

# The Watchman.

"I HAVE SET WATCHMEN UPON THY WALLS OF JERUSALEM THAT SHALL NEVER HOLD THEIR PEACE, DAY NOR NIGHT."

VOL. I.

TORONTO, CANADA WEST, MONDAY, JULY 22, 1850.

No. 27.

## Poetry.

From the *Kirk's Book.*

### FOUNTAIN IN THE DESERT.

He opened the rock, and the waters gushed out: they ran in the dry places like a river. [Psalms.]

He spoke, and from the barren rock  
A crystal fountain burst;  
Streams through the arid desert ran,  
To slake the traveller's thirst;  
Oh! joyous shouts were borne to heaven,  
For this new type of mercy given.

They drank—how wondrous host of God,  
And every languid eye  
Looked bright again, as fountains gush out,  
When snows have passed by;  
How grateful to the burning brow,  
Was that cool fountain's luxuriant flow!

Oh! deemed they not its worth beyond  
The costly dainties?  
Could ought of finest gold compare,  
Or pearl, or lustrous gem,  
With those pure bubbles, as they broke  
All gushing from the desert rock?

Love burned anew, and notes of praise  
Arose to Abraham's God,  
While yet again the pilgrims  
With cheerful feet they trod;  
Onward, a chosen, joyful band,  
They hasten'd to the promised land.

Behold! a better fount appears  
Mid life's dear wilderness,  
Whence streams of living water flow,  
The thirsty soul to bless;  
Forth from a rock it flows free,  
And boundless as eternity.

The fever'd spirit, sore oppressed  
With earthly wo and care;  
The weary and the guilty too,  
May find refreshment there:  
Hope springs and blossoms like the rose,  
Where this celestial fountain flows.

And oh! can aught exceed its worth,  
Bright gems, or purest gold?  
Seem not the choicest things on earth,  
Its stores of wealth untold,  
Less than the fading hues of exen,  
Compared with the best gift of Heaven?

Come nigh, ye pilgrims, faint and worn,  
For you a fount has burst;  
A Rock is open'd 'mid the waste!  
Come, freely quench your thirst:  
Then as on eagles' wings arise,  
And soar for your immortal prize!

## Miscellany.

### EJECTION OF THE CLERGY, ON SUNDAY, AUGUST 24, 1662.

St. Bartholomew's Day, which occurred upon Sunday, Aug. 24, 1662, is again rendered memorable by the Act of Uniformity coming into operation, and by which two thousand divines of the Established Church of England were ejected from their livings for refusing to take the oath it imposed. While as a narrative the details of its circumstances may be void of that interest which characterizes similar events, yet it must ever be ranked among the most important in the annals of ecclesiastical history, and especially as it is connected with our own country.—This event proved the demarcation between those who were the faithful servants of God and those who were not. It must be borne in mind that, while the term Nonconformist in the present day implies an entire separation from, non-interference of, the civil powers in matters of religion, yet, as implied in the ejected clergy, it must be understood in a more limited sense, at the times in which they lived, the contest was on the broad grounds of religious truth and error, rather than the particular principles by which Nonconformists are now distinguished, for though the Dissenters, as a body trace their origin to the days of Wycliff the year 1362, or as the famous era of uniformity, and laid the foundation of that more prominent and marked separation which was afterwards effected, and has continued ever since.

A glance at the character of Charles II. may serve to show the design and nature of this intolerant act. By this restoration the hopes of Rome were revived, and from that period grew more sanguine. During his exile he had been initiated into the mysteries of Popery, and had eagerly embraced it, and the zeal of this monarch for that religion was much greater than has been generally imagined, as, from the best evidence, it appears that it concurred with his

ministry a formal plan for subverting the constitution in favor of Popery, and its introduction as the religion was the principal object designed by Charles when he entered into the French alliance. This view of his character is also confirmed by the declaration of the Papists that the Irish massacre of two hundred thousand Protestants was sanctioned by his commission.

Owing to the attacks made by those in power on the civil and religious liberties of the people, a general cry for justice was heard throughout the land, which greatly alarmed the king and his favorites, who deemed it advisable, for their own safety, to reduce the religion of the country to a state of uniformity.

