

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
 - Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
 - Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
 - Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
 - Pages detached/
Pages détachées
 - Showthrough/
Transparence
 - Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
 - Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
 - Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
 - Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
 - Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

A
215
N85

NOVA SCOTIA
Church Chronicle.

VOL. IV.

HALIFAX, DECEMBER, 1868.

No. 12

"Ad profectum sacrosanctæ matris ecclesiæ."

EXTREMES vs. SINCERITY.

"ARE THERE ROMANIZING GERMS IN THE PRAYER BOOK?" is the title of a pamphlet, published at the offices of the *Protestant Churchman*, New York, and the *Episcopalian*, New York and Philadelphia, which has just reached us. It is the one of which mention was made in our October No. in connection with the perversion to dissent of the Rev. Mr. Cracraft, of Ohio. As we have neither time or space for a lengthened refutation of the extraordinary assertions of this pamphlet, we shall merely set before loyal churchmen a few paragraphs as specimens of its contents. It is necessary to premise that the unlimited right of private judgment in matters of faith and practice is the *singula non* of the present, as of all former, objectors to the Prayer Book, and therefore any—the slightest—encroachment on this Final Court of Appeal is an intolerable burden to the "conscience." "The Bible, as I understand it," is to be the rule of faith to each individual, to which must be added the right to vilify and persecute all who believe more than one's self, and infallibility and the right of anathematizing others is to be the prerogative of every pope, i. e. "believer," male and female, in Christendom.

The first Romanizing Germ in the Prayer Book, it seems, is the Rule of Faith. The pamphlet claims that "no doctrine is to be believed and no law is to be obeyed which may seem to any one seriously exercising the right of private judgment to offend God's Word." But because the Church will not cast away her Catholic birthright, but is willing to leave her decisions on the meaning of Holy Scripture, compared with the ruling of pure and primitive Christianity, and cites the testimony of the Apocrypha, the Homilies, the Ancient Authors and Ancient Canons, straightway our sticklers for the rights of modern human judgment are offended. Among other offensive expressions under this head in our formularies, the following from the form of consecrating a bishop is quoted:—"Brother, for as much as the Holy Scripture and the Ancient Canons command that we should not be hasty in laying on hands," &c.

This is condemned, as linking Holy Scripture with the traditions of men. This critic is not only too pure-minded for the Prayer Book, but herein condemns the Bible itself, seeing that the heathen poet, Epimenides, is quoted with approbation in the first chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to Titus, and Aratus, another heathen poet, in Acts xvii. Colenso, pure-minded man, was shocked out of all faith by the cruelties and impurities of the Mosaic Law. Verily, ultra-puritanism is near to infidelity, and this accounts for much otherwise unaccountable sympathy with our modern infidels, and deprecators of Bible and Church authority.

The next Romanizing Germ in the Prayer Book is its doctrine of the Ministry. This author quotes (p. 23) the words of our Baptismal Office:—"It hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit," and yet we find him (p. 19) asserting that "the second priestly function is the power, perhaps it ought to be called the privilege, of conferring Baptismal Regeneration." The animus of this perversion is clear enough. The writer is also scandalized by the reflection (p. 19) that a priest in our Church 'is called to exorcise higher and different functions than belong to him: who is made a deacon.' Assuming, also, that not one of the twelve apostles was a priest, he thence argues that a grace which has never been received cannot be transferred ergo priesthood by Apostolic succession in our Church is a thing which does not exist. The phraseology of the Prayer Book is consequently Romanizing in its tendency—with much more to the same purpose.

Another Romanizing Germ is the Doctrine of the Sacraments. On Baptismal Regeneration, the author says:—

"The Romish dogma is expressed with sufficient explicitness by the current phrase. BAPTISMAL REGENERATION. By the act of Baptism, when administered by a priest or his deputy in due form, the grace of the Holy Spirit is conferred, the heart of the baptized is regenerated or born again, the benefits of Christ's death are insured. The unbaptized, cut off from these gifts, are lost. *Baptismal regeneration* means thus, in plain words, *salvation by baptism*. We do not stop to prove, but simply assume, that this is contrary to God's word.

"What is the GERM of this element of Romanism? Keeping clear of all theological controversy, we feel that the following statement is a true description of it:

"In Baptism, when duly administered, a seed of grace, or 'habit of righteousness,' is deposited by the Holy Spirit. It may die, or it may live and bear fruit. The result is not so much a change of heart as of condition. There is a quasi-bestowal of the Holy Spirit, but the gift may be despised. This quasi-bestowal, whether despised or not, is regeneration or new birth. The future operation of the Holy Ghost is called *Renovation*."

Thus, admitting that the teaching of the Church is that the gift of God in Baptism may be lost, our author has yet the face to insinuate the slander, oft-repeated, that according to the formularies of his Church, men are saved by baptism alone. Observe his italics. We would commend to his attention the passage to be found in 1 Pet. iii. 20-21.

After clearly proving, by many quotations, that the Prayer Book teaches Baptismal Regeneration, and showing that the writings of the Fathers, and, in after times, the Reformers—among the rest Bucer—give their authority in its favor, the author accuses his evangelical brethren in the following startling language:—

"Having been led, by the importance of our subject, to dwell at this length upon the Doctrine of Baptism, we hesitate to tarry longer to examine one question closely connected with its practical aspects; yet it will not do to pass it by. It is this: *How can evangelical men use these offices, and yet remain faithful to the truth as it is in Jesus? We would answer, in their behalf, that few of them administer baptism heartily; some under protest; some refuse, the majority of them apologize for their action, by putting an non-natural sense upon the offices. When asked to explain them, they explain them away.*"

He then adduces several ways by which men who prefer the modern to the primitive gospel, attempt to show that the Prayer Book is in accordance with their peculiar views. We have long wondered why, if this be so, they are ever and anon agitating for a revision of our formularies. Once in a while, it is

true, a candid man, whose conscience cannot reconcile the Calvinistic system with our Baptismal Office, will take the trouble to read both sides of the question, and compare his pre-conceived notions with the Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers, as well as that of our own more learned divines. In almost every such case the plain, literal, and grammatical sense of the Prayer Book is the result of the reader's convictions, and his conscience finds immediate relief. But others, shunning the testimony of the Primitive Church, go on in the painful "non-natural" way, laying themselves open to any Spurgeon or other hard-hitter, who holds their opinions, but scouts at their position. In these days, however, when the depraver of the Prayer Book, on the Ritualistic side, goes to Rome, the sound earnest revival spirit in our Church which sloughs him off is bringing the depraver of the Prayer Book, on the other side, to a crisis. Hear our author:—

"Here are no less than five different explanations, all or any one of which destroys the unity of the Baptismal Service, and violates its plain letter. They are so constantly obtruded as to suggest great sensitiveness of conscience behind them. They have been unceasingly offered, but without relieving many of a sore burden which the service imposes. Some have outgrown the scruples of their consciences, but every new generation is obliged to pass through the same struggles as those who have gone before. The world is slow to believe that popular devotional formularies are so recalcitrant in their meaning that a vast amount of historical lore is necessary for their right interpretation, and has been quick to style these various explanations 'traditional, evasive expedients,' bad in principle and unsatisfactory in result.

"However satisfactory to the clergy these expedients may be, the laity, for the most part, are ignorant of or unwilling to accept them.

"Godly men, in other years and lands, have had such doubts as are herein expressed. The pious Simeon said:

"In the Baptismal Service we thank God for having regenerated the baptized infant by His Holy Spirit. Now, from hence it appears that, in the opinion of our reformers, regeneration and remission of sins did accompany baptism."

"Macaulay reckoned as

"Sophistical that peculiar form of mental aberration which refuses to recognize in the plain wording of the Baptismal Service the regenerating virtue of the sacrament"

"Baptist Noel says:

"I once labored hard to convince myself that our reformers did not and could not mean that our infants are regenerated by baptism. But no reasoning avails. The language is too plain."

"The venerated Bishop Meade once wrote:

"Why could not another prayer on the same plan be introduced into the Baptismal Service, and allowed to be used in the place of the one which we must now use, but which I never do without pain, because its plain, literal meaning contradicts my belief?"

"We are compelled to choose between two interpretations: One is the non-natural, offends many consciences, and results in a confused, deceiving formulary. The other is natural, logical, convincing to those who accept it. It teaches what Hagenbach asserts to be the teaching of the divines of the Church of England, 'the doctrine of baptismal regeneration with caution.' It is a part of what Dean Alford has recently called 'a piece of the original scarlet . . . which was tolerated for old customs' sake, and for the sake of those who cared for it.' Is not Neal's word historically true: 'Neither among the Eastern Offices of Baptism, all of which I know well—Constantinopolitan, Copto-Jacobite, Armenian, Syro-Jacobite, Ethiopic, Nestorian—nor, to the best of my belief, among those of the West, is there one which so unequivocally asserts the unconditional regeneration of an infant as our own Office?'"

