

The Church Guardian,

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER, PUBLISHED
IN THE INTERESTS OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

IT IS NON-PARTIZAN. IT IS INDEPENDENT.

It will be fearless and outspoken on all subjects, and its effort will always be to speak what it holds to be the truth in love.

Price only ONE DOLLAR a year, in advance.
When not paid in advance, Fifty Cents extra.

The Cheapest Church Weekly in America.

Address, THE CHURCH GUARDIAN,
Lock Drawer 29, Halifax, N. S.

The Halifax Editor can be found between the hours of 9 a.m. and 1 p.m., and 2 and 6 p.m., at his office, No. 34 Granville Street, up-stairs, directly over the Church of England Institute.

ABOUT TOMBSTONES.

WHATEVER may be thought about the strictness and utility of the rules which govern our Churchyards in England, and all that pertains to them, it must be admitted that, as a general thing, in Canada we have gone to the other extreme in laxity. Large numbers of Parishes have no burial ground of their own, and many which have a Churchyard appear to take little care to have the grounds of their "city of the dead" in decent order, or to see that the resting place of the human body points out to the stranger that a Christian community has laid to rest its departed members in hope of the resurrection. We desire to call attention to the great need of attempting to stop the heathenism which desecrates our burying grounds in the shape of monuments, and even inscriptions. What difference can any one see between many an ordinary burying ground and the burying ground of an educated heathen community which laid their dead to rest without hope in God or a future existence? We frankly say that we have gone into many a cemetery and churchyard, where, beyond an occasional verse from the Bible, many of these verses even with no reference to the future, we could not see any sign of Christianity. Urns and broken columns, suitable for the days before the Advent of Christ, which, if they signify anything, show the survivor's belief that death is the end of all, birds in all possible positions, unmeaning columns which simply show that the friends of the dead had money to waste, and no conception of a nobler monument that might be raised for the benefit of the living. Emblems of secret societies, hands, busts, fulsome inscriptions which no one believes, or words of grief without a ray of hope, these deface our modern burying places, and cause the beholder to ask, if professing Christians believe that the Resurrection was the great theme of the Apostles' preaching, and that St. Paul points us to that Resurrection as the great hope to which we are to look forward. Do professing Christian people consider that the common class of tombstones and monuments is merely a continuation of pagan traditions? Have we any right to say, by our broken columns and snapped lilies that death shatters and ruins? Is death to be arrayed with fictitious honors, and are skeletons and cross-bones the proper emblems to be carved on tombstones? The old reverential idea that a Christian monument should refer to a time when the struggles of life are over, has been gradually abandoned; and when we go even into a "storehouse of sepulchral art" such as Westminster Abbey, we find, instead of figures in the attitude of prayer, the soldier with sword and cannon, the members of Parliament with a scroll, the author with his books, and the engineer with a locomotive. Such references to the pursuits in life are in as bad taste as those symbols which show that death to the survivor means destruction, and that he has laboured hard to show his belief by the stone he has erected. Another article might be written about the inscriptions, so different from the ancient ones which merely recorded the name and date of him who had "departed" this life.

The cardinal principle in designing a gravestone or monument which is to be erected in a Christian place, is to distinctly recognize the Christian Faith, and to secure durability, distinctness and

simplicity. Church people, instead of relying on the undertaker who is often accustomed only to the unmeaning symbols of the ordinary cemetery, or trusts to American photographs, most of which are equally unmeaning, should consult their Rector on these sad occasions when they have to bury their dead, and no monument should be erected, or inscription cut, unless it had been first submitted to him. In this way many painful and distinctively heathen tombstones and monuments would not deface Christian Churchyards, and the memorials erected by loving zeal over the dead would speak the language of hope, and not really, (though in most cases unintentionally), of despair. If every clergyman had at hand a copy of some such pamphlet as Cox's catalogue of "monuments, crosses, and headstones," he would be able to furnish far better designs than can be procured from the ordinary undertaker. In England, the Churchyard is the freehold of the vicar, and nothing can be placed there without his consent and approval. Probably where there is a Churchyard here belonging exclusively to the Church of England, such a law would really be binding in this country. If it is, it is practically a dead letter, and it would be well if our Synods took up this whole matter of burying grounds, and either in Diocesan or Provincial Synods give us some wise rules upon questions affecting the use and control of our own burying places.

