

indefinitely postponed. What ministers of the Gospel could not effect, for lack of a little firmness, may thus be achieved through the medium simply of public disgust.

Church Observer.

"One Faith,—One Lord,—One Baptism."

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, DEC. 14, 1870

A PIONEER LEFT IN THE LURCH.

Nobody seems to think well of Mr. Orby Shipley's last project for Romanizing the Church of England. All our religious contemporaries speak disparagingly of it, even the *Church Times*, which does not strain at gnats, gravely remonstrating with the reverend gentleman on his imprudence. The scheme may find favour with the "Brethren of the Society of the Holy Cross," to whom Mr. Shipley first exhibited his sickly bantling, but until we know more of that "select circle" we shall refrain from estimating the value of their admiration. It is clear, then, that there is a limit to the enterprise of Romish propagandists in the Church. Let us see where that limit is. Mr. Shipley wants to found an "Oratory" in the Metropolis, in which will be concentrated two hundred priests, who shall be occupied in "missionary work," daily services, evensong, vespers, compline, confessions, recitation of "hours, matins, text," hourly masses, additional masses for strangers, etc. These abundant "Church privileges," as Anglicans term them, will, of course, need elaborate "properties,"—"Gospel lights, consecration lights and candles, altar bells, lavabo, complete Eucharistic vestments," and other curiosities in millinery and ironmongery too numerous for mention. Now, taking the items one by one, no moderate ritualist would object to either the services or the utensils. Every one of them is now in use in the Churches where they have their own way. Why then do they object to the aggregate if they approve of the details? They are afraid of startling Protestant England by performing their Romish rites on such a grand scale. The time will come for showing what they think of the profanation of Christian worship. They must for a while be content with a hazy, tentatively, gradually accustoming to the details and so as not to inhibit the whole. Ritualists respect the sagacity of Mr. Shipley's train upon it. They mutter defiance of the structure. We wish Evan- from the Shipley reme the be re

doctrines of the divinity of Christ, His eternal co-equality with the Father, the necessity and validity of the atonement which He made in dying, and every other doctrine accounted orthodox. Is the reason of the quiescence of those who so strongly deprecated Mr. Smith's participation in the Lord's Supper to be found in the fact that Episcopal ordination covers all shortcomings,—that the lack of that and not erroneous belief was the head and front of Mr. Smith's offending? For our own part we see no great difference between a heretic in the Church of England and one out of it; nor can we easily be brought to regard the former as in the line of apostolical succession any more than the latter. Do not St. John's words, "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God"—i. e. from God, either by regeneration or ordination—apply equally to both?

Mr. Voysey claims that he has in, no instance, contradicted "the outward letter of the articles, or avowed his intention of infringing them. Such a plea would disgrace the lips of the most unskilful pettifogger. The imperfection of human language makes it simply impossible so to word a compact between two parties, or a statute—which is strictly a compact between the governing and the governed—as to render impossible an infraction of the bargain while the letter of its terms is respected. In the interpretation of such compacts it is a well understood principle that so far as it can be ascertained the spirit is to explain the letter, and that literal compliance is very often insufficient. The work of a legal practitioner would be very simple if it comprised nothing more than a recitation of the terms of an agreement alleged to have been violated.

But Mr. Voysey further maintains that he has not forfeited his ecclesiastical status, because, forsooth, various theologians have, on the one hand, given expression to the views for which he is under trial, and, on the other, stated the doctrines to which he is opposed in terms unsanctioned by the articles and by Holy Scripture. Neither his negative or his positive teaching, he contends on this ground, can involve him in penal consequences. To a certain extent this plea of precedent must be admitted as good. The formal and admitted expositions, by responsible writers, of the articles, must have some weight when the sense of the articles is in dispute. But there is a limit to the admission of the plea. It would be simply preposterous to allow, in every trial for heretical teaching, the defendant to bring into court every scrap of writing bearing the name of a theologian of repute which countenanced or seem to countenance the teaching impugned. Such a course would reduce ecclesiastical litigation to an utter absurdity. It would even be preferable to exclude all authorities but the recognised standards of the Church, and be content with their literal interpretation.

ADVENT THOUGHTS.

At this season of the year the Church lovingly invites her children to "behold the glory" of "the Word made flesh." Such special contemplation of the amazing fact of the Incarnation must prove salutary. If the direction of the mind towards any object of thought can at once humble and elevate, subdue to calm and raise to rapture, correct false notions of God's relations to our race and make true ideas of that relation the spring of holy cheerful activity, it is when the Nativity becomes the theme of meditation. In that event, as much as the crucifixion we see the persistence of the intensity of Divine love and the seriousness of the Divine mode of acting. What love short of the infinite stoop so low to rescue those who

were so unworthy? And who could save that which none can instruct—such surveys all necessities and all possibilities—could have determined on *that* as needful to man's recovery? Stolid indeed must he be who views unmazed this restoration of the fallen by the stooping of the Restorer to the level of the lost, this identification of the "Captain of Salvation" with the objects of His condescending grace, this "unity of person" in which human sympathy is as real as if there were no deity conjoined, while divine glory is as manifest as if there were no fleshy veil. Unfathomable mystery! Yet a mystery where the stream of salvation flows in unflinching fullness and efficacy to all human kind. Imitating the example of the magi who recognised the Redeemer in the Babe, let us bring our rarest gifts to His feet—our finest gold, our most fragrant frankincense and myrrh,—counting no homage too humble, to offer Him who deemed no condescension too abject for us.