Accordingly, the principal affair that employed Parliament in the early part of the year 1662 was the famous "Act of Uniformity," &c., designed for the enclosure of the church, and as the only entrance to any ecclesiastical preferments. After sundry debates relative to it the rigorous Act passed the Commons by a majority of about six voices; the Lords made great objection to it, and several amendments; but the Commons would abate nothing, neither would they consent to proposal of provision for those ejected by it, for fear of establishing a schism and weakening the authority of the church in her power of imposing indifferent rites and ceremonies. At length the Lords laid aside their objections and concurred with the Commons; the bill passed, and on the 19th of May received the royal assent. It was to take place from the 24th of Aug. following; and when, in the meantime, those who could not subscribe without perjury presented to his majesty a petition for indulgence, they were threatened for making so bold an attempt. This Act gave to the ministers who could not conscientiously conform to those things required by it only three months ere they were excluded; and as it enjoined the use of those copies of the Prayer book which contained the said "alterations," it was next to impossible that the clergy, within the specified time, could obtain and examine them. Those who did not subscribe within the time limited were utterly disabled and *ipso facto* deprived of their benefices: not one divine in ten, living at any considerable distance from town, could peruse the book within the time and, therefore, many subscribed implicitly to that they had never seen. The terms of conformity were made higher than before the civil wars, and the Prayer book more exceptionable by the insertion of more apocryphal lessons new holy days enjoined, and a few new collects made by bishops, were added, but nothing altered, as proposed by the Presbyterians, the validity of whose ordination was renounced; by which the ministrations of foreign churches were disowned, and a new declaration was invented, to which none who understood the constitution of England could safely subscribe; the oath of this Act required that no endeavor should at any time or under any circumstances be made to alter the government of the church and state.

Previously to stating the many grounds for nonconformity which existed, it may be well to give an abstract of the Act, which will be best understood in its own words. It proceeds as follows:—"That all and singular ministers shall be bound to say and use all common prayers in such form as is mentioned in the uniform order of service enjoined to be used by Act of Parliament, to the intent that every person may know the rule to which he is to conform in public worship." "That every parson, vicar, or other minister whatsoever, shall before the feast of St. Bartholomew, in the year of our Lord 1662, open and publically, before the congregation assembled for religious worship, declare his unfeigned consent and assent to the use of all things contained and prescribed in the said book, in these words, and no other:—I, do hereby declare my unfeigned consent and assent and to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England, together with the Psalter, or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches, and the form or manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons:—The penalty for neglecting or refusing to make this declaration is deprivation of all his spiritual promotions." And it is further enacted, that every dean, canon, prebendary, all masters, heads, fellows, chaplains, tutors public professors, readers in either university, and in every college and elsewhere, all parsons, vicars, curates, lecturers, schoolmasters, and every person instructing in any private family, shall before the feast of St. Bartholomew, subscribe the following declaration:—I, do hereby declare that it is not lawful, upon any pretence

whatever to take up arms against the king, and that the oath, commonly called the solemn league and covenant, to endeavor any change or alteration of government either in church or state, was in itself an unlawful oath." This declaration was to be subscribed by the persons mentioned before the archbishop or bishop of the diocese, on pain of deprivation, for those who were possessed of livings and for others, he punishing for the first offence was three months imprisonment, and a fine of five pounds to his majesty, with three months imprisonment for every other offence. It was also further enjoined, that no person should be capable of any benefice, or to "consecrate" and administer the Lord's supper, before ordained by episcopal ordination, on pain of forfeiting one hundred pounds, that no other form of prayer should be used in any church, chapel, or public place of worship; that none should be received as lecturers, or be permitted to preach or read any sermon, unless approved and licensed by the bishop, and unless the first time he preached any lecture or sermon he should openly read the Common Prayer and declare his assent to it; that a true printed copy of the said book should be provided in every parish church or chapel, college, and hall at the cost of the parishioners or society, before the feast of St. Bartholomew, on pain of forfeiting three pounds a month so long as they shall be unprovided with it.

To be Continued.

### SCRIPTURE ILLUSTRATION.

"These are the beasts which ye shall eat."—Lev. xi. 2. As this very remarkable chapter forms the basis of the dietary system of the Jews, we shall here give such attention to it as may supersede the necessity for many dispersed notes hereafter. Besides some remarks which will occur in the details which this chapter embraces, we shall now make some observations on the design of the distinctions here established; and in the concluding note shall remark on the proper import of the words *clean* and *unclean*, as applied to animals declared as fit or unfit for food.—Michaelis has entered largely into these subjects, and he is the guide we shall principally follow, without, however, excluding our own observation, or information derived from other sources.