HATCH ON EPISCOPACY.

Canon Carmichael, of Hamilton, in the columns of the *Evangelical Churchman*, has been mercilessly criticising Mr. Hatch's Bampton Lectures, which had been favourably reviewed in that paper. The Canon is too well known to be charged with extreme views with regard to the Church, and yet he arrives at the conclusion—the only conclusion, indeed, which an honest and unprejudiced student of God's Word and Ecclesiastical History can arrive at—that Mr. Hatch is no authority upon the subject treated of, and cannot be depended upon for a fair and unbiassed opinion. Canon Carmichael says:—"It would be impossible for me, writing as I am, to follow Mr. Hatch through the jungle of scrap authorities found in his notes, to criticize, as might easily be done, some of the singularly slender pegs on which he hangs a link here, and a link there, in his patchwork theory of Episcopal probabilities. Suffice it to say, that a careful comparison of not a few of his questions, with the works from whence they are taken, will satisfy the student, that if Mr. Hatch is not gifted with the grace of orthodoxy, he is certainly possessed of the somewhat dangerous power of weaving a very elaborate web out of singularly thin and weak materials."

"The general answer to Mr. Hatch's theory as to bishops, is to be found in the very volume that he has ruthlessly ruled out of court—the Word of God. Tested by the New Testament his whole theory on this point falls to the ground, for the elder or ruler of the epistles is no more like Mr. Hatch's creation, than a master is like a servant."

"Now to get at the duties of the first bishop, or elder, or presbyter, we cannot do better than go back to St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy, a careful study of which will lead us to the conclusion that whether Timothy was a bishop, or presbyter, there was certainly one thing he was not, namely—a member or president of a relief committee. Timothy was to war the good warfare, and hold the faith; to put the brethren in mind of truth, to command, and read, and exhort, and teach, to be an example in word, and life, and faith. To give himself wholly to the work of a teacher, to reprove sinners, to lay hands suddenly on no man, to follow after a godly life, to keep the commandments without spot, to pass on the truth to faithful men, to flee youthful lusts and ignorant questionings, to preach the word, to be earnest in season and out of season, to reprove, rebuke, exhort, to do the work of an evangelist, and to fulfil his ministry—in short, do everything that a Christian bishop or presbyter to-day would do, except mix himself up with money matters. Throughout the whole of these Epistles to Timothy, there is not one solitary direction given as to his duty as "chief almoner," as "an administrator of church funds," as president of a committee of out-door relief—not one word.

"Much the same may be said of St. Paul's advice to Titus. Titus was to ordain elders in every city, to speak sound doctrine, to exhort young men and servants to be sober-minded and obedient, to avoid the discussion of foolish questions, to be a pattern of good works and doctrine, to reject heretics, and

to speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority—in short, like Timothy, to do everything except mix himself up with money matters.

"The same may be said of St. Paul's definition of a bishop and deacon in 1 Tim. 111., and of the angels or heads of the Asiatic churches in the 2nd and 3rd chapters of the Revelation. With the exception of Laodicea, money is never spoken of, and wherever the duty of the angel is alluded to, the great head of the church, the Lord Jesus Himself, refers solely to those duties which are purely spiritual."