ROMAN CATHOLIC JUDGES.

To get into a rage when inconvenient questions are asked, though not a very dignified is sometimes a very effectual way of disposing of them. In private life, when no public interests are concerned, this is frequently resorted to, but it is not often that a judge on the bench is reduced to such a ludicrous extremity. Even in private life a man will not indulge in this artificial indignation if he can avail himself of any more respectable means of extrication. The judges challenged in the Guibord case have unconsciously shown the stability of the grounds on which they have been recused. Could they have met the challenge in any other way it is not to be supposed that they would have contented themselves with declining it on the ground that it was insulting. Indignation more than a week old is very stale and tame. Judge Drummond's "wrath" must have required careful "nursing to keep it warm" so long. It might take a week for Chief Justice Duval to come to the conclusion that the challenge was only meant for a joke at the expense of the Bench; but so long an interval might have sufficed to modify Judge Drummond's intense emotion and enable him to discuss a purely legal question with the calmness and self-possession becoming an experienced administrator of the law.

We do not profess to be competent to discuss the citations which the latter judge intermingled with his expressions of "great indignation," but we can scarcely see that they establish the inadmissibility of the challenge.

His Honour is reported to have said: "The causes of recusation mentioned by 'the code' [of Civil Procedure of Lower Canada] No. 176 are seven in number. The 7th is as follows:—'If he (the judge) has any interest in favouring either of the parties. The following article (177) explains what is meant by 'the word interest.' 'A judge is disqualified if he is interested in the suit, either personally or on account of his wife, or if his wife, when separated from him as to property, is interested in the suit.'" The Judges recused in this case are not personally interested in the interment or non-interment of the late Mr. Guibord; but they are interested in the suit in so far as their own religious concerns may be affected by the judgment they render. The Church of Rome claims them as subjects, and makes their eternal salvation dependent on their implicit obedience to its dictates; if that is not being "personally interested" we are curious to know what is.

The recusation has been ruled inadmissible partly on the ground that this is not one "of the cases in which a recusation

may be proposed, and partly because it is virtually charging the recused judges with treason and perjury. Even so. But is it utterly beyond the bounds of possibility that a Lower Canada Judge should be disloyal or untruthful? And admitting the possibility of this is there no security for the public except the cumbrous and unsatisfactory process of impeachment? And is it consistent with justice and common sense that other checks (supposed to have been provided for public security should be controlled by those to whom the check is to be applied.

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

The reply of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the "Sacred Synod of the Church of Greece" has given prominence to a doctrine which, though not claiming the slightest "warrant of Holy Scripture" is being surreptitiously introduced into our Church. The Primate, in reciprocating the friendly expressions of the Synod, chanced to say, "The English Church does not sanction prayers for the dead." There was nothing very shocking, one would think, in this remark. If the Greek clergy are as well informed as we believe them generally to be, they would not be startled by the statement. Till very recently at least, the Church of England has not recognized the practice of praying for departed souls. Had she believed in the efficacy of such prayers she would have doubtless made provision for them, whereas, with the exception of a very ambiguous passage in the Communion service, her silence is complete. But though the clergy of the Greek Church have probably received the announcement as matter of fact, and as being an assertion of what they have all along known, the Ritualists profess to be very much astonished at the ignorance and illiberality of His Grace of Canterbury "Not pray for the dead! Whoever heard of such a charge against the Church of England? What will the Greek prelates say? will they not ask in amazement 'How then, can it be Catholic? only Protestants forget their dead!'"

Precisely so; the Church of England is Protestant—Catholic because Protestant—and she therefore repudiates with abhorrence the unscriptural and soul-destroying practice of praying for those whose eternal destiny was fixed this side the grave. In view of the unbroken silence of our church in regard to the possibility of altering in the least the condition of souls after death—in view of the unanimous denunciation by our divines of the Romish doctrine and practice, we pronounce the surprise which Ritualistic writers profess to feel a childish and most contemptible piece of affectation. If it is anything else than affectation, let them produce their authorities—if they can.

With all our heart we thank the Primate for his emphatic repudiation of this destructive error. Probably he made it almost unconsciously—without the least idea that it could give offence to any who professed to be members and ministers of the Church of England; but it is not any the less valuable on that account. Would that all our bishops were on all occasions as fully in accord with the spirit and traditions of the church over which the Holy Ghost has made them overseers!

We lately published a letter from an esteemed correspondent, who had an opportunity of attending service in All Saints Church Edinburgh. The preacher in enforcing the duty of constant prayer told his hearers that they should pray for the dead! We wish our correspondent had put himself in communication with the reverend gentleman with a view to ascertaining why the dead should be prayed for. We are sometimes required to do things