

The Church Times.

"Evangelical Truth--Apostolic Order."

VOL. IX. HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1858. NO. 42.

Calendar.

CALENDAR WITH LESSONS.

Day	MORNING.	EVENING.
MON	Prov. 13	1 Pet. 3
TUE	13	15
WED	17	18
THUR	19	20
FRI	21	22
SAT	23	24
SUN	25	26

Poetry.

THE WORSHIP OF NATURE.

The ocean looketh up to heaven,
As 'twere a living thing;
The homage of its waves is given
In ceaseless worshipp'g.

They kneel upon the sloping sand,
As bends the human knee,
A beautiful and tireless band,
The priesthood of the sea.

They pour their glittering treasures out,
Which in the deep have birth,
And chant their awful hymns about
The watching hills of earth.

The green earth sends its incense up,
From every mountain shrine
From every flower and dewy cup
That greeteth the sunshine.

The mists are lifted from the hills,
Like the white wing of prayer,
They lean above the ancient hills
As doing homage there.

The forest tops are lowly bent
O'er the breezy hills and glen,
As if a prayerful spirit passed
On nature as on men.

The clouds weep o'er the fallen world,
E'en as repentant lore,
Ere to the blessed breeze unfurled,
They fade in light above.

The sky is as a temple's area;
The blue and wavy air,
Is glorious with the spirit march,
Of messengers at prayer.

The gentle moon, the kindling sun,
The many stars are given
As flames to burn earth's incense on
The altar-fires of heaven.

J. G. Whittier.

Religious Miscellany.

(From the London Guardian)

A rumour is mentioned in the Plymouth papers of the serious illness of the Bishop of Exeter. We are glad to find it untrue. The bishop presided over the anniversary meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, which was held in the Exeter Guildhall last Thursday. Among those present were Lord Courtenay, the Hon. and Rev. H. Courtenay, Mr. T. D. Actand, the Revd. Dr. Buil, and Archdeacon Moore Stevens. In his opening speech the right rev. prelate made some severe observations on a circular which has been issued by the Protestant Association, and which is signed by Earl Shaftesbury as president, several other noble lords, and a large number of clergymen, among whom are several from the Bishop of Exeter's own diocese. The circular in question protests against Episcopal letters being sent to incumbents to preach on behalf of the joint societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, notwithstanding the withdrawal of the royal letters, inasmuch as such withdrawal—

“Was hailed by many as a timely relief and as a cause for thankfulness; for the royal letters had long been regarded with dislike, as favouring certain societies to the exclusion of others, and as tending to fetter the free judgment and action of both clergy and laity. The issuing of Episcopal letters, while it tends to reimpose the yoke in another and not less embarrassing form, may place both the clergy, the laity, and the society for which it is made in a false or a painful position, and may oblige the clergy either to disregard the injunction of their Bishop, or out of deference to his office, to advocate a cause they do not cordially approve.”

The Bishop said—“One circumstance has surprised me a great deal—if any thing can surprise one in these times, for perhaps you are not aware that you are considered Popish, and that by a society which numbers on its list noble lords, and has a noble lord at its head. I received a letter not very long ago from a gentleman who is known only to me as the secretary of a society called the Protestant Association, and it contained a document for your instruction and aid in my instruction, which is of somewhat remarkable character. Now, what is it. It is, in fact, a remonstrance to the Bishops for addressing letters, requesting their clergy, if they see fit, to advocate the cause of these societies. Really there is something that is absolutely astounding in this—what shall I say? The only words that occur to my mind are not likely to proceed from my mouth in this meeting. It is really scarcely credible that noblemen and gentlemen—religious gentlemen—men of eminent Christian profession—should join in any such remonstrance. It is a declaration against Episcopal advice and counsel to the clergy in lieu of the Queen's letters. I need not say that the Queen's letters having been withdrawn, the Archbishop proffered a general request that in future each Bishop in his own diocese might issue letters in favor of societies of this kind. Now, it does happen, that, knowing as I do the numerous claims upon the clergy of this diocese, I have never issued letters, as far as I can recollect, requesting them to address their parishioners in favor of any society, without special request from them to consider whether, in their judgments, they may think fit so to do. Therefore there has not been any great deal of Episcopal interference on my part in so doing. Her Majesty and Her Council, when they thought fit to restrain the Bishops from exercising their discretion in calling upon their clergy to act as they pleased in favor of any society, or of any object of Christian benevolence. Therefore, do not let it be imagined, that in sending letters in support of the two societies that claim your attention to-day, the Bishop is acting or doing anything in any way against the royal commission. I should be very much shocked if the time should ever come when the Crown of England should think fit to enjoin the Bishops not to issue letters in favor of the Christian Knowledge or the Propagation of the Gospel Society. This is only a specimen. I am afraid, of a spirit that prevails—a spirit which I have no hesitation to say would, if it were able, act on the same principles, and do as was done some two hundred years ago—it would pull down the Church of England, extinguish episcopacy, and overturn both the Church and the State, that would be a necessary consequence of carrying out the principle on which these gentlemen act. What possible harm is there in a Bishop asking his clergy, if they think fit, to exercise their discretion in addressing their people in favor of these two societies—societies, let me say, that have the royal charter—not granted in a time when Popery was particularly prevalent, for it was granted in the reign of William III.—I say these two Popish societies have the authority of King William III. I am not aware of any feeling of dislike to these societies—I am sure I know of none among the clerical order in the church; for, though there may be, perhaps, some who call themselves churchmen who do so complain, yet in the name of our church I disclaim all such principles. I do not know that there are many names on this list who do not wish well to our church, but there are names of estimable clergymen and churchmen whom I am astounded and shocked to find joining and taking part in such monstrous proceedings as these. I declare I never heard of a Bishop who called upon his clergy to advocate a cause which he did not cordially approve. I myself repudiate this assumption; and, in answer to this monstrous assertion, I have to say that I have requested my clergy to act only according to their own discretion and judgment in the case. The Right Rev. prelate then read the following passages from the circular:

“It may oblige the laity either to neglect the appeal of their pastor, or to support, by their offerings, a society which has not their sympathy. It holds out an inducement to the society to rest its claim to public support not so much upon the importance of the work to which it is engaged, or the

principles on which it acts, as upon the official patronage it may be able to secure.”

“Does not this (said the Bishop) apply equally to all sermons for any special society whatever, and for any special object whatever, of Christian benevolence? This is said to be tyrannising over the laity. I must say, if this is tyranny—we might say it is tyranny—that it is a shame to put us in shackles of this kind, and not to permit us to address our hearers on subjects essential to the Church of Christ, and essential, let me add, to the Christian character of the congregations whom we address. But lastly—

“For the foregoing reasons the undersigned earnestly but most respectfully remonstrate against the substitution of Episcopal for Queen's letters. They feel convinced that in so doing they are adopting the course which is most for the advantage of the various societies now sustained by the Christian benevolence of England, and most consistent with the respect due to Episcopal authority, with the responsibility and discretion of the clergy, and with the free judgment of the laity.”

Now, really (said his lordship), that is too absurd to waste observations upon; but, absurd as it is, it is a most uncomfortable information of the spirit which is abroad—a spirit that can operate on men not only at considerable stations of life, but I am told it also affects many hundreds of the clergy. Yet I am happy to say only a very small proportion of these are from the clergy of this diocese—a proportion of the clergy of this diocese far less than we had, perhaps, a right to expect. I should be doing great injustice to my clergy if I did not say there never was a time in the history of the Church of England, or of the Church of Christ, when greater faithfulness characterized the clergy as a body in this diocese. I say it thankfully, and it is a great satisfaction to me as Bishop, to witness that such are the principles of the clergy over whom I am placed. However, in saying this, and recognizing the names of some of those gentlemen who have subscribed to this movement of the clergy not to preach for these societies, I must say my eye glanced upon the name of one who I thought would not feel much pain in opposing his Bishop—I mean the Rev. James Shore of Bridgetown, Tobago. I wish all the Rev. Jrs. Shores, and persons of that kind, would declare themselves. This name, be it remembered, is in the list of those gentlemen who are anxious, for the interests of the Church, for Bishops not to take too much upon themselves. This name is a strong indication of the feeling shared in by the gentlemen whose names are attached to this circular. I am ashamed to occupy so much of your time. I do not mean to say the matter is in itself one worthy of much consideration, but it is an act of gross folly—it is a marvellous folly—but also at the same time that it is a very foolish action, it is an indication of which way the wind blows, for these straws—I regard this in itself as a mere straw—show how strong the anti Church spirit prevails among a large and powerful body. Now, I do not want you to rise up in opposition by a spirit of aggression, I only hope you will see in this a sufficient ground for increased energy, zeal, and constant assiduity in promoting the great cause which is so interesting to us all—a cause which you have now in view.

(From the Colonial Church Chronicle.)

THE DIFFERENCES AND AGREEMENTS BETWEEN GREEK, ROME, AND ENGLAND.*

II.—Points on which the Oriental Church agrees with the Church of England in opposition to the Church of Rome.

1. The first which we will mention is the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy. From the first moment that the “Western Pride,” to use St. Basil's expression, put forward this claim down to the present day, it has been steadily, uniformly, contemptuously rejected by the Oriental Church. The East has never for one hour been subject to Papal authority, and has never ceased to denounce the arrogance of the Bishop of Rome. We need only refer to the Encyclical Letter of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, which was called out by the “Papal Aggression” made by Rome upon the Eastern Church in the year 1848

(* Continued from last week.)