THE DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

It has long been notorious that the agitation for a repeal of the law prohibiting marriage with a deceased wife's sister was maintained at a great cost by interested parties, but the following statement, taken from an English paper, of the amount of money expended by one person with this object is startling: "The *World* states that the advocates of the Sister's Marriage Bill have lost a powerful ally by the death of Mr. Sykes Thornton. It appears from an investigation of his books that he spent little short of a million of money (pounds sterling) during his life towards the furtherance of that end." No marvel that petitions have been obtained with numerous signatures in favor of this Bill, when a firm of solicitors has constantly been occupied with plans for the furtherance of this object, and numerous agents have been employed throughout England in obtaining signatures to petitions. A million of money spent in the course of forty years may accomplish a great deal, and other persons have also contributed large sums. The results of this expenditure have been paraded before the public as proofs of a wide-spread conviction of the necessity for a change in the law, whereas, in truth, we are only furnished with another instance of the influence of an unlimited expenditure of money.

KING'S COLLEGE ENDOWMENT.

We have been requested by the Treasurer to publish the names and amounts (so far as they have been received) of the subscribers to this Fund. It may be well to state that there are several lists not yet in the Treasurer's hands, which will materially add to the present acknowledgments. Owing to the difficulty in securing a collector able to devote his whole time to the cause, the spasmodic efforts of a number of gentlemen have represented the work of the past; but now, we are glad to know, the Governors have engaged the services of the Rev. D. H. Hind, who will canvass the Maritime Provinces until the fund is completed.

The Methodists have added \$50,000 (four persons having given \$35,000) to the present Endowment of their Mount Allison Institution; while the Baptists have already secured a very considerable amount towards the Endowment of Acadia College; and it may be taken for granted that Churchmen will not be less willing to sustain King's College. With Mr. Hind devoting his whole time to the work we have not the least doubt as to what the result will be.

Everybody now knows that there has been a good deal of "sounding brass" in connection with the advocacy of University Consolidation, which for a time misled many; but it is now an admitted fact that the so-called Denominational Colleges will never consent to give up their Charters in order that a Central University may be formed in Halifax, destitute altogether of religious influences and teaching. There is too much of a growing disposition to undervalue and even ignore all that is orthodox in religion, for the several Christian Bodies to allow the existing Colleges to pass into the hands of open enemies, or of those who utterly misconceive what is the necessary training for the development of the whole man. The Methodists have nobly declared that they at least will be no party to a godless system of higher education, but that with them religious as well as merely mental training shall be the aim and object of their educational system; the Baptists have avowed a similar determination; and the Church of England in these Provinces cannot do otherwise without proving false to her past record in Canada and to every principle which has guided and governed her in the mother land.

SUBSCRIPTIONS TOWARD THE ENDOWMENT OF KING'S COLLEGE, WINDSOR, N. S.

The Bishop, \$1,000; W. C. Silver, \$250; Canon Dart, \$200; H. Pryor, \$300; G. R. Anderson,