After the foregoing, our readers can readily imagine the manifold expressions in the Communion Office, and especially in that of the American Prayer Book, which contain—not exactly the milk for babes—which our author would desire. No wonder, he says, after giving a list of such expressions:—

"We object to the doctrinal phrase,

'But also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament.'"

Such teaching, he says—

"Will germinate into Romish error. Such germination is to be expected in view of the soil made ready by the Romanizing compost furnished by the Doctrines of the Rule of Faith, of the Ministry, and of Baptism. An illustration of this is given by Bishop Overall, who in commenting on the words,

'Most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that, by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we, and all Thy whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion.'

remarks :

'This is a plain oblation of Christ's death once offered, and a representative sacrifice of it for the sins and for the benefit of the whole world, of the whole Church'

"So we find in the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper a FORTH ROMANIZING GERM."

Having objected to the Office for Baptism, because it treats the baptized child as a Christian, (p. 25) our pamphleteer does not surprise us by the solemn declaration that he regards the Catechism—

"As a fruitful source of Romanizing doctrine, and as the instrument most useful in instilling in the minds of the young the germinal ideas of the sacerdotal and sacramentarian theories."

After condemning the Prayer Book to his heart's content, the author heads his last chapter with the momentous question : "Men and brethren what shall we do?" Taking no hint, however, from St. Peter's answer to this question, as recorded in Acts ii. 38, the author's answer is—"*Agitate. AGITATE and AGITATE*, until the language of the Prayer Book is changed."

"How often have the Gospel teachings of the pulpit been neutralized by the instructions of the Prayer Book! The Offices for Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Ordination have implanted in many Romanizing germs which have warped them from Gospel simplicity. The constant repetition of the declaration of baptismal regeneration has forced many to believe, at last, what has been so often spoken in unbelief. Defections from evangelical truth among us are to be traced to the insidious influence of the Offices."

We commend to our author a very pregnant paragraph on the 20th page of Dr. Newton's recently published sermon on "Liberal Views of the Ministry," (Philadelphia, Henry B. Ashmead). Dr. Newton, a prophet of their own, thus informs his evangelical readers of the reason for the Canon of the American Church, which requires her ministers to be episcopally ordained, whereas, he says, in former times this strictness was not observed—

"The real reason for this change of practice was, that persons thus admitted as ministers in the Church without a real love for its services, were sometimes found to do great harm, and therefore it was deemed expedient to require Episcopal ordination for all persons received as ministers in 'this Church'."

We can imagine nothing more painful to a man's own feelings, more lowering to his self-respect, more likely to render conference with his brethren in Synod or Council disastrous to his influence in the Church, more calculated to bring the sword of the Lord "upon his arm and upon his right eye" than this wretched system of "looking one way and rowing another." A most vigorous process of purification is now going on in the Church. State abuses, infidel abuses, ritualistic abuses and puritanic abuses are fast rising to the surface, and in the fierce commotion of purification a good deal that can well be spared will boil over. Agitators, dissatisfied with the Prayer Book, will find ere long that the great body of Churchmen love the old formularies, and will not follow those who are given to change, and who desire to mutilate or emasculate this

heritage, the language of which has become crystallized in the literature of their nation, and is as familiar and dear to them as household words. Plain folk are not all fools, and even a very simple-minded Christian will expect the chief characteristics of godly men to be godly sincerity. Truth and honesty will in the end prevail, and the end of some of these controversies may not be far off. Let a man be well persuaded in his own mind. If he can believe the words he utters in public prayer to the Searcher of all hearts to be according to His will, let him not fear though the earth be moved. If for some reason best known to himself he utters those words in unbelief, and still ministers where he is bound to utter them, how can he expect a blessing on his work from the God of Truth? Now that this system of utter insincerity is openly proclaimed in the United States by the insincere themselves, is it at all marvellous that at the last General Convention the great body of the Church was found to be against them, and a deaf ear was turned to their "scruples of conscience?" Such publications as this on "Romanizing Germs" fully account for the great falling off in numbers and influence of a party, once formidable for both, in the Church in the United States.

The *Episcopalian*, from whose office the pamphlet on "Romanizing Germs" emanates, is very anxious that the Bishop of Oxford and those who think with him shall leave the Church. But what relief would this immense exodus (six-sevenths of the Church, as the *Episcopalian* lately showed,) afford to the anti-Prayer Book remainder? Whilst a shred of the distinctive principles of the Church remains they will not be satisfied. Meantime our author pathetically observes:—

"They shrink from the continued repetition of unsatisfactory explanations. *They regard with alarm the influence of the Prayer Book upon many of the souls committed to their charge.* This stress of conscience dulls their enthusiasm and abates their influence." [The Italics are ours,—Ed. C. C.]

And again:—

"We cannot use or give a Prayer Book without, in some sense, becoming a party to its errors."

After such explanations, we can no longer wonder at the practice of public extemporaneous prayer in the Church, which obtains among these men, nor at their strong desire to exchange pulpits with those who share their contempt for the Prayer Book, but do not in any way make use of that objectionable volume.

The present revival in the Church of England has brought out a great deal of plain speaking. The secrets of many hearts are being revealed, and we cannot doubt that all this will tend to the advancement of truth. We expect very good results from the revelations of this pamphlet on Romanizing Germs in the Prayer Book. Anything is better than stagnation, and it was well observed by Judge Otis, at the late General Convention in New York, that—

"At a time when the Church of England was at its lowest in point of ritual, and approached nearest to the sects around it, then was the time when it lost one hundred and nine thousand of its members by their defection to Methodism."

All true followers of Christ are earnestly praying and working for unity, but this we cannot have without purity and sincerity of faith. May He give each of us grace to discover that portion of the general error which each may remedy, by God's help, within and around himself!

FAULT-FINDERS.

A correspondent mentions the publication of a Pamphlet, lately by that voluminous but somewhat meddlesome and dictatorial writer, Judge Marshall, repeating the hackneyed objections to the Lambeth Conference, and particularly attacking our declaration of submission to synodical decisions, and our regulation concerning letters dimissory. We would ask the Judge whether a minister of his own denomination—the Wesleyans—is not bound by rules which *shall* be made, as well as by those which have been made by the Conference—that arbitrary body, of which no layman is a member? Can a Wesleyan minister pass from one Conference or District to another without testimonials? We even venture to doubt, whether a lay member, among the Methodists, any more than among the Baptists, would be received into communion in another circuit without showing his class-ticket or letter recommendatory.

We trust it will not be laying ourselves open to a charge of ingratitude if we express no particular degree of thankfulness for the Judge's interest in our affairs, and that at a time when, by all accounts, his hands are pretty full. At all events, we should almost expect a Churchman to be accused of impertinence if he were to go out of his way to attack the decisions of the Wesleyan or Baptist Conference, or the Presbyterian Synod. And yet, whilst the Judge is denouncing with pious indignation the arbitrary conduct of the Bishop or the Synod of our Church, in an imaginary difficulty which he conjures up, some of our ready writers may possibly feel their fingers tingled to remind their censor of certain unfortunate probationers, ere now, being required by Conference to give a solemn pledge to abstain from the use of tobacco, on pain of being rejected as candidates for the ministry.

We can assure our zealous prophets of evil, both without and within our Church, that their haunting fears and predictions of disaster do not shake our confidence in the promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against that which Christ has founded. It would be an extraordinary thing if the evils of many years of supineness and mismanagement could be shaken off without a struggle. In our present revival, a kind Providence is permitting all evils of faith and practice among us to come prominently to the surface in this our day, when on all sides of the Church there are sharp eyes and willing hands ready to discover and eject them. Of course the timid and unfaithful will be anxious to leave the ship on the first appearance of the storm, or what is perhaps worse, may strive to discourage the braver portion of the crew by their constant predictions of disaster; but the wind, though strong, is steady and fair, and our progress towards the haven where we would be is beyond measure greater now than in the days of weary and listless calm. We have abiding faith in the good ship, and shall not yet look for the boat.

