

Original Poetry.

CANADIAN MINSTRELSEY.—No. 1.

"Why stand ye idle here?"

When mental darkness erst obscured our much loved father-land,
The Pope of Rome was paramount. Beneath his iron hand
And soul-destroying rule, our sires were sunk in abject fear;
And long it was ere they dared ask "Why rest we fettered here?"

Of and again a ray of hope would break upon their sight:
Across the sea a voice was heard loud o'er the din of fight,
Waged in the "Isle of Saints" by those who bravely struggled
To keep the faith:—The cry they raised,—"Why stand ye idle here?"

Those gallant champions of the truth who saved the Bible then—
The Bible shall our standard be—the banner we will wave
And eye, until at length it reached stout Wickliffe's ear,
Who echoed back those stirring words,—"Why stand ye idle here?"

Why stand ye idle here, I say? Shake off your mental chains:
All for salvation needed is, the word of God contains.
No intercessor but the one—no low confession near—
No Monkish fables we will list,—"Why stand ye idle here?"

Tradition henceforth we disown: no idols we will have:
The Bible shall our standard be—the banner we will wave
See how the Irish Church still holds its pristine faith so dear!
Then up, my gallant Englishmen,—"Why stand ye idle here?"

These stirring words were dragon's teeth, and many an armed knight
Took up the sword—the spirit's sword—to gird him for the fight.
A Cranmer and a Ridley—a Latimer—were near,
And never more the base reproach,—"Why stand ye idle here?"

Our English sires rose in their might, determined to be free,
The freedom truth alone creates to win it gallantly.
They braved the faggot and the stake, alike devoid of fear,
And from the flames the shouts arose,—"Oh ne'er rest idle here!"

Nor idle did they longer rest. Their freedom it was won—
That freedom, precious legacy, from parent still to son
Is handed down, and eye has been to British hearts so dear,
And when assailed their war cry still,—"Why stand ye idle here?"

When Spanish Philip with his fleet vainglorious crossed the main,
With racks and fetters for our sires, they drove them back again
A maiden Queen led on the hosts. "A kingly heart beats here,
Aye, and of England too" she cried,—"We stand not idle here."

Three hundred years of freedom gone—the Dragon now has dared
His pestilential breath to breathe: his rampant head is reared;
Our soil polluted by his foot. A British Queen is there
To raise once more the stirring cry,—"Why stand ye idle here?"

"Why stand ye idle?" now she said—"up, up my lieges all
Of every clime—of every land. In Freedom's name I call,
Of England still I am the Queen; these fetters we'll not wear;
The God of battles we'll invoke,—"We stand not idle here."

The shouts of English hearts are now resounding in our ears;
Far o'er the ocean wide is borne their soul-exciting cheers,
Responsive to the Sovereign's call, when danger thus is near,
How is it then across the main,—"We stand not idle here?"

Do British hearts no longer beat within Canadian breasts?
Is chilled the blood?—or how is it amidst danger they can rest?
The father-land, is it forgot?—the village church so dear—
The Bible too?—it cannot be!—"Why rest ye idle here?"

Why will ye bow beneath the yoke, and meekly be the slave,
And wear the fetters cowards wear—they suit not to the brave.
The chains of mental slavery are clanking in your ear;
Are these for you, Canadian hearts?—Then rest ye idle here!

And hug the chain, and close the book rich with the words of life,
The word of God which freedom gives, and hide you from the strife:
The distaff take,—the petticoat—fit garment—you can wear,
Yet woman asks the question still,—"Why stand ye idle here?"

Hark to the wall of those who hold the ering faith of Rome,
On British soil they crave your aid to save for them a home
Where tyrant churchmen forge no chains,—no Romish canons
near
To gag the thoughts! they piteously ask—"Why stand ye idle here?"

If British hearts thus recreate prove beneath Canadian skies,
The Red child loves his freedom still. See from the bush he
hies!
To take his stand in danger's front. Hark to his stirring cheer,
"His British, half! I hear it now,—"We stand not idle here."

With tomahawk no more he comes—no scalping knife in hand—
No war paint now, no war song raised—behold the redmen's band.
Their weapons now—the word of God; and as our homes they
near,
On high they raise that glorious hymn—"Why stand ye idle here?"

The man of colour, too, he comes, his Bible to defend:
For freedom's home, in freedom's cause, to make a gallant stand.
Onward he rushes to the front; and as he passes near
The British slave, says, tauntingly, "Aye, sleep you idly there."

NO SLAVE IS HE! A LION'S WHELM—he slumbers for a day,
The dragon's foot but touches him—he drives his sleep away;
With tail erect, and mane distent, his roar now rends the air,
As rushing to the front, he shouts,—"We stand not idle here!"