\$200; Rev. J. D. H. Browne, \$100; Arthur Silver, \$50; J. D. Campbell, \$50; B. A. Smith, \$50; C. B. Bullock, \$20; Isaac Mathers, \$10; C. A. Creighton, \$10; Dr. Cowie, \$200; Mr. Barry, \$1; Dr. Mountain, \$200; Mrs. Josh Chandler, \$1; A. Cowie and Son, \$20; Frank Forbes, \$4; R. S. Williams, \$5; J. H. Johnson, \$4; Miss Sterns, \$100; Jason Mack, \$5; A. W. Moren, \$5; Rev. J. Forsythe, \$8; N. S. Wetmore, \$20; Wm. Henderson, \$4; Rev. G. Hodgson, \$75; Archdeacon Gilpin, \$200; D. Hodgson, \$1,000; Loran Baker, \$500; Rev. A. D. Jamison, \$100; D. Fraser, \$5; Mrs. Miller, \$1; A. Owen, \$5; Rev. D. Smith, \$20; E. S. Sterling, \$20; H. Davenport, \$20; C. Clarke, \$4; Rev. G. Metzler, \$20; W. Browne, \$5; W. S. Wiggins, \$400; H. C. Creighton, \$2; A. B. Warburton, \$20; Mr. Shipley, \$1; A. Friend, \$1; S. S. Ruggles, \$2; Mrs. Blair, \$2; T. McCormick, \$1; Frank Prat, \$1; F. Crookill, \$2; H. S. Piper, \$1; A. B. Menie, \$3; Peter Innes, \$5; James King, \$5; J. E. DeWolfe, \$5; The Misses Webster, \$5; Fredk. Brown, \$10; Jas. Leard, \$5; Thos. Tuzo, \$5; Wm. Munro, \$3; Albert Hittz, \$10; Dr. Moore, \$6; Wm. Grono, \$3; H. S. Prat, \$15; P. Giffkins, \$5; H. M. Bailey, \$5; E. S. Crawley, \$10; Mrs. E. K. Brown, \$10; Robt. Davis, \$5; Dr. Sutherland, \$20; W. N. Silver, \$50; Rev. J. A. Kaubach, \$100; Rev. G. W. Morris, \$100; Rev. Geo. H. Butler, \$25; H. Poole, \$100; J. Rutherford, \$60; J. G. Rutherford, \$40; Rev. D. C. Moore, \$40; Henry Townsend, \$25; Frances Drake, \$20; J. Smith, \$8; Charles Dickson, \$4; A. B. Gray, \$4; J. A. Ward, \$2; W. Moore, \$2; J. Wentworth, \$5; Geo. Carew, \$2; A. Carew, \$1; Miller, \$1; Mrs. Miller, \$1; Daniel Ross, \$1; Joseph Clish, \$1; Enoch Hill, \$1; A. O. Pritchard, \$2; Ed. Partridge, \$2; R. Willis, \$2; Joseph Vaux, \$1.

MISCELLANEA.

WANTED—A SACRISTAN. This is a notice that might very fittingly be affixed to the doors of a great many of our churches. It is quite true that "sexton" and "sacristan" are different forms of the same word; but the class of men who are now employed as sextons cannot do all the work that the "sacristans" performed. To light the fires, dust the church, and attend to furnaces are duties which may very well be left to the modern sexton. But to have the care of the church ornaments, to see that the sanctuary and altar are kept scrupulously neat, clean and tidy; that the altar is duly prepared for each service; and generally to see that everything in the church is in at least as good order as in a well-kept drawing-room, is work above a sexton.

In many cases the clergyman himself will be the only one who can attend to these duties. But among the clergy, as among any other classes of men, some are to be found constitutionally slovenly, and the sooner such an one becomes conscious of his own defects, and either remedies them, or enlists the services of some devout member of his congregation as a sacristan the better. But whoever it may be, *some one person* should have charge; and it should be impressed upon that one person that the condition of a successful discharge of the duties of the office is a careful attention to the minutest details. The custom of decorating our churches with flowers is increasing. A good sacristan will bestow some pains upon this, and will probably have been instructed by his clergyman to this effect. That no vases should ever be put upon the Holy Table itself; that showy drawing-room vases should never be used; as soon as possible let correct brazen ones be procured, and until they are provided let something as plain as possible be used, and covered with moss and leaves; that flowers should not be allowed to wither, and drop their decayed leaves, about the sanctuary, but should be removed in good time; that no flowers should be put in the font; and that the font itself should never be decorated in any way that would interfere with its immediate use. Neither clergyman nor sacristan will, on the occasion of a wedding, allow the church to be overrun by a crowd of young people putting up "bells of flowers" and other vulgarities that delight the soul of an ecclesiastical Jenkins.

There is one thing, however, which the clergyman will never hand over to the sacristan or to any one else, and that is the care of the sacred vessels. They must always be his special charge. He will see that they are at all times perfectly clean and ready for use. He will not put them away uncleaned after a celebration, and leave them untouched for two or three months, and then take them out all stained with damp and rust. He will not put them in a basket under a vestry table and let them take care of themselves till they are wanted again. He will not leave it to the "sexton" to get them