As to those outsiders who take an interest in our ecclesiastical affairs, we would point to the list of our clergy in our D. C. S. Report, which shows a goodly number, steadily increasing, of zealous men, willing and fitly prepared to spread the blessed truths of the gospel, and the principles of the Church of England. Not now, as in former days, are they working, each man apart in cheerless isolation, but meeting regularly for mutual counsel and encouragement in their Rural Deaneries and Synods. These are signs which wise men around us will duly appreciate, and it is only the purblind who will now seek political gain by attacking our church or its office-bearers, as in the old and evil day when, without the means of mutual consultation, the church of England was the butt for every political hack and peuny-a-liner who chose, for popularity's sake, to attack it.

To the weak-kneed and irresolute among ourselves we would say, that every church has its difficulties, as well as every family; and our difficulty just now is to provide means to meet the large and increasing deficiency in the monies paid by the S. P. G. and the Commissariat Department,—the latter falling off at the decease of each of the old incumbents. For the year 1851, the amount paid from the S. P. G. towards the support of our Church, exclusive of P. E. Island, was £3748 stg., whilst for last year we received only £2850. In 1851 we had from the Commissariat £2600, and we have now £1300. If we mistake not, the amount received from the Colonial Church Society was quite as much in 1851 as it is now. So that we have had a diminution of £2200 stg. in the amount of aid from England, whilst the clergy have, notwithstanding, increased from 55 in 1851 to 84 in 1867. In P. E. Island, the S. P. G. pay £450 against £780 in 1851, but the clergy have increased from 7 to 10.

Our Endowment Fund, amounting to £16,000, raised within a few years, would have obviated our difficulties, and would have been in operation for the last two or three years, if the subscribers had honestly fulfilled their pledges, but owing to neglect, and the dangerous doctrine of repudiation, we are now suffering. Our difficulties, whatever they are, are mainly owing to those facts which, for correction, are largely within the power of our fault-finders themselves.

That the funds of the D. C. S. are not what they ought to be, there can be no doubt; but we need not be discouraged when we consider how very much more is now paid by the several congregations, direct to their respective pastors, than formerly. Under these circumstances, we may be thankful that there is an increase instead of a diminution in our general funds.

For 1851, the receipts of the D. C. S. were.....	£2939
“ 1867, “ “ “ “	4155

the receipts for 1867 being indeed less by £183 than those for 1866, but \$480 more than for 1865. If we include *special* funds, administered by the Society, we have for last year \$9322 against \$4052 in 1851.

Our Protestant Dissenting and R. Catholic neighbours, looking at our means and our numbers, will laugh at our difficulties, seeing that the cure lies in our own pockets. We are slowly but surely passing through the disagreeable process of weaning, and learning at the same time the salutary lesson of self-support, for we are past the age of infancy and dentition. Our cries, meanwhile, are anything but dignified, and the sooner we lay aside childish things, become men in faith, and support our own church, and that handsomely, the better. Our D. C. S. is under the management, and deserves the confidence and hearty and generous support, of the whole Church. Let not one wait for or discourage another, but all willingly put their shoulders to the wheel.

GENERAL CONVENTION U. S., 1868.

THE following is the closing Address of the President, Dr Craik, to the House Deputies on the last day of the session. The entire Convention rose to their feet during the delivery of the Address. The Rev. President said:

As it is not probable that we shall meet again in the relation which we now sustain to each other, I ask your indulgence to make a few remarks. . . . It is but the reiteration of the common feeling and the expression of all who have attended the sessions of this House to utter my assured conviction that the extraordinary harmony, the cordial courtesy, and the manifestations of fraternal affection which have

distinguished the deliberations of this body from its commencement to its close, could have come under the circumstances in which we have been placed, and with the exciting questions which have been before us, from no other source than the guidance and presiding influence of the Holy Ghost. For this precious gift and Grace of God let us render to Him all the praise and gratitude of which our poor hearts are capable. We humbly, thankfully, take it for an earnest that God will continue to be gracious to this branch of His Church, and designs her, small as she is, to exert a blessed influence in moulding the character and destiny of this new world in which our lot is cast. He will control and overrule the agitations and aberrations of the day to a greater good. They are but the signs and necessities of a more exuberant life. As that life expresses itself in one direction, all of us will agree to maintain all that truly tends to produce those two things which God has so emphatically consecrated in His public worship—glory and beauty—while we reject all that is tawdry, mean, and trifling, and as far as on either hand, this teeming life has degenerated into false doctrine and disloyalty. Men of mere subjective faith will go to their own place from this Church, following Newman and Manning on one hand, or Colenso and Baptist Noel on the other. Even so this will but purify and strengthen the Church. The most important and continuing subject for gratulation in this Church is the fidelity with which we have adhered to the Divinely given pattern of a Christian Council by making the laity an essential portion of such Council. Our more extended experience in the practical working of this Divine pattern enables us to say confidently to our brethren of the Church of England, and of the provinces of England, who are trying to bring their synodical organization to a higher standard, that the lay element in this body has at all times been at once progressive and eminently conservative, that it is an effectual preservation against class legislation, and, in my opinion, contributes largely to the dignity, courtesy, and high character of this Convention. The Church, I trust, rising to a higher estimation of her powers, and capabilities, will have each of her ministers not merely a workman, but the leader and guide of a body of working people which is the only way that this Church can fulfil her great mission in evangelizing this country. The laity, under the control of and with the assistance of their respective ministers, by lay reading, must occupy every accessible position wherever the Church may be planted.

BISHOP POTTER'S ADDRESS.

[Continued.]

WE CANNOT GO BACK SIXTY YEARS.

The answer to these questions will rise up before almost every mind so soon as they are stated. We cannot exclude all improvements within the limits of Law, if we would; and certainly we ought not, if we could. An attempt to keep all our churches and all our services forever conformed to the standard of what were the average forms sixty years ago would have been a monstrous absurdity, and it would have been just as impossible as to prevent

the rising of the ocean tides. Could an exact image of the average services of the Church as they were celebrated sixty years ago be made palpable to our view, there is not one Churchman or Churchwoman in an hundred in this Diocese who would desire to recall them.

We revere the Bishops and Clergy of those days. They did all that the circumstances of the Church and country permitted or required. But the Church of England in that and the preceding age was not seeing her best days; and when we consider under what disabilities our Church in this country labored previous to and during the Revolution, and indeed for many years after it, and that she took her first impress from the Mother Church, when that Church was by no means the glowing, working Church that she has been since, we can easily see that to take our Church as she was in her first feeble and crude days in this country, and make it an absolute pattern, even in subordinate things, for all future ages, would have been of all things shortsighted and fatal.

We can easily see, too, if our General Convention in those early days had undertaken to engage in minute restrictive legislation in regard to Ritual, absolutely tying down all our services to precisely the form and manner which alone entered into their conceptions; I say, if they had attempted to do that, we can easily see what a piece of work they would have made of it! Let, then, the wisdom of the past, whether deliberate or accidental, be a lesson for the future! At the present day it seems to me that the General Convention could scarcely engage in a more perilous and mischievous undertaking than would be that of seeking by legislation to abridge the just liberty of the Clergy. It is not required for the legitimate government of the Church, and it cannot be carried to any such extent as would give anything like respectability to the attempt without the gravest inconveniences and dangers.

RESTRICTIVE LEGISLATION NOT NEEDED.

I say restrictive legislation in regard to Ritual is not required in the Church in this country, and for two reasons:—

First—Excessive ritualism (so called) as it is seen in some places in England has not transferred itself to this country to any extent worthy of notice. It has never from the first had vitality enough on this side of the ocean to propagate itself. It is ten years or more since the first alarm was raised, since certain features appeared for the first time in one or two small churches in this Diocese. These ten years have passed away, and still everything that can possibly be charged as real excess is confined to two or three small churches. For to speak of such services as those of Trinity Church as worthy of grave censure,—to treat choral services, and surpliced choirs, and processional psalms and hymns as things perilous to the Church—is a puerility hardly entitled to serious consideration. We can hardly presume to cut ourselves off from all reference to the authority and example of the Mother Church from which we are descended; and in the Church of England most people know that choral services and surpliced choirs and processions have been familiar things ever since the Reformation. Particular individuals, being unused to these things, may not find them helps to devotion, and may prefer to attend a worship which is differently ordered. This they are perfectly at liberty to do; but for them to attempt to deprive others of the services which they do not choose for

themselves, for them to denounce those services as unlawful and wicked and perilous to the souls of men, and to seek to have them put under a ban throughout the Church, is scarcely consistent with Christian moderation and charity—scarcely consistent with the comprehensive character of the great Communion to which they belong. I say, then, that real excesses in Ritual have appeared in this country only to an extent which is insignificant, that they evince no power to propagate themselves, and therefore call for no restrictive legislation.—for,

In the second place, such as they are, they may be safely left to the authorities of the Diocese in which they occur. And, if those authorities are wise, they will act in all such matters with great reserve and moderation, whatever their own individual views may happen to be. The real limits to which services may be carried without violation of what may be called law and usage in the Church, and without symbolizing false doctrine, are somewhat vague. It is some eight or ten years since I remarked in a conventional Address, that if in the discharge of my duty I visited a church where the services were somewhat peculiar, and if I did so without special remark upon the services, it was not to be inferred that they were altogether to my taste, or that I entirely approved of them; and if those services by liberal construction could be brought within the limits of the law and usage of the Church, it did not seem to me to become a Bishop to attempt to rule them by the measure of his own individual idiosyncrasies. I think so still. And I think, moreover, that a Bishop had better in many such things be slow to act. Many evils are of a nature to cure themselves, and a microscopic vision and hasty and imperious action are by no means the best securities for ecclesiastical order.

