

His Honor

# The Church Times.

"Evangelical Truth--Apostolic Order."

VOL. 8. HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA, SATURDAY, APRIL 18, 1857. NO. 16.

### Calendar.

#### CALENDAR WITH LESSONS.

Day	Date	MORNING.			EVENING.		
		Num.	Act.	Ep.	Num.	Act.	Ep.
S.	19	1 Sam.	16	10	21	1	1
M.	20	2 Sam.	14	17	13	4	5
T.	21	1 Sam.	16	10	15	2	3
W.	22	2 Sam.	14	17	17	2	1
T.	23	1 Sam.	16	10	19	3	4
F.	24	2 Sam.	14	17	21	2	3
S.	25	1 Sam.	16	10	23	1	2

### Poetry.

#### THE FLOWER BUD.

THE leaves are fallen, the forest bare,  
Savo buds alone on branch and bough;  
The frost-king breathes upon the air,  
And hoary grows pale Winter's brow.  
Upon the glebe, and vale, and hill,  
No voice exults, but silent all,  
Savo the wind-spirits' bugle shrill,  
Sad music of their carnival.

Patient wait, for all is well;  
Wait, and hopeful vigils keep;  
Wait, a coming day may tell  
The life-germ did but sleep.

List! now, methinks, a voice I hear,  
A calm, sweet voice of one at rest:  
"Tis but the slumber of the Year,  
Ere in her garb of beauty drest.  
Securely in its resting-place,  
In all its undeveloped grace,  
The blossom-bud, in calm repose,  
Lies cradled by the winds and snows,  
As on a mother's breast.

"As birth the chrysalis implies,  
Ere the fair Psyche seeks the skies  
On buoyant wing;  
The flower-bud, in downy fall,  
Surviving Winter's storms and cold,  
Shall wake with Spring.  
For, lo! the vernal year shall wake  
Its slumber, and its fetters break  
With soothing voice.  
And its expanding beauty make  
The glebe rejoice."

So Hope, the Angel, ever sings  
With yearnings high on golden wings;  
And with bright eye, einte, describes  
God's universal harmonies.  
She sees fair skies, and suns, and showers,  
Unfold the budding leaves and flowers,  
As if anew to glory born  
In Nature's resurrection morn.

So the immortal bud survives  
All ills of earth;  
And both storms and sunshine lives  
For higher birth.  
Yet the true bud of Paradise  
Must perish, save from holier skies  
To it be given  
The breath of heaven;  
Whose light of love, and dews of grace,  
God's image on the bud may trace,  
The living germ developing,  
Transforming and all hallowing—  
The presage of Eternal Spring.  
—New York Churchman.

### Religious Miscellany.

#### CHURCH ORNAMENTS.

"The judgment of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, in the Knightsbridge cases, "Westerton and Beal v. Liddel," was given on Saturday, March 21, at the Privy Council Office; Lord Wensleydale, Mr. Pemberton Leigh, Sir John Patteson, Sir W. H. Maule, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of London being present. The Council Chamber was densely crowded, and several ladies were accommodated with seats within the Bar. Mr. Pemberton Leigh delivered the judgment."

We noticed this formal decision of a vexed question in the last Church Times—and now proceed to give such extracts from, and such a summary of the Judgment itself, as will place it within the comprehension of our readers.

#### "Crosses not Images.

"Although it is true that crosses had been abused as well as crucifixes and images of saints, it must be remembered that there is a wide difference between the cross and the images of saints, and even, though in a less degree, between a cross and a crucifix. A

cross was used as a symbol of Christianity for two or three centuries before either crucifixes or images were introduced; it was used for ages before the Reformation, and has continued ever since to be used as an ensign of honour, as an ornament both of buildings and persons, ecclesiastical and civil, public and private, without any relation to superstitious or even to religious usages. That this was the view taken by some of the early Reformers will sufficiently appear by a letter of Cassander.

#### "The Judgment as to Crosses.

"Upon the whole, their lordships, after the most anxious consideration, have come to the conclusion that crosses, as distinguished from crucifixes, have been in use as ornaments of churches from the earliest periods of Christianity; that when used as mere emblems of the Christian faith, and not as objects of superstitious reverence, they may still lawfully be erected as architectural decorations of churches; that the wooden cross erected on the chancel screen of St. Barnabas' is to be considered as a mere architectural ornament; and that as to this article they must advise her Majesty to reverse the judgment complained of. Their lordships hope and believe that the laws in force respecting the consecration of any building for a church, and which forbid any subsequent alteration without a faculty from the Ordinary, will be sufficient to prevent any abuse in this respect.

#### "A Distinction as to Altar Crosses."

"This decision, however, by no means disposes of the question as to crosses attached to communion tables, which it will be convenient to deal with in connection with the altar at St. Barnabas', which is ordered to be removed. This article of church furniture consists of a marble slab, with a super-altare on the side nearest to the wall of the chapel. It stands apart from the wall, supported upon stone carved arches, the arches resting upon a stone plinth, which is let into and embedded in the pavement on which it stands. The cross is attached to the super-altare, and stands between two large candlesticks, which are moveable.