The principal design not only of these, but of many other of the laws of Moses, was, as far as possible, to oblige the Israelites to continue a distinct people in Palestine, without spreading into other countries, or having much intercourse with their inhabitants. This object explains many directions which otherwise it would be difficult to understand. And the ulterior intention of this, doubtless was, to prevent them from being infected by that idolatry into which all the neighboring nations were plunged as well as to preserve them from the degrading vices to which the Canaanites were eminently addicted, as we learn not only from the Scriptures, but from the authority of the Roman writers. Now in attaining this object, a distinction of meats must be felt to have been of the highest importance. "Intimate friendships," says Michaelis, "are in most cases formed at table; and with the man with whom I can neither eat nor drink, let our intercourse in business be what it may, I shall seldom become so familiar as with him whose guest I am, and he mine. If we have, besides, from education, an abhorrence of the food which others eat, this forms a new obstacle to closer intimacy." The truth of this observation must be obvious to every person acquainted with the East, where, on account of the natives regarding as unclean many articles of food and modes of preparation in which Europeans indulge, travellers or residents find it impossible to associate intimately with conscientious Mohammedans or Hindoos. Nothing more effectual could be devised to keep one people distinct from another. It causes the difference between them to be ever present to the mind, and, as it does upon so many points of social and every day contact, and it is therefore more efficient in its results as a rule of distinction than any difference in doctrine, worship, or morals, which men could entertain.—While the writer of this note was in Asia, he had almost daily occasion to be convinced of the incalculable efficacy of such distinctions in keeping men apart from strangers. A Mahomedan for instance, might be kind, liberal, indulgent, but the recurrence of a meal or any eating, threw him back upon his own distinctive practices and habits of indulgence in foods and drinks forbidden to him, and that his own purity was endangered by communication with you. Your own perception of this feeling in him is not to you less painful and discouraging in intercourse, than its existence is to him who entertains it. It is a mutual repulsion continually

operating, and its effect may be estimated from the fact, that no nation, in which a distinction of meats was rigidly enforced as part of a religious system, has ever changed its religion. Oriental legislators have been generally aware of the effect of such regulations; and hence through most parts of Asia we find a religious distinction of meats in very active operation, and so arranged as to prevent social intercourse with people of a different faith. In the chapter before us it is not difficult to discover that the Israelites, in attending to its injunctions, must be precluded from social intercourse with any of their neighbors. As to the Egyptians, they had themselves a system of national laws on this point, which restrained them from intercourse with strangers. They could not eat with the Israelites in the time of Jacob. Some of the animals which the Israelites were allowed to eat—the cow, for instance—were never slaughtered by the Egyptians, being sacred to some god; while, on the other hand, the Israelites were interdicted some animals which the Egyptians ate freely. Then as the Canaanites or Phoenicians, they seem to have eaten not only those meats prohibited by Moses, which we usually eat; but also others, of which the flesh of dogs was one.—*Pictorial Bible.*

### A LITTLE SERMON.

"Neither will I offer burnt-offerings unto the Lord my God, of that which cost me nothing." 2 SAM. xxiv. 24.

David, in the pride of his heart, had now numbered the people. The Most High was angry, and had just now sent a pestilence; and there died of Israel in a very short time seventy thousand men.

But David soon became penitent. As an evidence of his penitence, we find him going to Araunah the Jebusite, to buy his threshing-floor, where he might build an altar unto the Lord.

Araunah, knowing his pious object, offered to make him a present of the floor, and his oxen, and whatever else he might need for the service of God on that occasion. But the noble hearted king waived the benevolent offer of Araunah, saying, "Nay, but I will surely buy it of thee at a price; neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God of that which cost me nothing." Although David would receive the Grace of God, as a free, unmerited favor, without money and without price, as it really is, yet, in performing the duties of religion, he could not entertain the thought of serving the great, the glorious God, in so cheap a way.

### DOCTRINE.

So far as duties are concerned, true religion is not a cheap religion. For,

- 1 True religion costs one all *sinful pleasures.*
- 2 True religion costs one all *merely ambitious pursuits*—all pride, all self seeking.
- 3 True religion costs one the sacrifice of *himself.*

- 4 True religion costs one all he possesses,
- 5 True religion requires costly duties, such as the following:

Laborious study of the Bible.  
Serious thought and devout meditation.  
Much time in the performance of duty.  
And such a disposition of his money as the glory of God demands.

### REMARKS.

1. From the light of this subject, we see that that religion which costs a man nothing is, generally, good for nothing.

2. The person who is looking for a cheap religion exposes himself to the suspicion of being unlike the noble king David, who would not offer to the Lord a sacrifice that cost him nothing, and of being unlike the benevolent Araunah, who offered his floor as the place for an altar, and his oxen for the sacrifice. Those who are like these good men are never satisfied without a good and commodious place of worship. When winter is coming on, they prepare good fuel, and bring their fuel share in season. They see that some one is provided to build the fire in season on Sabbath mornings. They are for having their minister so well paid that he can afford to study his sermons. Henry says, a scandalous support makes a scandalous ministry.

3. From this subject, it is very much to the purpose to say, that that sermon which costs a minister nothing is, usually, good for nothing.

Those who leave their own meetings, or leave their own denomination, to save expence, make a mistake.

5. Good people will attend meeting on the sabbath, rain or shine. Those who attend only when it is convenient, offer sacrifices which cost them nothing.

Lastly. The reason why many Christians are so superficial in their religion, and do no good, is, that they do not give themselves time to acquire knowledge—knowledge of God, of duty, of a duty perishing world!