

subscriptions	
Rev. Arthur Mortimer, annual sub.	5 00
J. W. Brent, Esq.	5 00
John Carter, Esq., life membership	50 00

TRACTS FOR PRIESTS AND PEOPLE.

We have received two nicely printed volumes, in all respects very creditably got up, being reports of "Essays and Reviews," and of "Tracts for Priests and People," published by Messrs. Walker, Wise, & Co., Boston.

The objects and tendency of the former volume are so well known, and have been so fully discussed, that any observation on it is superfluous; but we are anxious to caution our readers that the "Tracts for Priests and People" cannot be regarded as an antidote for the poison of the former book. We do not doubt that the writers have honestly done their best to meet what they consider to be the perilous teachings of the "Essays and Reviews." But it appears to us that they have sought to disarm the enemy rather by surrender than by successful attack. Religio Laici, by the amiable author of "Tom Brown's School days," may be, in its writer's apprehension, a satisfactory statement of his reasons for believing in the Christian faith, but we can scarcely conceive of any intollient sceptic who will not immediately and conclusively reply that his moral tastes and perceptions differ from those of Mr. Hughes, and that, until he has some objective reason presented to him for receiving Christianity as a divine revelation, he must demur to accepting it on Mr. Hughes' personal recommendation.

Two papers are written by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, which discover his accustomed faults and excellencies. The St. Simonians, some years ago, proposed to distribute mankind, from their early years, into three great classes—of actors, thinkers, and feelers. In the hands of this sect, Mr. Maurice would assuredly have been assigned to the third class—by no possibility to the second; it is not his forte to think accurately, far less to be qualified to teach others to do so, and, in the perilous task which he assumes of defending that which is "our life," his admirable moral qualities make his defects as a reasoner only the more dangerous. On two essays we must dwell with especial regret.—The third, by the Rev. Francis Garden, on the Atonement. It is a very slight, superficial, notice of a most momentous subject. There is no doubt a danger in theorizing too much in detail on so mysterious a truth, but there is a worse danger in resting in some view of it, which falls far short of what Holy Scripture reveals. Mr. Garden calls our Lord's work a sacrifice, but he seems to see in it nothing reconciling and propitiatory, beyond the pure and perfect service of One who was a perfect and sinless man. Where in this view, we must ask, is the mysterious connexion between our Lord's perfect obedience unto death, and the redemption of our race thereby? Why does God's absolute approval of the man Christ Jesus avail for the salvation of the world? How did Christ by dying, rising, and reviving, "become Lord both of the dead and of the living?" There is a great truth here deeper than any which Mr. Garden enunciates, and we cannot but remember that the rejection of that truth is described by the Apostle as "denying the Lord that bought them." We use these words, not for the purpose of advancing any accusation, but to express an awful conviction on the danger of uttering, or of listening to, hasty words respecting the great work of "the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world."

We can but beg our readers to consult, instead of Mr. Garden's essay, the grave cautious, and

reverent author to whom he refers, Bishop Butler, in the second part of his "Analogy of Religion," more especially the chapter on the Appointment of a Mediator, and the Redemption of the World by Him."

Mr. Llewelyn Davie's essay is deeply to be regretted. To silence modern objectors against miracles, he deposes them from their proper place—they constitute, he says, no attestation of the truth of the Christian revelation, they are simply signs of the kingdom of heaven, "signs and wonders," suitable to the character of the Messiah. He says, "their language (that of the Scriptures) concerning the signs and wonders of the gospel is such, that, if any one should think it worth while to maintain the hypothesis that, in some future age, through the advancing knowledge and power bestowed by the Creator upon the human race, men will be enabled without supernatural agency, to do the very works which Christ did, no sentence could be quoted from Scripture to condemn it." Again, he says, "mighty works were a fitting part of His ministration, and might do much good by opening and instructing the minds of men. But such signs and wonders deserve no great honour in themselves. They might be exhibited in attestation of falsehood, and then true men should scorn them. The child of God can hear God's voice, whether it comes with mighty works, or without them." How is the child of God to know that it is God's voice? The voice must be submitted to his own individual judgment, and be pronounced by that august tribunal to be divine, or earthly, or perhaps devilish. God may speak, but till man approves, His word is not, to man, divine. We must turn from these vain imaginations to the old truth, which shall never be worn out till the mystery of God shall be finished, the truth which tells us of a great salvation which first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him, God also bearing them witness both by signs and wonders, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to His will." We do not disparage internal or subjective evidence—in its due place it is most valuable and comfortable—but before we can know its value, or enjoy its comfort, we must surrender ourselves to a conviction based on external evidence, we must believe on solid grounds, that God has spoken, and in this faith we must proceed, by the illumination of His spirit, to examine and apprehend His communication, as we could never have done without the primary and independent assurance that it is the Word of God.