E. T. D.

SUNDAY EVENINGS AT HOME.

From a Correspondent.

REV. SIR,—Permit me, through you, to call the attention of the Book and Tract Committee of the Church Society, to a work of great usefulness and piety, which I find has not yet found a place in that inestimable depot of Christian knowledge. I allude to "The Churchman's Sunday Evenings at Home," by the Reverend Alexander Watson, M.A. Though the varied avocations and hurried periods of a very busy life have left me, for some years, but few opportunities of perusing or examining the several valuable publications which assist the Christian in his endeavours to comprehend the Scriptures, and to understand the foundation, scope and meaning of the important offices and beautiful Liturgy of the Church of England,—yet I have been enabled occasionally to see some of them, and to perceive their effects upon the mind. Among those I have met with, none which seem so calculated to fulfil the intention I have alluded to, viz., of explaining the scope and bearing of our several Services, whether for the peculiar seasons, or the individual days which our Church recommends or directs to be kept holy to the LORD, than this little work.

The matter is most judiciously selected—the tone is that of the most earnest piety—the style is forcible, clear and elegant, without pretension or verbosity; and the illustrations and proofs are eminently scriptural.

I trust I shall be excused in warmly recommending it as a work eminently suited for what it professes to be—Sunday Evening Readings at Home—and equally pleasing to the elder and younger members of the Christian circle round the Sunday Evening's table. I forward an extract from "Ash

Wednesday" in illustration of my remarks—

And remain Rev. Sir,
Your very humble servant.

* * * *

Let us, with this view, see wherein Self-Denial, the great duty of Lent, consists.

Self-denial may be evidenced in two ways: by the mortification of the flesh, for the purpose of conquering our unruly wills and passions; and by depriving ourselves of something which we should really miss, for the good of those who are of the household of faith. If both, or either of these duties, be disregarded, we tempt the LORD our God: if we never curb our wills, never deny our appetites, how can we hope to be proof against the inroads of lust and intemperance? The devil will tempt us all; and, if we never mortify the flesh, we shall be so wilful and headstrong, that we shall cast ourselves down from the eminence of virtue, wherein baptismal grace has placed us, and, vainly trusting that God will bestow an aid and mercy for which He never made a promise, we shall tempt the LORD our God, and fail of reward! Let us learn from Christ's fasting, how we may beat hope to arm ourselves against the adversary, so that the flesh may be obedient unto the soul, the soul unto grace, and that so we may say, as David, "I come forth in the name of my God." Christ fasted forty days, and was armed against the Tempter! St. Basil asserts fasting to be necessary for our spiritual combat. Who overcame the host of the Assyrians? Fasting Judith. Who mitigated the wrath ready to come on a great city? Fasting Ninevites. Who prevailed for the preservation of the people? Fasting Moses. Who stayed the intended destruction of many innocents? Fasting Esther. Adam fell by eating; Christ prevailed by fasting. Doubt not, therefore, but that he who refuses to deny his appetites, tempts God; for, if we nourish the flesh, we nourish the vices of the flesh; if we pamper the body, we sharpen the very weapons of the enemy to hurt us! "They who are Christ's, have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts thereof," saith the Apostle; and, therefore, they who do it not, are not, to any practical purpose, Christ's. Moses, who was fasting saw God above in the mount; the people, that were eating and drinking, committed idolatry beneath in the valley!

Nor doubt the Church's wisdom in appointing a season of forty days—"A wisdom which has been her's," saith St. Jerome, "since the time of the Apostles. Forty days," saith the same author, "is often, in Scripture, applied to a time of penitence and affliction for our sins." Forty days continued the waters of the flood; forty days wandered the people in the wilderness; forty days had the Ninevites to repent them of their sins; forty days slept Ezekiel on his right side, sorrowing for the tribe of Judah; forty days fasted Elias, when he fled before Jezebel; forty days fasted Moses, when he received the law upon the mount. Moses for the law, Elias for the prophets, Christ for the gospel, who appeared together at the transfiguration, three sufficient witnesses to authorize fasting, and the number of forty days' fasting!

He that will not deny himself in a season of prosperity, is a mere tempter of the Most High, if he hopes to be sustained in a day of adversity. Let us be careful that we receive not the grace of God in vain. Let us devote this holy season to fasting and mortification, that so we be not led by fulness to deny the Lord that bought us. Let us cut off enjoyment, and curtail our amusements. Let us not increase the number of the festive board. Let us not swell the giddy throng, while the Church's head is crowned with ashes. Let us forbear from even the most innocent amusements, rather than forget our allegiance to the Scripture and the Church. Christ's service and the world's, are things diametrically opposed the one to the other. If we refuse to fast, we add weapons to the world's armoury; whereas, if we pursue a course of holy discipline, we enlist angels as our champions, and are true and leal to Christ, our Great Captain of Salvation.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

(From the English Churchman.)

