immerses at the usual place, as ordered by the rubrics, it would be necessary to keep the baptized standing before him in his wet

clothing for some time, seeing that he has yet to be specially addressed, and certain prayers, in which he is interested, have to be offered up. With those who practice immersion, as do the Baptists, it is the final act of their service, the immersed immediately going away to a vestry for the necessary change of clothing. Some of the clergy have immersed candidates; how have they acted? In a number of a missionary magazine I saw a picture of a Baptism of an African. The candidate was in the river, but the administrator was in his surplice on one of its banks. Would you not consider that in such a mode the catechumen was baptizing himself, although the words were being said by the Priest on the bank? It is the priest or minister that is to immerse, just as in Confirmation, it is not the candidate that confirms anything, but the Bishop.

W. R. B.

BARNABAS AND SAUL.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—I have read with care the communication of your nameless correspondent, headed "The ordination of Barnabas and Saul." I cannot agree with the conclusions at which he has arrived for the following reasons:—

1. Because Barnabas and Saul were "prophets and teachers" as well as Lucius, Niger and Manaen. These three men, who laid hands on Barnabas and Saul, could not have ordained them to a higher office than they themselves possessed, and they were not apostles. Saul, immediately on his conversion, "preached 'Christ in the synagogues' at Damascus, 'that He is the Son of God.'" And at Antioch, previous to this event, Barnabas and Saul, "for a whole year, assembled themselves with the Church, and taught much people." Saul, I take it, considered himself an apostle from the moment that Christ appeared unto Him; and he possessed the lesser offices of "prophet and teacher"—the less being comprehended in the greater—in the same way that St. Peter declared himself to be "an Elder," though he was also an apostle. Acts xiii. 1; ix. 20, 22, 27, 29; xi. 23, 27.

2. The separation of Saul and Barnabas was not an ordination, but for a special missionary "work," which they immediately undertook and "fulfilled" when they had reached Attalia. This appears from a careful reading of the context from Acts xiii. 4 to 14, 27. This then could not have been an ordination, but a less important ceremony of recommending them "to the grace of God for the work which they fulfilled." And besides "the laying on of hands" was not confined to ordination and confirmation, but was a mode of blessing, as in the case of Jacob blessing the sons of Joseph, and in the healing of the sick by the apostles.

3. But the most conclusive proof of all, that this was not an ordination, is found in Gal. i. 1, where St. Paul declares himself to be "an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father." Six different times does he make this declaration. He declares also that after his conversion he "conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went he up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before him,"—they only who were possessed of the apostleship and could have conferred it on St. Paul, if it had been necessary.

Yours truly,

WM. LOGAN,

Fenelon Falls, April 5, 1881.

"WRITING TO THE PAPERS," AND THE OUTLINE ON ST. MARK VIII., 36, 37.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Many thanks to "A. B." for his reply to my request, on St. Mark viii., 36, etc. All the more does he receive my thanks for the good example he sets in so responding, to many of the clergy. How many of them are utterly indifferent to helping one another through their Church paper. What with the routine of their parochial work, their domestic cares, and perhaps anxieties, many of them doubtless find little time, and less inclination to sitting down and writing off, more especially if they have to refresh themselves on the point, an answer to some query that some clerical brother is awaiting a solution to, or is in difficulty with. Yet, if more attention was paid to one of the lessons of last Sunday's Gospel (Fourth in Lent) "to gather up the fragments (say, of time) that nothing be lost," and use those fragments of time in assisting their Church paper in various ways to make it interesting and profitable, they would be doing a work, the effect of which would be [I don't think it too strong a word] incalculable. When a person sits down to ask a question through a paper, he must be desirous of an answer. It is not to merely "while away" the time, or a sign of ignorance, or learning, as the case may be. If all were to act as some clergymen do, who will sit and criticize correspondents and editors and the "get up," perhaps, of the paper generally, yet never send a communication of any sort, ["don't like writing to the papers," say they, "don't like speaking of ourselves, or our work,"] why we might give up having papers at all! Not so acts the Methodist minister to his *Guardian*, or the Presbyterian teaching Elder to his *Advocate* or *Herald*. Their paper is part of their work, not obligatory, but from a sense of their duty being something more and wider than the care of the particular flock under their charge. Their denomination's interest demands that the paper should be supported. And

support it they do. The result is, they read the paper themselves with interest, and interest some way or somehow their people in it. The paper is read, and is readable, and they, one and all, make it so. We must take a leaf out of their book. Your paper, Messrs. Editors, is readable and interesting, and it is to be hoped it may be not only increasingly so, but profitable pecuniarily.