Enough has been said in the preceding part of this Address to show that the Bishop of this Diocese is very far from being friendly to excessive Ritual, as, on the other hand, he is equally far removed from partiality to a narrow restrictive system in regard to the worship of the Church. That within the last twenty years there has been upon the whole a great change for the better in the form and style of our holy places, in the treatment of them, and in the more careful ordering of the services, especially in many of the smaller parishes few candid and well-informed persons will be inclined to deny. And if these changes have tended to increase of visible reverence for everything pertaining to the public worship of Almighty God, if in many respects they have been of a nature to interest and engage the young, and if these changes (changes not in substance, but in a few particulars of manner,—of outward expression), if these changes have in no way interfered with the preaching of the "Truth as it is in Jesus," or with Church work, it seems to me that they need not greatly alarm us.

RELATION OF OUTWARD EXPRESSION TO INWARD FEELING.

This is not the place in which to attempt a full discussion of the nature and influence of outward and visible things, such as form and ceremonial in religion. The question which we in this branch of the Church have to consider in regard to the form and manner of conducting Divine services is, of course, not an abstract and original question as to what kind of Ritual would be most conducive to devotion and to the maintenance of Divine Truth in its purity, had we everything to create anew; the question is, what is consistent with our Prayer Book? What is consistent with the law and usage of this branch of

the Church or of the Anglican Communion as a whole? And within the limits of allowed usage, what are the comparative merits of the simpler and the more ornate, or more expressive services? On the general question, I detain you with only one observation. There is a vague notion prevalent in a large portion of the popular religious world, which constitutes the main staple of certain arguments and denunciations in regard to ceremonial, sometimes launched against the Church from without, and still more frequently used within by one portion of the Church against the other. It is a notion of such general prevalence and use that it has passed into a kind of stereotyped formula, forever repeated in the Pulpit, forever reechoed from the Press: it is to this effect: that there is a necessary and irreconcilable antagonism between the outward and visible and the inward and spiritual: that in proportion as we are influenced by the former, we are withdrawn from the influence of the latter: that they who make much of the outward and visible, make little of the inward and spiritual. Of course this naked and unqualified statement would be denied by the class of persons now referred to. They would say, "We also believe in some use of the outward and visible, as may be seen in our practice. What we object to is an excessive use of the outward, which we hold to be unfavorable to the attention and susceptibility of the soul to the spiritual." Of course "excessive use," in the meaning of each such individual, would be that which exceeds what may chance to have been the custom with him.—the custom in his sphere of action and observation. But it cannot be doubted that in the unguarded popular way in which such views are usually stated, things outward and visible are placed in direct antagonism to things inward and spiritual, and the idea is strongly inculcated that interest in the outward deadens the interest of the soul in the spiritual.

No doubt there are religious services in other portions of the Christian world, which appear to our unaccustomed eyes to be altogether overburdened with elaborate ceremonial. But what a gross fallacy is involved in the popular notion that outward expression stands in the way of inward feeling! What are the senses made for, but that outward things may have an avenue through which they may act upon and stir up the affections of the soul? When the Psalmist rejoiced that "the heavens declare the glory of God," that "the firmament showeth forth His handiwork," he seemed to think that the magnificence of the visible creation could not but move the intelligent beholder to adoration and praise; he more than anticipated the latter saying that "the undevout astronomer is mad." Let me not abuse your patience by taking up time to prove what every one knows; that, more than in almost any other way, the soul is reached and excited by impressions derived from eternal things; the visible helps us to realize the invisible. I never heard that impressive funeral ceremonies were supposed to detract from the reverence felt for the departed. When political parties, on the eve of an election, light their fires, and parade with banners their immense torchlight processions, they seem not to have learned, from their many years' experience, that these outward displays are of a nature to lessen the inward enthusiasm and devotion of their followers. When the commander of a great army, as the hour of battle approaches, collects around him his splendid retinue of glittering sabres and nodding plumes, and passes along the front of his line,—banners lowered, trumpets sounding, until the blood of every soldier boils in his veins with martial excitement,—it surely implies no apprehension on his part that this preparatory

ceremonial will take off their thoughts from the mighty struggle before them, or detract from their heroic determination. I have heard rugged men speak of the effect produced upon them as the procession of the Clergy and Laity moved up the aisle at the consecration of a church, repeating the sublime anthem: they said they could not repress their tears. As majesty and beauty in the House of the Lord impress the mind with awe, and predispose it to devotion, so a certain degree of order, dignity, beauty in the worship, whether addressed to the eye, or to the ear, if bearing the impress of reverence, helps to touch and elevate the soul,—*unless, indeed, there be invincible prejudices standing in the way!*

Novelties introduced into the customary order of Divine services, whether in the way of addition or omission in the outward ceremonial, will no doubt at first jostle the mind of the worshipper and disturb in some measure his devotion, more or less, according as he is more or less a creature of prejudice and easily offended. But it is a mistake to suppose that in places where the services are always of the same general character, no matter how striking in outward ceremonial, the ordinary attendant is much occupied with conscious attention to outward details. Accompany a devout person who is accustomed to worship in one of the most magnificent cathedrals of England, you will see him as much abstracted as if he were in a quaker meeting. The impressive things about him are too familiar to be able to fasten his attention absolutely upon themselves. Unconsciously he is warmed and animated, and lifted up by their influence, but without their becoming distinct and separate objects of thought in any such way as to take off his mind from his devotions. Quite the contrary, in such a cathedral I have seen the humblest and plainest of the poor absorbed in their Prayer Books and their devotions, apparently without the slightest thought or recollection that there was anything remarkable around them.

And these observations bring into view one great reason why, in the same place, the services should be, as far as possible, uniform. If they be of a uniform character, the worshipper will become accustomed to them whatever they may be, and cease to give any conscious attention to the details. But, as we have seen, our Church is a comprehensive Church, and our services, within reasonable limits, may be expected to exhibit in different times and places, considerable varieties, reaching from the simplest worship of the village church up to the highest and most animated service known to the cathedrals of England. And I confess, it seems to me that that member of the Church is in an unhappy state of mind who cannot meet a service of any tone, included within the reasonable limits referred to, without being offended at it, or without denouncing it in the public papers as unfaithful to the Church and to the Truth. Such a person may find a service which he encounters, agreeing more or less with his individual preferences, but that any lawful service should have the power of disturbing his devotions or his equanimity, implies that the mischief is more in the mind of the individual than in the form of the worship. Surely a little more breadth of mind, a little more largeness of view, a little more habitual recognition of the fact that a slightly different mode of celebrating our one Service may be just as edifying to another person as the particular mode we prefer is to us, would be good for any member of our Communion. It would make him more happy, more charitable, and less apt to assist in disturbing the Church with groundless alarms.

[To be continued.]

CAROL FOR CHRISTMAS.

Awake, to watch the crimson dawn,
And meet the Angel throng,
Arise, to greet the Virgin-born,
With matin prayer and song.

Behold He comes in lowly mien,
He comes to bless the earth,
Let every voice, let every scene,
Tell out His welcome birth.

Gather the boughs of evergreen,
Festoon the hall and board,
And wreath the roof, and altar screen,
The pathway of the Lord.

The columns crown—entwine the niche,
Embow'r the Temple door,
And all its inner court enrich,
With offerings for the poor.

With loving hearts, let young and old
Their grateful tribute bring:
A tribute dearer far than gold,
To their anointed king.

In choir and hall—in ev'ry place,
In ev'ry heart and home,
We sing, to save our ruin'd race,
The promised Lord is come!