ELEMENTS OF NATURAL THEOLOGY.—By James Beaven, D.D. (London, Rivingtons, pp. 240.) Dr. Beaven has, within a small compass, provided a very useful and well-digested manual for the use of students in this interesting department of knowledge. Without pretending to originality, he has carefully cultivated the opinions of both ancient and modern writers, which in any way bear upon the subject; and, by a judicious arrangement of the several parts, has succeeded in bringing before him, in systematic order, the leading principles of the science. Commencing with a somewhat elaborate review of the notions held by heathen philosophers on the Being and attributes of God, he proceeds to consider the additional light which the investigations of modern writers, particularly Paley, Crabbe, and the authors of the "Bridgewater Treatise," into the course and constitution of nature, have thrown upon these momentous subjects, and gives such citations from the works as are necessary to illustrate the principles he wishes to establish. Dr. Beaven has also been more than

ordinarily successful in his anticipation of infidel objections, and in the refutation he has given of their antagonistic theories. Desiring, moreover, to render the treatment of his subject "complete for its own proper ends," and to "pave the way for the better consideration of the evidences of revealed religion," he enters into the important subjects of a future state—the immortality of the soul—future rewards and punishments—a particular providence, &c. By thus enlarging the field of his inquiry, and extending his views to the consideration of the moral government of God, he supplies an acknowledged deficiency in the works of those writers on Natural Theology whose labours have been exclusively directed to a strictly scientific examination of the laws which regulate the conduct of the universe, and produce order and harmony in the minutest details of creation. And, when we reflect that the present rationalistic spirit, now so prevalent, if it did not in part originate from, at least is greatly encouraged by, the merely intellectual aspect which the writers alluded to were accustomed to regard the wonderful works of nature,—it becomes a matter of some moment clearly to indicate the field in which alone the intellect can exercise its legitimate functions, and to point out the dangers which result from its endeavours to penetrate the veil, behind which Almighty God has enshrined His holiest truths,—those deep mysteries which mark the boundaries of human reason, in no degree elaborated by human skill, and only recognized by that higher principle which discerns in the immediate revelation of God "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

We could have wished the author had enlarged more on this point, and we think we see a fitting opportunity for his doing so in the chapter—"On the means we possess of ascertaining the will of God"—should a second edition of this useful little volume be called for, which we think is likely to be the case.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S BILL.

(From the English Churchman.)

After a three months' agitation, consequent upon the "Verbosa et grandis epistola" of the Premier, the result produced, in the shape of the Bill submitted to Parliament on Friday last, is very small indeed and, we anticipate, not at all satisfactory to the platform orators, whether in town or country, or, rather, to those who urged them on; for, after all we really believe that the large majority of noble lords and squires of low degree, who figured at the various meetings, in truth cared very little for the matter, but were chiefly impelled by a natural wish not to be out of fashion.

For ourselves, we confess the Bill brought in by Government seems in itself very suitable for the occasion. The offence committed was the assumption of local and territorial titles and jurisdiction by Roman Catholic Ecclesiastics, when Bishops of the English Church were in lawful occupation. The Bill declares such assumption illegal, and affixes certain penalties and disabilities to it. By the law, as it stood before, Roman Catholic Prelates were not allowed to assume the title of any See of the English Church. The present Bill extends the enactment to all other places in the three kingdoms. We see several obviously good reasons for this extension of the law. First, because if, as it is to be hoped, our own Episcopate shall one day be largely increased, it would probably be desirable to take for the new Sees the names appropriated by the Roman Catholics—as, for instance, Southwark or Westminster; secondly, because the assumption of the title of a place within the jurisdiction of another Bishop seems to us as much an invasion of the law of the Church, as to adopt the title of the See already occupied by another Bishop. Westminster, being within the Diocese of London, it is as much at variance with the law of the Universal Church for an intrusive Bishop to take the title of Westminster as of London. In this point of view, the Bill of the Government, viewed in its enactments, is a very useful recognition and enforcement of the rights and privileges of the true Catholic Church of England.