In thanking "A. B." once more for what, I believe, is a help, yet I find that in my request I did not give expression to the thought in my mind; that is, as we have used this text to support the doctrine of the inherent immortality of the soul, in all, does it not cease to do so in its new dress? Those who uphold conditional immortality will, rather do not see that this text or passage can in any way militate against their view; but rather the reverse, that as it means physical life in one place, so it means the same in the other; or, to put it in other words, as it cannot mean physical life which may be terminated in one place, it cannot mean an immortal principle separate and distinct from the body in the other. It was to meet this I wished the outline to bring out. I have not yet, however, thoroughly studied "A. B.'s" outline side by side with the interpretation put thereon by the advocates of conditional immortality. B.

THE CHURCH.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Some weeks ago a correspondent, "Roths say," rebuked you because you did not acknowledge the various denominations to be Churches. Why he did so is best known to himself. The important question in this connection seems to be this: Is Christ divided? If this question must be answered in the negative, the conclusion is that there can be but one Church, one body of Christ; and that the religious body which can show its well-supported history from the earliest ages, and can prove it has kept the primitive faith until now, has the best claim to be called the Church,—the city of the living God. The Church is as a city set on a hill,—it cannot be hid. It does not seem that any hole or corner existence was ever intended for the Church; and I imagine it would be very wrong in us to say that the Church died out before or during that time which a few people call the dark ages, and has been restored to life again, at the will of some man or woman, in these more enlightened days. God has promised to be with His Church every day till the end of time. If we say that the Church ceased to exist even during one day we say that the promise of God has failed in this case. If in this, why not in any and every other case? Then, if so, what is the value of any hope, if the promises of God are not fulfilled?

Now, what is the history of those religious bodies, each of which "Roths say" wishes you to call the Church?

There are Churches—many, perhaps nearly two hundred—divided into groups or families of Churches; and I believe the first in alphabetical order is the Baptist group or family of Churches. This is one of the very largest family of Churches. In this Province of New Brunswick alone there are, I think, five different, separate, and independent Baptist Churches, which are not a happy family by any means. Have each of these Churches a history that extends to the Apostles' times? We should be able to refresh our memories in historical matters without offence to anyone. What is the history of the Baptist Churches? Is it not this? In the early part of the Seventeenth Century, a few men living in New England came to the conclusion that they had never been baptized. They may have been immersed or sprinkled when infants, and probably were so, but they concluded they had never been baptized. Of course, they thought they did not belong to the Church of Christ. What steps do they take? They set about creating a Church which should commend itself to them. They chose one of their number to baptize. They give authority to Ezekiel Holloman to baptize Roger Williams. In their own estimation these men were heathen; believing and conscientious men, I presume, but heathen for all that, because unbaptized. Our Divine Lord says to the Apostles, "Go and baptize." These unbaptized men in New England say to Ezekiel Holloman, "Go and baptize." We know our Divine Lord had authority. What authority had these unbaptized men? Does it not seem from these historical facts, that Baptism the Baptist Churches seem to confer is merely a human institution, and of no more value in a religious point of view than any other washing with water.

And if their baptism is so deficient in its original, how is it with the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper which they celebrate? What of the orders they confer upon their teachers? Can these be good and valid, and can that be the Church of Christ in which Baptism, Sacrament of the Lord's Supper and ordination are so evidently the institutions of men. The Baptist Churches are indeed most glaringly deficient in essential authority; yet the Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian families of Churches are in the same position: they came into existence at the Reformation or after it. Each of these bodies claims to be the Church of God, and upon them rests the difficult task of reconciling the promise of Christ to be with His Church every day till the end of the world with the fact that they did not exist during many hundred years before the Reformation. Can any of these be that Church which Christ founded and promised to be with thenceforth every day till the end of time?

QUERO.