W. B.

Halifax: Christmastide.

REVIEWS.

CHURCH MISSIONS, &c., compiled by Colonel Lowry. Halifax: Miss
Katzmann, W. Gossip, and Z. S. Hall.

One of the most cheering facts of our day, and which goes farther than a thousand arguments to silence our croaking prophets of evil, is the great zeal for the prosperity and extension of our Church evinced by the laity in Great Britain, her colonies, and the United States. In our Synods, they are found to be the conservative element, and their practical wisdom and business habits are of invaluable service. And since their admission to our Synods a new zeal and liberality towards their Church is springing up on all sides. Conference with their brethren in the faith has greatly enlarged their sympathies, and abated prejudices engendered by former isolation.

Another cheering fact is the great revival of religion at present so observable in the army and navy of Great Britain. Naval chaplains notice with deep thankfulness to God a wonderful growth beginning to manifest itself in their formerly barren field of operations. Good centurions, in the other branch of the service, and also in our day, as in olden time, showing examples of love and faith, which their brethren of more peaceful occupations would do well to copy.

Among the rest, the author of the pamphlet before us is well known, both here and in Canada, as a most zealous and efficient labourer in his Master's cause. “Church Missions, &c.,” its author says, “is to a large extent a compilation from the writings and accounts of others. It has been drawn from many sources, from what I have read, from what I heard, and from what I have seen.” The lecture now published being the pith of many former ones delivered by the author, is replete with interesting facts and suggestions. Not a superfluous word is to be found in it, and utterly unlike the “slack-twisted talk,” spinning one idea into the twaddle of an hour, often dignified with the name of “lecture,” it suggests ideas and modes of action at every turn.

Contrasting the success of ancient with the slow and uncertain progress of modern missions, the lecturer raises the question—why is it that whilst in the days of St. Anskar and St. Augustine Sweden and England were converted to Christianity: heathenism gave way on every side, and thousands were baptized by those missionaries and their assistants in one day, whilst in after times Xavier and Martin and many others of extraordinary zeal have laboured in India, generation after generation, with the most meagre results? Why is the world still so largely heathen? And why is infidelity raising its head in Christian lands? The lecturer sets himself to the task of suggesting answers to these most interesting questions.

The early missionaries were not Romanists, in the modern acceptation of the term, for most of the errors which are known as Romish among us, crept in since their day. It was not therefore to the modern phase of Romish unity they owed their success, for the labours of Xavier, holy man as he was, have been as barren of permanent results as the missions of Protestants. They were poor men, sent by a poor Church—not by societies in the Church, owing their existence to jealousy and division. Yet how long did it take not only to establish Christianity in those lands, but absolutely to root out heathenism, so that no traces of it remained? Was it as long as since our first establishment in India? Why did these ancient missions succeed, whilst modern missions have comparatively failed? To elucidate this point, the lecturer compares the mission of St. Augustine with modern missions to India:

“The history of the mission is this. Gregory, then Bishop of Rome, seeing some English captives, and lamenting that so fine a race of men should be given to idolatry, determined if possible to evangelize them. The first thing he did was to seek out a band of men who were willing to undertake the work, and then to place a missionary Bishop at the head of them. This Bishop was Augustine. Here you will observe the first differences between the ancient missions and our own. The only society that was formed for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was the society of those men who were to go; there was no society for sending them: they were sent by the Church. Another difference is that at their head there was a Bishop unfettered by Acts of Parliament about ordaining and consecrating. He was competent to ‘ordain elders in every city’ in which he should succeed in establishing a Church, but where was the money for their support to come from, if there was no society at home? No doubt the earlier missionaries fared hardly at first; no doubt, like their Divine Master, they often had not where to lay their heads. But though in those days there was no rule of celibacy among the clergy any more than there is with us now, though we find the men and their successors, after they had established themselves in Churches of their own founding, exercising their priestly duties, as married men and bringing up their children as Christians—yet we do not find them setting out on their missions with their domestic comforts about them. Hardships they went through at first, but soon it came that they who preached the Gospel began to live of the Gospel. Beyond

a doubt even such missions as these were not self-supporting at first. They drew their first sustenance from the Church that sent them. We must not forget that, in those days, offertories really were *offertories*, where men offered of their substance, that is to say, in proportion to their substance; that the poor were supported by them, that Churches were endowed, and missions furnished. A good many years after this, when the worship of saints had crept into the Church a writer complains that “*ten thousands* were offered at the altar of St. Thomas, before a *thousand* was offered at the altar of God.” This will give us some idea what offertories used to be; we do not talk about them by *thousands* now.

“The mission of Augustine took place in the year 597. Ethelbert was then not only King of Kent, but exercised a kind of imperial authority as far as the Humber. He was married to Bertha, a French Princess and a Christian.

“The Missionaries conducted themselves with consistent simplicity, and devoted themselves to the instruction of the people in the Gospel. Their labours were soon rewarded. Ethelbert declared himself a Christian, and was baptized. Crowds speedily followed the example, and Gregory states in a letter to the Patriarch Eulogius that ten thousand were baptized in one day. The missionaries were soon established within the walls of Canterbury. The King gave up his palace to Augustine for a residence, and on the adjacent grounds the foundations of the first Cathedral were laid.

“As the Church increased Augustine became Archbishop, and his chief difficulties seem to have arisen after his elevation to this high position. It is related that he was at a loss as to what liturgy to use in the newly erected churches. There were it is well known, four principal liturgies in the early Church. The liturgy of St. James, which was followed generally in the Eastern Churches—the liturgy of St. Mark which was followed in Egypt and Abyssinia,—the Roman claiming the authority of St. Peter,—and the Gallican, derived probably through Irenæus from Ephesus and St. John. In the small church of St. Martin, reserved to the Queen, the Gallican liturgy had been hitherto observed.

“Augustine greatly preferred that of his country, at the same time that he did not wish to displease the Queen by substituting it for the Gallican. In his difficulty he consulted Gregory, who advised him, in arranging the services of the English Church, ‘not to tie himself down to the Roman ritual, or to the Gallican, or to any other, but to select out of every church what is pious, religious, and right, and so to form a new liturgy for the Church of England,’ for, he added, ‘things are not to be valued on account of places, but places for the good things which they contain.’

“As the Church took root in the land it began to throw out its branches. Canterbury became the metropolis or mother city of the Church of England. It sent out its own missions to other towns, just as it had been itself a mission of Rome. These missions were the exact model of the original mission, headed by Bishops, not of foreign ordination, but consecrated from its own body. The earliest missions from Canterbury were to Winchester and Selsey, but those soon ramified till the greater part of the South of England became evangelized, had their parishes and their parsons, and were under the superintendence of their own Bishops.

“The form of the Church was never lost: in the beginning it consisted of thirty persons, the members who, with Augustine, landed on the shores of Kent; but, in those thirty persons there were Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and Laymen. It was a perfect Church—the Apostles’ fellowship, as well as their doctrine. It never lost the form in which Christ had cast it, and so it never lost the promise of His perpetual presence!

“Now compare this with the efforts of our societies. A Church produced a Church, but a society could not produce a Church. Every failure experienced by our missions was not a failure of the Church, but of individuals in it collected together, not by the rules of Christ, but by rules of their own forming. Let me illustrate this by a story of the great missionary Wolff

“Dr. Wolff was travelling in some out-of-the-way place in the far east, in the diocese of one of Bishops of the Eastern, or Greek Church, and in the course of his wanderings he fell in with the Bishop. “Who are you?” said his Lordship looking at him suspiciously. ‘A poor missionary,’ said the Doctor. “A what?” said the

Bishop. ‘A missionary,’ said Dr. Wolff, pulling out his Bible, and opening it at the precise text he wanted—I am come to preach salvation to these poor people. ‘How shall they call upon Him, on whom they have not believed, or how shall they believe in Him on whom they have not heard, or how shall they hear without a preacher?’ ‘That is all very well,’ said the Bishop, ‘but why don’t you finish the text?—How shall they preach except they be sent?’—‘Who sent you?’ ‘Sent,’ said Wolff. “Yes sent,” said the Bishop—“My metropolitan sent me, and his predecessors sent him, and I send my priests and deacons. Now who sent you?’ ‘The Spirit of the Lord,’ said Wolff boldly, for he was not a man to be put out of countenance. ‘I hope you do not deny that Christ is able to send His own messengers without human intervention?’ ‘God forbid that I should doubt it for one moment,’ said the Bishop. ‘I know that He sent Moses and Aaron without human intervention, and I know that He superseded this very priesthood of His own ordination, by sending without intervention, the Apostolic Priesthood, and what He did once, He can do again. Still I have always observed that whenever He sends any one directly from himself, He is pleased to confirm His appointment to the minds of His servants by signs and wonders. Moses called down bread from Heaven. He and Aaron brought forth waters from the rock. And when it pleased God to supersede their priesthood, many wonders and signs were wrought by the hands of the Apostles.’ ‘Where are your witnesses,’ continued the Bishop, ‘what supernatural powers do you appeal to in proof of your heavenly mission?’ This was a puzzler; it had been so to Mohammed several hundred years ago, but the prophet got out of it by saying that he had written the Koran, which, as every one could see, was a miracle in itself. Wolff could not say he had written the bible, so he fell a-thinking, and the result was he came home *not a better* man—for a most excellent one he was always—but a wiser man!