But, though we are not disposed to quarrel with the Bill itself, we are constrained to say that we see very slight traces, if any, of sound Church principles in the speech of the Ministerial mover of it. The Church owes Lord John Russell very small thanks indeed. His Lordship is a politician, and nothing more—and, therefore, as we conceive, a very bad politician; his sole object is to vindicate the power of the State over the Church; he has no notion whatever of availing himself of the Church's power for those great objects which that only can effect. He sees the power of the Church, and, like a worldly politician, as he is, is jealous of it, instead of working with it. His object is not to aid what he calls his own Church, and the Church of his Sovereign, against the illegal aggression of the Church of Rome, but to "put down" both together. In his whole speech he seems to have constantly had in his eye the power claimed by the Church of England—her claim of Synodical action—her jealous desire to retain the education of her own children. It is true he does not make any open attack on the Church, or threaten any positive aggression. Perhaps he thinks that he

has enough on his hands for the present; but the principles which he advocates throughout, if admitted, will be equally available for the subjugation of the English Church as the Romish.

"The real object of apprehension with the noble lord (as one of the speakers told him) was that Protestant Church which he saw around him." [Indeed, Lord John Russell confessed as much in his famous letter.] "The noble lord had taken the part of turning Church-dissenter himself, setting up the banner of Royalty against the banner of the Church—appointing other Church-dissenters to all the vacant Bishoprics—snubbing the Bishops who did not agree with him—swamping the Ecclesiastical Courts—blockading the Church—and storming the Universities. The fact was, that the Papal aggression had been a regular God-send to the noble lord. Cardinal Wiseman is a whipping-boy on whom to flog the Anglican truants; and the cry of invasion from without, a cover from behind which to quell treason with us."

For an unfriendly orator, all this is very good; and we trust the real state of the case is tolerably well understood by this time on both sides of the house. It is with this feeling that Lord John Russell vehemently attacks the Synod of Thurles. And why? Not because it was a Synod of intrusive Bishops, but because it interfered with the Government system of education, which Lord John holds to be a secular affair. The Roman Catholic Prelates rightly believe education to be a question of "faith and morals." "All that they asked for (says Mr. John O'Connell) was a guarantee of the orthodoxy of the teachers in those Colleges, so that no infidel doctrines would be taught to the Catholic youth under their care." They see that if education became secularized, the Church must needs take damage, and therefore they denounce the system. At this Lord John is highly indignant; and, if in his indignation he carries public opinion with him, it is obvious that he will have prepared it equally to resist the attempts of the English Church to retain the education of the English people.

He dwells on the analogous proceedings of the Church in Belgium; his mind is evidently set on the suppression of Church education. Instead of availing himself of those services which the Church of England would gladly render to educate the people as Christians and good citizens, the Premier is determined, if he can, to wrest education out of Church hands, and substitute that secular system which has demoralized the Continent.

He is evidently under a sort of monomania as to the ambitious views of Ecclesiastics. Men are wont (as he himself reminded Mr. Roebuck) to attribute to others the feelings which they entertain themselves. Aiming himself at encroachment on the Church, he persuades himself that the Church is similarly disposed towards him. "I conceive (he says) it is of the nature of all Ecclesiastical bodies to attempt to trench on secular matters. (Cheers.) I have myself resented with regard to Protestants in this country, and with regard to the Church of England, measures and proposals which I thought tended to give undue power to Ecclesiastics over the temporal affairs of the State."

What can his Lordship allude to? Our poor depressed Church aspiring to undue power over the temporal affairs of the State! when she is almost in a death struggle to escape being absorbed by the State—when the State appoints whom it will to be her Bishops—calls on her to elect, and dictates whom she is to elect—confirms them in their office, without listening to the objections which it invites—meddles with her very doctrine and forces heretics into her parishes! And yet Lord John Russell says that the Church aims at exercising undue power in the State. The old story of the wolf and the lamb! It never occurs to him that politicians also may be greedy of power, and apt to wrest it from those to whom it lawfully belongs.

"I am (he says) for the fullest enjoyment of religious liberty; but I am entirely opposed to any interference of Ecclesiastics with the temporal supremacy of the realm. Whenever I have seen in other bodies—whenever I have seen in my own Church—a disposition to assume powers which I thought were inconsistent with the temporal supremacy which belonged to the State, I have not been slow in urging myself, and inducing others to urge, strong and prevailing objection to any such measure. I may perhaps say that, in the course of the very last year, when the proposal was made, which was plausible in itself, to give to the Bishops of the English Church a power which I thought would give them a control over the existence, and well-being, and property of the clergy of the Church—that proposal, because I saw in it a dangerous principle, was resisted, and successfully resisted, by my colleagues in the place where it was proposed." This, of course, refers to the bill brought in by concurrent consent of all the Bishops, to give to the Episcopal body the decision of purely spiritual questions; and this Lord John Russell calls an interference with the temporal supremacy of the realm, and intimates his determination to resist such a measure in future.

Well! be it so; it is his day just now. He has committed himself to the struggle with the Church