

is incessantly bringing more and more the illimitable Unknown within the circle of the Known," and *Herbert Spencer* says "At the utmost reach of discovery there must ever arise the question, "What lies beyond?" *Scepticism* called in Science to destroy belief in the *Resurrection* by its materialistic dogmas and limitations, and behold! to day Science stands dumb-founded at the inscrutable phenomena of forms of life as far beyond its ken as the *Resurrection*, and the only rational, mark the word, the only rational theory men of science can imagine as an explanation of these psychical mysteries is the doctrine of *Revelation* "There is spiritual body." Coleridge in "Aids to reflection" (page 392 Ed. 1836.) told sceptics their vision was too limited "There is no pause, no chasm in the activities of nature," and the chief enemy of the supernatural is to day conscious that death is no finality for he stands at the grave asking "What lies beyond" and in spite of himself thus admits a belief in "the life of the world to come!"

That the body which will be raised will not be composed of the same material elements as the one which was laid aside at death is no greater obstacle to a belief in the resurrection than the fact, that we never rise in the morning with our bodies composed of exactly the same material elements as those which we laid down at night. In sickness the changes are great; in accidents the body is reduced suddenly in size, in a few years the whole body is renewed, yet our identity remains. What is that which thus survives grave chemical changes in sickness, which is not one whit injured by the absolute destruction of every limb, which is not diminished one jot in force by the entire periodic removal of the whole of the material elements which constitute the bodily frame? Is it a substance? No! if conscious personality were a substance, what a sport, what a dream life would be! Is it a reality? Let each reader consider whether there is anything known to him so real, so absolutely free from the conceivable possibility of delusion as the experience of his conscious personality? We have here then two daily experiences which should help us if not to realise the existence of ourselves out of the body, at least to exorcise from us the evil spirit of doubt, and implant a firm faith in a glorious resurrection of the body. This shrine of mortality, sown a natural body, will be raised a spiritual body, sown in corruption, will be raised incorruptible, in the very likeness of Him *Who* is the *Resurrection* and the *Life*, by *Whose* Incarnation we are enabled to be made one with Him, not in spirit only but in body, being made in Baptism members of *His* Body, which is the Church, and in the Eucharist, fed by life streaming out from the fount of *His* Divine life. I believe in the resurrection of the body and the life of that body in the world to come, renewed in the purity and power of God, *Who* in the first Paradise made man in His own image, and *Who* in the Paradise of Heaven will cause that image to shine incorruptible through an eternal Eastertide of joy!

THE AGENCIES BEST ADAPTED TO ATTACH PEOPLE TO THE CHURCH.

BY MR. CHAS. JENKINS, PETROLIA.

The Church being the society of redeemed humanity, must include all grades of that humanity, of all modes thought and variety of idea. Its message to mankind, however, cannot be modified by any liberty of thought whatever. The great liberal apostle writes: "Though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." That misleading phrase "school of thought" cannot be applied to the Church of Christ. Is Christ divided? There are no schools of thought in the Body of Christ. Church teaching is based upon certain specific facts, which either must be accepted or rejected. If rejected, whatever relation it may please the great Head of the Church to ultimately establish between Him and those who reject, for the purposes of this world, they must be regarded as being outside of the Church. The life that is hid with Christ in God must express itself in the world in visible acknowledgment of Him before men. If the religious truth we believe is to be propagated, it can only be done in connection with the Church visible and invisible. If being Head over all things means anything to the Church, it means that connection with the Head means membership in the body. But can a man be member of a society and act externally as he pleases? No: Conscience is a faculty that requires education. The child must be under governors until his faculties are sufficiently matured to allow him to be master of his own actions, and authority must educate and regulate the spiritual child until he becomes a spiritual man. Church teaching and authority mean all the preserved wisdom, devotion and experience of the past, applying the message received from Heaven to the hearts and conscience of men. Says Paul the Apostle to Titus, "These things speak and exhort and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee."

Whatever test you apply to prove the existence of spiritual manhood, this condition must be attained before the man can be in the proper moral condition to exercise Christian liberty.

How is this freedom of conscience, then, and liberty to be exercised? When a free citizen in a free state attains his manhood, does that mean that he can then act without law, at pleasure; without restraint and under no responsibility of any kind, either in services, taxes or obedience? No, it rather increases his responsibilities. The liberty he gets is his proper share in the regulation of the commonwealth, whatever practical assistance he can give it in public service, or in improving and amending its laws. So the exercise of Christian conscience, when authority has educated the man to freedom, does not mean cutting adrift from the church; setting individual phantasy above church order; starting a new sect of one's own in the name of Christ; liberty to withhold material support from the church; or having the conscience so strong and tender that it, forsooth, cannot be tied to a visible church, being of too high an order for such an association.