‘Till lately, as regards missionary efforts, the Church of England had dropped that note of its Apostolic character; it had lost not the power of reproducing itself, but the will!

‘Why—incredible as it seems—it is yet true that, for one hundred years, there existed an Episcopal Church on this continent without a Bishop, and the Church which had the protection of the Government of England was that which was left without organization! In vain did the Church plead for redress; year after year did the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel make strenuous efforts to remedy the evil, but—while the State permitted the Roman Catholic Church to have what Bishops she pleased—the sons and daughters of the Church of England in America were left without the ministrations pledged to them at their baptism.

‘To what then but our own neglect can we attribute the growth on this continent of such innumerable varieties of religious denominations? It is certain, too, that nothing so tended to bring about the revolution which severed so large a portion of North America from the mother country as the neglect of her spiritual duties to her children.

‘The exertions which were made were those of *individuals*. and, though they were not without that share of blessing and success, never denied to holy purposes, and prayerful men, the nature of that success was—what might have been expected—desultory and uncertain.

‘This was the character of our Indian Missions, and, to a great extent, of all our missions.

‘The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, which was founded in the year 1701, may in some sense be considered a cast of the Church, and in these days when she appears to be rousing herself and reassuming some of her ancient functions, it may, perhaps, be moulded into an efficient implement of united and vigorous missionary action. But at the close of the last century society after society was set on foot, and these societies were all more or less distinct from one another in doctrine and government. The blame must be on ourselves; the Church in those days was dormant and supine.

‘Christianity suffers for all this; it *must* suffer. We must be prepared for failures; we must be prepared for the confounding together by the heathen of the works of all the associations I have referred to, whether within or without the Church, and for their imputation of the faults of each to all: while the Romanists,

who class us all alike as schismatic sects, are but too glad to attribute the failures of any portion of them to a general withholding of God's blessings from any missionary labors thus undertaken, and thus directed. Can any of us doubt that God regards with anger and displeasure our dissensions and schisms, and that these form the chief obstacle to the extension of His kingdom?

“We are too apt to think of our missions as being sent to ignorant and benighted heathens. In India this is not the case, for though ignorant of the *true religion*, they are far from being uncivilized, and many, very many, Mahometans and Hindoos are well educated men. Now to such as these we must present ourselves, not as giving uncertain sounds, but as fully convinced of the truth of our teaching: we must be models in discipline of our own doctrinal theory. We have seen the aspect in which the Church must have presented itself in *doctrine* to such men; let us see how they must have viewed it with respect to *discipline*.

“At the time when our multifarious Societies began to disseminate their multifarious doctrines, not only were incessant wars devastating every Province, not only were Christians apparently living unaffected by religious discipline and principles, not only was the Church of Christ unseen in any visible form, but Christian governments denounced Christianity. Laws passed by Englishmen rendered converts to Christianity incapable of holding offices as civilians, and the good Bishop Heber relates that a corporal in the then company's service was removed from it for having embraced Christianity. I have read, too, that the first Indian Bishop was inducted into his spiritual domain by stealth, through a faithless fear of offending heathen prejudices.

“Under such an aspect was the missionary's work to be presented to the Indian people! To the very same purport is later intelligence from China. Our minister even now will not tolerate the presence of a Protestant Missionary at Peking. The only one whom the Bishop of Hong Kong was able to leave on the occasion of a visit he made a few years ago to the Celestial capital, would appear to have been accredited there only as a *teacher of the English language*! Why is it that more toleration is shown in that capital to Roman than to English Catholics. May it not be that the French Government throw themselves heartily into the work of pushing forward and supporting the mission of their Church and faith. Already their converts in Peking amount to over two thousand, and a large elegant cathedral is completed in *one* part of the city, whilst in another a smaller one has been some time built. We have no house of prayer yet, and our only missionary is a *smuggled one*. Remember moreover such facts as these: When Tarey, the Baptist Missionary, went out first to India to preach the word of God, he was forced to betake himself to the Danish settlement of Serampore, because the English were afraid of having the missionary to the heathen settle in their territory. Again, Sir Peregrine Maitland was compelled to return to England, leaving a high official post, returning in disgrace, and *so far as man's orders could make it*, a dishonored man, because he refused to order Christian English soldiers to fire salutes for the most accursed of the Hindoo idols! ‘The element of Christianity,’ says a writer on the subject, ‘was in India entirely suppressed; and our administration presented the spectacle of one of the greatest Christian powers in the world sedulously bent upon ignoring its own belief.’

“How would all this appear from the point of view in which the Mahometans, the Hindoos, or even the Chinese would see it? The Mahometan is a strict observer of his religious duties, as those duties are taught him. Never does the sun rise or set on him, but, having performed all his ablutions, having, as he would say, washed his hands in innocency, and spread his carpet to keep him from the pollutions of this sinful earth, he kneels down and repeats his prayers. And this is done secretly or openly, wherever he may happen to be at the time. I have seen it carried out with the most rapt but unobtrusive devotion on the crowded and busy decks of a steamer. With him almsgiving is a set and regular duty, scrupulously, though perhaps formally, performed. Fasting with him is regular and severe; terribly so I remember to have thought it when I first visited Turkey in their Ramadan, or Lent season. When the Mahometan enters his mosque, his shoes are care-

fully put off at the door. Thus he acknowledges that the place where he is treading is holy ground, and when in, he creeps silently and reverently to his place, where, as before, he kneels upon his carpet. Now what can we say to such a man as that? He will admit that he believes in Christ; that they—the Mahometans—had been Christians once, ‘but,’ says he, ‘we had fallen into those bad habits in which you Christians continue to this day, and so God sent us another Prophet, Mahomet, to bring us back to the pure religion. Look at your people—they never pray, they never fast. Some give alms certainly, but not all: it is evidently, therefore, not a part of your religion. It was in Christ’s time, but you have forgotten it, and as for your places of worship—supposing he had ever seen a church—they are not places of worship at all. They are places occasionally open where people hear lectures, but not where men go to kneel, and pray, as we do.’ This is supposing he had ever seen a church, but most likely he never would have seen one. For many years there was not a church in India, and even yet there are but few. The Christians, who were to set an example to the nations had not enough religion to worship their God once a week, instead of the every day of the Mahometans. In vain would the missionary talk of the pure religion and its strict requirements! The Mahometan judged not by what he heard—for he heard so many different versions—but by what he saw! There was no visible representative Church: there was no band of holy men actually doing what the preacher said God’s law required. English troops were pushed far into the country, but, till lately, they carried not God’s Minister along with them. Sir Charles Napier, when commanding in Scinde, sent home his solemn protest against the absence of ministers of the religion of England in the force and Province committed to his government.

“One Catholic Church!” There was not a Church. There were Men’s Societies. There was the difference between Augustine’s mission and our Indian missions! With the Hindoo the case was still more difficult. He worshipped, indeed, a multitude of Idols, but still he would answer that there was but one God, and that his idols were but reminders of God’s perfections. The very essence of Hindooism is self-denial, as indeed in theory it is of Christianity. In the Hindoo it is mixed up with all sorts of impieties and absurdities, as might be expected of men who have not the spirit of Christ to guide them; but there it is, and they act up to it. They will sacrifice anything—their riches, their children, their very lives—to their sense of duty to God: monstrous as that idea sometimes is in practice. But this is the essence of the Christian religion also—at least we profess that it is. The missionary preaches it as he is bound: but the Hindoo replies: ‘Look at us, and look at yourselves; whose religion’ is true, judging by the earnestness of its followers? Look at us in our holy pilgrimages over the hot plains of Hindostan; look at us giving up our children to the holy Ganges; look at us leaving all, counting our lives as nothing in the service of our God, and look at yourselves. You count your lives as nothing: you leave your homes and your friends as well as we, but it is in the pursuit of pleasure, whenever it is not in the pursuit of gain.’