#### "Communion tables not Altars.

"The question is whether this structure is a communion table within the meaning of the law. The appellants, in their pleadings, term these tables altars or communion tables; and in the argument they have referred to two recent statutes in which the word "altar" is used to signify the communion table. When the same thing is signified it may not be of much importance by what name it is called; but the distinction between an altar and a communion table is in itself essential and deeply founded, in the most important difference in matters of faith between Protestantists and Romanists, namely, in the different notions of the nature of the Lord's Supper which prevailed in the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation, and those which were introduced by the Reformers. By the former it was considered as a sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Saviour. The altar was the place on which the sacrifice was to be made; the elements were to be consecrated, and being so consecrated, were treated as the actual Body and Blood of the victim. The Reformers, on the other hand, considered the Holy Communion not as a sacrifice, but as a feast, to be celebrated at the Lord's table; though as to the consecration of the elements, and the effect of this consecration, and several other points, they differed greatly amongst themselves.—This distinction is well pointed out in Cudworth's Discourse concerning the True Nature of the Lord's Supper, c. 5, p. 27:—

"We see how the theological controversy which hath cost so many disputes, whether the Lord's Supper be a sacrifice, is already decided; for it is not sacrificium but epulum de sacrificio; not a sacrifice, but a feast upon sacrifice; or else, in other words, not oblatio sacrificii, but, as Tertullian excellently speaks, participatio sacrificii; not the offering of something up to God upon an altar, but the eating of something which comes from God's altar, and is set upon our tables. Neither was it ever known amongst the Jews or heathens that those tables upon which they did eat their sacrifices should be called by the name of altars; therefore he (St. Paul) must needs call the communion table by the name of the Lord's table—i. e., the table upon

which God's meat is eaten, not His altar upon which it is offered.

#### The Wooden Cross at St. Paul's Table to be removed.

Next, with respect to the wooden cross attached to the communion table at St. Paul's. Their lordships have already declared their opinion that the communion-table intended by the canon was a table in the ordinary sense of the word, flat and moveable, capable of being covered with a cloth, at which or around which the communicants might be placed in order to partake of the Lord's Supper, and the question is whether the existence of a cross attached to the table is consistent either with the spirit or with the letter of those regulations. Their lordships are clearly of opinion that it is not, and they must recommend that upon this point also the decree complained of should be affirmed. It may be urged, and indeed was urged with great force by counsel for the bar, that in modern usage the communion-table never, in fact, is moved; and the general adoption of rails to fence off the table from the rest of the church shows that its removal is never contemplated; and that if it is not to be moved it is useless to require it to be moveable; that if it be in such a form that a sufficient portion of it may be covered with a fair linen cloth to receive the sacred elements, it is idle to insist on the whole being capable of being covered. To these observations the answer is that the distinction between an altar and a table is in itself essential; that the circumstances, therefore, which constitute the distinction, however trifling in themselves, are for that reason important; and that when positive rules are established by law, courts of justice are bound into action by parties entitled to maintain the suit, are bound to enforce the law as they find it, leaving it to the Legislature, if it see fit, in any way to alter it.

#### Credence-tables unobjectionable, and to be maintained.

The next question is as to the credence-table. Here the rubrics of the Prayer-book become important. Their lordships entirely agree with the opinions expressed by the learned Judges in these cases and in "Faulkner v. Litchfield," that in the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the Prayer book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed; that no omission and no addition can be permitted; but they are not prepared to hold that the use of all articles not expressly mentioned in the rubric, although quite consistent with and even subsidiary to the service, is forbidden. Organs are not mentioned, yet because they are auxiliary to the singing they are allowed. Pews, cushions to kneel upon, pulpit-cloths, hassocks, seats by the communion table, are in constant use, yet they are not mentioned in the rubric. Now, what is a credence-table? It is simply a small side table on which the bread and wine are placed before the consecration, have no connection with any superstitious usage of the Church of Rome. Their removal has been ordered on the ground that they are adjuncts to an altar; their lordships cannot but think that they are more properly to be regarded as adjuncts to a communion table. The rubric directs that at a certain point in the course of the communion service (for this is, no doubt, the true meaning of the rubric), the minister shall place the bread and wine on the communion table, but where they are to be placed previously is nowhere stated. In practice they are usually placed on the communion table before the commencement of the service, but this certainly is not according to the order prescribed. Nothing seems to be less objectionable than a small side table, from which they may be conveniently reached by the officiating minister, and at the proper time transferred to the communion table. As to the credence tables, their lordships, therefore, must advise a reversal of the sentence complained of.

#### "Variety of Altar cloths allowable, subject only to the discretion of the Ordinary.

"Next, as to the embroidered cloth, it is said that the canon orders a covering of silk, or of some other proper material, but that it does not mention, and therefore, by implication, excludes more than one covering. Their lordships are unable to adopt