The exercise of Christian conscience, thoughts and liberty means free, loyal and hearty service to the church; assistance with head, heart and hands; helping its administration; assisting in removing obstacles amidst the perpetual changes of persons and circumstances it has to deal with; amending its machinery when necessary, and generally with good will doing service in all departments of Church work, with all the talents at one's disposal, as to the Lord and not to men.

That is the true Christian freedom, and if High Churchmen and Low Churchmen could intellectually understand each other, they would, instead of being antagonistic, feel that they were complementary. The High Churchman would say: "Brother, I have need of thee. My authority is to educate to your liberty." And the Low Churchman would say in reply: "Brother, I have need of thee. My freedom can best keep its value by being allied with your authority." Such a desirable result might imply a working mediatory agency, which I will consider further on; but if such harmony were attained, it would prove a most powerful attaching influence to the Church.

But another detaching experience was before the Church. Church life and growth required more channels than legal enactment could provide for. Numerous societies were formed all over the Kingdom for promoting personal piety and observing Church ordinances. The "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," and the "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge" belong to this period. One of the local societies referred to, formed in Oxford, was known as the "Methodists," and this society having a natural bishop, John Wesley, at its head, developed into the Methodist Church.

The Church of England is blamed for allowing this

schism to take place. "She should have prevented it; she should have kept them in," etc. Macaulay, in one of his powerful essays, draws a striking picture of how the Church of Rome would have handled this movement and kept them all in. But the policy that might be followed by Rome could not necessarily be followed by the Protestant Church of England. The movement, at first, did not profess to detach. Wesley and his followers did not wish it to be considered that they wanted to leave the church; and from all that can be learned many ministers of the Church encouraged the movement, until its preachers' without episcopal ordination, began to dispense the sacrament.

But wherein did the Church of England system fail to suit the spiritual wants of these people? Her liturgy was compiled by men of the highest culture, and intellect, and piety. It was taken from the very best devotional expressions of all the ages of the Christian era. The order of service had been carefully studied and frequently revised. How then did it not attract? This is a practical question of the highest moment still. We believe the answer to it is, that the genius of the Church of England service, calling for quietness, reverence and self-suppression, did not suit this class of people, who were at that stage of mental development where sensation and positive self-assertion are necessary for any interest to be excited in them. Possibly, too, the effect of the fixed ritual and church seasons was to suppress the importance of preaching. While some underrate the importance of preaching, others make it the principal part of religious service. Worship means something more than preaching; but one thing is certain, the necessity for preaching always exists, and the more efficient the preaching the greater the life in the Church. The Methodists wanted services they could enter into, and preaching they could understand. They could not then get this in the Church; so they got what they wanted out of it. But they did not go to the Presbyterians, Independents or Baptists. The style of these bodies did not suit them. Broadly speaking, the causes of these bodies leaving the Church of England was thought; the cause of the Methodists leaving was emotion.

Those who think the Church to blame in not retaining the Methodists in her communion, must bear this in mind that for nearly two hundred years her service and ritual had been constant subjects of national discussion, and scarcely forty years before, the Comprehension Bill, modifying them to suit Non-conformists, had been thrown out of parliament. They could not be altered then, and in spite of the Reformed Episcopal and Revision movements, I question if they could be much altered now. But what we have to consider is, how far the fixed ritual and orderly services should be insisted on when there is a class of people that you cannot get at that way. A church must be able to adapt itself to the necessities of the humanity it is called upon to deal with. The same principle applies to the people called Ritualists, but whom I would prefer to call Symbolists. People of a certain mental condition must worship by symbol, as they cannot worship any other way. Mental constitution must be considered in this matter of religious service. Teuton and Latin must each have his own order.

This is a task which will test the highest constructive statesmanship in the Church. The Methodist schism, however, may fairly be considered as raising the question—whether the office of deacon, as administered in the primitive church, is sufficiently recognised in the Church of England!

To be continued.

Home & Foreign Church News.

From our own Correspondents.

DOMINION.

QUEBEC.

LENNOXVILLE.—*Bishop's College*.—The Bishop of Quebec has the following letter in the leading organ of the Church in England.

SIR.—Will you allow me to draw attention to an advertisement appearing in your columns respecting the principalship of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, about to become vacant?

Bishop's College is a chartered University, training students in arts and theology at Lennoxville, and having a faculty of law in the neighbouring town of Sherbrooke, and a faculty of medicine in Montreal.

A special object of its foundation was the preparation of candidates for holy orders in what was then the diocese of Quebec, but is now divided into the two dioceses of Quebec and Montreal. The Bishops of these two dioceses are the visitors, the senior being