“Now this description is not the whole truth, and I know that the Christian would have a great deal more to say for himself, but I think it is the truth as it would strike the mind of a Hindoo.”

Colonel Lowry shows that very gratifying progress towards intercommunion has been made between the Anglo-Catholic and Greek Churches, and gives us the earnest convictions of one whose position affords him the best opportunity for judging, that the Holy Scriptures and the evangelical doctrines drawn from that pure source, as set forth summarily in the Nicene Creed, are the only standards to which she clings with pertinacity.

We earnestly recommend this excellent and suggestive Lecture to a wide circulation and careful perusal; and regret that the limited space at our command compels us to omit much that we had intended to present to our readers.

"*Liberal Views of the Ministry in Harmony with the Prayer Book and the Canons.*" A Sermon. By Rev. RICHARD NEWTON, D. D. Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead.

Our readers will remember that a short time ago the Rev. Stephen Tyng, jr., of New York, violated the Canon law of the American Church by preaching in another man's parish without leave, and also by exchanging pulpits with a Dissenting minister. For this he was tried, found guilty and publicly reprimanded. About the same time the Rev. Mr. Hubbard, of Rhode Island, finding himself "spoiling for a fight" with his Bishop, exchanged pulpits with a Baptist minister, and straightway notified his Diocesan of the audacious fact. The eclat of this last attack upon the law of the Church, however, was considerably diminished by the ungracious conduct of the Baptists—who, before the Bishop had time to notice officially the *coquetting* in question, publicly condemned the whole transaction, and repudiated all ministerial services from men—who like Rev. Mr. Hubbard—had never, in their view, been baptized.

The two facts show the existence of a feeling among a small party in the United States to break down the barriers on one side of the Church, and to be the judges—each in his own case—of what denominations among the numberless sects in that country of schisms, they shall admit to their pulpits for the purpose of teaching their flocks. It is true there are certain Canons at present in the way, and also the awkward promise given at ordination, to banish and drive away all heretical and false teaching. There is also the implicit engagement on the part of the pastor, at induction, to feed the flock with the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and no other.

The intention of Dr. Newton's Sermon is to show how sorely these various restrictions galling the tender conscience, and restrain the liberty of "preaching the Gospel." This he does with some vehemence, asserting, for example, (p. 15) that the idea of one of the smallest Protestant bodies in the land ignoring the orders of bodies of Christians greatly their superiors in number, and their equals in piety, is nothing short of "*arrogant presumption*," (*sic.*) and a crime approaching as nearly as possible, in modern days, to the sin against the Holy Ghost. Success, with the Doctor, is a proof of truth. How about the Mormons?

The Doctor is evidently a writer of much vigour, sparing none who cannot see with his "liberal view." Of moderate men, (like Nova Scotia Churchmen,) he says: "We sometimes meet with persons who pretend to ignore all party names and distinctions in the Church. They say 'we belong to no party; we only profess to be Churchmen. We hold only the views of the Church.' Of this class, all that need be said is that if they have not intelligence enough to know that real differences of opinion do exist in our Church, on matters not fundamental or saving, indeed, but yet gravely important, or if knowing this they have not force of character enough to form or hold a distinct and independent view on those great subjects, then we can only look upon them as cyphers. Their opinions are not worth regarding. In fact they have no opinions."

Well, such people will be greatly assisted in forming opinions (if they wish to remain Churchmen) by reading "*Romanizing Germs in the Prayer Book*," and "*Liberal Views of the Ministry*."

Correspondence.

The Editor of the Nova Scotia Church Chronicle does not hold himself responsible for the opinions of Correspondents.

D. C. S.

Letter from Rev. C. J. Shreve to the Rev. the Secretary.

RECTORY, CHESTER, April 3, 1868.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—I much regret that our subscriptions to the D. C. S. for the year 1867 are a few pounds less than the amount forwarded for the preceding year, and yet when I consider the poverty and destitution of the many I confess that the amount realized has exceeded my expectations. Much credit is due to the Ladies for their perseverance; and we have here another proof of the importance of Lay co-operation.

It was necessary to make exertions if we wished to be successful. I travelled sixteen miles to obtain five dollars.

I held a meeting in one of my out-stations, and several subscriptions were obtained under circumstances which are worthy of being recorded. Two persons subscribed 25 cents each, which small sums they at the time could not pay.

On my way home I was informed that one had not eaten any food that day—had walked more than a mile to attend the meeting, and left her children without food. The first fifteen pence she received for a day's work, she brought to me a few days before the contribution from this Parish was forwarded to you. The other person had her small subscription in readiness but a few days before the Missionary Meeting was held. She visited a neighbor who was very ill and was really suffering for the want of something required in her weak state. She spent that same sum for the benefit of her neighbor, but her name is found in the list of subscriptions forwarded. May we not hope that He who generously received the widow's mite, will accept these offerings? Ought not such sacrifices made by the poor induce the wealthy to give of their abundance largely for the cause of God?

Yours truly,

C. JESSON SHREVE.

(Copy.)

PICTOU, 19th Sept., 1868.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—We, the undersigned, the Church Wardens and Vestry of St. James's Church, Pictou, on behalf of the congregation, beg to express to you on the eve of your departure from us, the high esteem and respect that we entertain for you, and our regret that the connection which has existed between us as Minister and people is now about to be severed.

We trust that you may long be spared to work with the same activity and zeal that characterized your labors here, in your new but yet familiar sphere of labor—new, because of the altered relation in which you go to it; familiar, because of its being your native place.

Please convey to Mrs. Wood our united regards and best wishes for her future health and happiness.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD TANNER.

W. NORMAN RUDOLF,

J. H. LANE, *Vestry Clerk.*

} *Church Wardens.*

(Copy.)

ST. JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND, November 11th, 1868.

Dear Brethren and Friends,—I beg to thank you very sincerely for the kind address with which you have favored me, now, on this occasion of my departure from among you.

The kind expressions of regard for myself, and the very handsome manner in which you refer to my past work in your midst, are, believe me, very grateful to my feelings. I hope and pray that the Glorious Work will never flag or slacken amongst you, but that the Cause of Christ may be strengthened in your day.

For your good wishes with regard to my future work in life, permit me again to thank you; and my prayer will ever be in the future, as in the past, that you may grow and increase, spiritually; that you all may prosper abundantly, in all ways, temporally and spiritually.

Mrs. Wood desires me to convey to you the appreciation of your kind wishes on her behalf; and we both beg to say, that for many works of kindness shewn to us while in Pictou, we shall, we trust, ever cherish a warm and grateful remembrance.

Believe me to be, with all Christian affection and esteem,

Very faithfully yours,

ARTHUR C. F. WOOD.

To the Church Wardens and Vestry
(on behalf of the Congregation)
of St. James's Church, Pictou, N. S.

The Month.

ENGLAND.—The Bishop of London is Archbishop of Canterbury. The deanery of Lichfield has been conferred upon the Rev. Canon Champneys, vicar of St. Pancras; the canony of St. Paul's, thus vacant, upon the Rev. George Prothero, rector of Whippingham, the Queen's chaplain at Osborne; the canony of Westminster, vacant through the death of the Rev. Ernest Hawkins, is given to the Rev. Dr. Leighton, Warden of All Souls; and the Rev. William Bright has been appointed Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and to the canony of Christ Church annexed to that office, in succession to Dr. Mansel, now Dean of St. Paul's.

At the November meeting of the S. P. C. K., a grant of £20 stg. was made towards building a church at Port Medway, N. S.

In reply to an inquiry whether an Incumbent can introduce into his church any hymn-book he likes, the following letter, addressed by the Bishop of Oxford to Archdeacon Wordsworth, has been published:—

DEAR DR. WORDSWORTH,—I did not feel able to answer so important a question as yours without fortifying my opinion by that of my Chancellor (Sir Robert Phillimore). So fortified, I may say that he is of opinion (1) that a private clergyman has no right to adopt at his mere arbitrum a new set of hymns for use in a church, and (2) that it is within the power of the Bishop to authorize the use of a set of hymns either in his diocese or in any separate parish of it.

I am, &c.,

S. OXON.

The Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Jackson, has been translated to London, and Canon Woodworth takes his place as Bishop of Lincoln.

UNITED STATES.—A new diocese has been set off in the northern part of the State of New York, and an effort is now being vigorously made towards its endowment. Dr. Littlejohn, of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn,—an excellent man, a good preacher, and a sound churchman,—is elected as the first bishop of the new see.

Bishop Stevens, of Philadelphia, has had an arm and a leg fractured by a fall.

Dr. Dix, rector of Trinity Church, N. Y., moved by the spiritual necessities of the poor in that city, is stirring up the office-bearers of his wealthy

church-corporation to establish, in all destitute quarters, free chapels for Sunday and daily service. The corner-stone of one, St. Chrysostom's, has already been laid.

The Americans, though loaded with taxes, besides supporting their parish organizations and Home and Foreign Missions with a liberality infinitely beyond anything of the kind hitherto attempted by us, have lately contributed most handsomely towards the assistance of the sufferers by the late earthquake in Peru, and of the Swiss, who, in several Cantons, have been rendered destitute by late freshets.

At a large anniversary meeting of the Reformed Presbyterians in Philadelphia lately, the congregation stood during the singing.

DOMINION OF CANADA.—The election of a Metropolitan and a Bishop of Montreal came to a dead lock, and was, by the house of Bishops, adjourned until next May.

This scandal might have been prevented by a little of the spirit of conciliation, particularly on the part of the Synod of Montreal. A majority of that body, it would seem, had at a caucus meeting, before the election, set their hearts on the Bishop of Rupert's Land, who—whilst the body of the late Metropolitan lay in the Cathedral awaiting burial—had, with very questionable taste, delivered a sermon, under the same roof, in which he took care to inform the electing Diocese that his church opinions differed from those of their deceased prelate. No other person, whose name was sent down to the Synod by the House of Bishops, having thus pronounced the shibboleth of the majority on the lay side, stood the ghost of a chance. Bishops of moderate views and good administrative capacity were, by the laity of Montreal, declared to be "unknown," and the fitness of that little body to choose a Metropolitan for an important Province of the Church in these days of controversy between faith and infidelity, was shown by their decision that the Bishop of Grahamstown (whom their own Synod had formerly thanked for his noble defence of the Faith,) was "an unknown man."

Rev. Dr. Buleh, it is intimated, would have been elected by the Synod had he been nominated by the House of Bishops. But he is an American clergyman, only three years resident in the Dominion, is advanced in life, and has never been considered a man of superlative attainments. He might do for a Bishop of Montreal, but the idea of elevating him over the heads of all the Bishops and priests of Canada was out of the question.

The Bishops would seem to have precipitated matters with the excitable majority of the Lower House, by their first message, declaring their determination that no selection would be made by them but from the Episcopal Order (afterwards yielded by the nomination of Dean Goulburn.) This was aggravated by a second message, conveying the decision of the Bishops to separate, as soon as possible, the Metropolitanity from the See of Montreal. This mutual throwing down of gauntlets resulted in a drawn battle. Amid the exultation of the victorious laity, however, one cannot fail to detect a strain in the minor key—the prelude to a change of tune—so soon as their excitement passes away, and the full results of their "No surrender" manifest themselves. "No surrender" to my Lords Bishops may be accompanied by full surrender to party prejudice and blind passion—a tyranny infinitely more degrading and disastrous in the end.

The Canon for the election of a Metropolitan was the result of a compro-

mise. The Metropolitan must be a man of thorough education and great experience, fit to preside over the other bishops of his Province, and, if need be, to represent them and the Province in the Councils of the Church and Nation. Who, then, can blame the Bishops for desiring a Bishop to represent them and the Church in such exigencies, as well as to preside over the councils of his province with dignity and wisdom?

On the other hand, the See of Montreal is one of the poorest (in episcopal income) of all in the ecclesiastical Province, and—as shown by figures, by one of its own clergy, Dr. Balch—is bankrupt at that. The diocese, however, is now in the hands of a party who will have none but a party-man of their own stripe as their bishop.

The patched-up canon fails to combine two interests so utterly conflicting. Hence the present dead-lock. The two offices must be separated, and the proposal now made by the Bishops is that a Metropolitan shall in May next be elected, who shall engage himself to hold the See of Montreal only long enough to enable the House of Bishops and Diocesan Synod of Montreal to separate the Metropolitanacy from the Bishopric of that Diocese by a Canon, which, it seems, cannot be enacted under the present law, except under the Presidency of a man combining both offices in his own person. This Canon must and will be passed, and the Synod of Montreal, by its newly-declared policy of “no surrender,” will vacate a most influential position in the Councils of the Church.—a matter of no small moment in these stirring times.

Notes and Notices.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

WITH the present number we bring to a close another volume of the *Church Chronicle*, in the conduct of which we have conscientiously endeavored to promote the cause of Christ and his Church, and “to speak the truth in love.” Whatever have been our failings and disappointments, we have good reason to believe that all our efforts have not been in vain, and that they have yielded gratification to many who, knowing the difficulties with which we have had to contend, have looked with an indulgent eye upon our monthly pages.—We had earnestly hoped that before this we should have been enabled to meet the wants of the Church with a weekly periodical, but either we have lacked the power or our fellow-Churchmen the zeal to confirm this hope for the present, and we must be content with the original issue, and wait in patient expectation that the want of constant intelligence will be more generally felt, and its advantages better understood.

But, while we lament our inadequate success, we have determined by the help of God to continue our labors, and with the hearty desire of commending the *Church Chronicle* to the favor of our brethren, we have associated with us a staff of theological scholars, animated with the true spirit of Christian fellowship, and a kindly aim to promote the cause we have in hand. To sustain this cause, we again appeal to the honor and generosity of Churchmen, that we be not put to shame by the various “denominations” by which we are surrounded, and dissatisfied of our hope to serve the Church of God.

Hitherto the *Chronicle* has been published at so small a price that considerable loss has been sustained by its promoters, and as it is to be continued in the enlarged form, and postage is charged upon every number we are compelled to raise the subscription to seventy-five cents, which will be made to cover all expenses and to ensure the regular delivery free of all charges. This arrangement, we trust, may be satisfactory to the clergy and acceptable to the great body of our subscribers, to each and all of whom we send greeting.

A PARTING WORD.

Having now for two years, amid the multifarious cares of a poor and scattered parish, given our labours as Editor to the *Church Chronicle*, our pastoral duties compel us to say farewell to our readers, and leave this paper in the hands of the Synod Committee, from whom we received it. This we had for some time desired to do, but were hitherto prevented by circumstances over which we had no control.

Though no believer in the modern system of "mutual admiration," we cannot lay aside the Editorial pen without returning our sincere thanks for the many warm expressions of kindness, confidence, and encouragement which have from time to time reached us from far and near. From England and the United States,—from the neighbouring Maritime Dioceses, as well as from many esteemed members of the Church, both clerical and lay, in our own, we have under our hand testimony to show that we have read aright the signs of the times, and that a *weekly* paper in the spirit of the *Church Chronicle* is greatly needed, and will be supported.

Laying our two little volumes at the foot of the Church, and craving of our brethren leniency towards the offering, we wish our subscribers all the happiness and blessings of the approaching holy season, and bid them farewell.

JUST RECEIVED.—A pamphlet "On Recent Proceedings of Episcopal Synods, in relation to Religious Truth and Freedom." By JOHN G. MARSHALL.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"A Lover of Union" received too late for this No. Will be sent to new editor.

DIED.—At West Hoboken, New Jersey, U. S., on the 2nd November, the Rev. W. G. Jarvis, M. A., of King's College, Windsor, and son of the late Chief Justice Jarvis, of P. E. Island.

A gentleman, residing near the Rev. Mr. Jarvis' late parish, writes us thus:—"He died as he lived—a just man and an holy." I never saw a congregation so bowed down with grief." This grief will be shared by all who knew our dear brother, now departed in the Lord, especially by those who, like ourselves, knew him at College, and therefore intimately. An honest, manly straightforwardness, combined with a kindness and courtesy ever mindful of the claims of others, a deep and unobtrusive piety, an unflagging zeal in the work of our holy calling,—these were among the characteristics of our dear brother, whom to know was to love. Early called away from the trials of earth, he rests from his labors, and his works do follow him.

THE CHURCH CHRONICLE is printed at the office of Messrs. James Bowyer & Sons, 153 Hollis St., and issued on the second Wednesday of every month.

Financial Agent, the Rev. Canon Gilpin, D. D. Subscribers names and payments received by the Financial Agent, and also by WILLIAM GOSSIP, Esq, Bookseller and Stationer, 109 Grandville Street, and Miss Katzmann, Provincial Bookstore, Grandville St., Halifax.