Mr. Davie calls upon the philosopher "at least to excuse the superhuman power put forth by Jesus Christ," in a country and in an age wherein "the most cultivated of mankind were victims of sorcery, magic, and enchantments." The motive suggested for the excuse constitutes, in our opinion, the very reason why it should not be granted, the very reason why our Lord, as well as John the Baptist, should have wrought no miracle. But was our Lord, by virtue of His miracles, referred to a class of wonder-seekers? Were miracles only a compliment, requisite to make up the character of a prophet, in the eyes of a people blinded by superstition or fanaticism? What do we read? St. Matt. ix. 8., "They marvelled and glorified God which had given such power unto men;" xii. 23., "And all the people were amazed and said, 'Is not this the Son of David?'" xiv. 33., "They that were in the ship came and worshipped Him, saying, of a truth thou art the Son of God." Should not our Lord have replied, according to Mr. Davie's theory, "Your admiration is misplaced, your confession is unfounded, I am indeed the Son of God, but what you have witnessed, is no proof whatever that I

am so." We will take two more passages only: St. Luke, ix. 48., where we read that after the cure of the demoniac, "They were all amazed at the mighty power (or majesty) of God." St. John, ix., 32, 33, where the man who had been blind said, "Since the world began, was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that had been born blind; if this man were not of God, he could do nothing." The mass of those who witnessed the Lord's miracles, certainly those who were the subjects of them felt that "this was the finger of God," as keenly as ever the Egyptian magicians did.

But suppose that we thus "apologise" for our blessed Lord's active miracles, those which He wrought on others, what shall we say of those of which He was, in His human nature, the subject? What shall we say of the Transfiguration, and above all, of the Resurrection? Are these exempt from that "aversion" which Mr. Davie tells us "the student of science" entertains towards "prodigies," an aversion in which he counsels us "to go heartily with the student?" St. Peter describes transfiguration as a revelation of that "majesty" which St. Luke asserts to have been displayed by the cure of the demoniac. St. Peter delights to dwell on the remembrance of what he saw and heard "in the holy mount, as an attestation, both to himself and to others, that he had not followed cunningly devised fables," in preaching the gospel of Christ.

Of the resurrection, St. Paul tells us that Christ was thereby "declared the Son of God with power," and it is obvious that with that one crowning act, the sum and substance of Christianity is bound up; our hopes, our fears, our duties, our practice, our belief, all alike fast bound to a miracle; to a work which was, both in its essence and in its circumstances, the result of the "working of the mighty power" of God. Could the "child of God" have heard God's voice, as it speaks to us in the gospel; "Whether it had come with this mighty work or without it?"

There is something most deplorable in the spectacle of men, whose avowed purpose is to defend the truth, and to obviate the objections of opponents, thus abandoning, in order to conciliate adversaries, the very bulwarks of our faith.

As we referred our readers to Butler, from Mr. Garden's essay, so would we here refer them from Mr. Davie's to an admirable essay, to which he himself refers, prefixed to Dean Richie's book on miracles.

It is impossible, within our limits, to examine either Mr. Garden's or Mr. Davie's papers with the care which they demand; and the other papers we must pass over, only remarking that a "Lay Dialogue on the Laws of Nature," by J. M. Ludlow, appears to us especially objectionable, both in substance and in expression.

THOROLD PARISH, PRESENTATION TO
REV. DR. FULLER.

An interesting scene was witnessed in St. John's Church, Thorold, on Wednesday, the 23rd of April. The Rev. Dr. Fuller having been presented to the incumbency of St. George's Church, Toronto, last October, with the understanding that he should not sever his connexion with his old parishioners till the spring, they assembled on that day in the beautiful church of Thorold, for the purpose of presenting to him and Mrs. Fuller a piece of plate, "as a mark of their appreciation of the unwearied and disinterested ministerial labours of the former, and as a token of their affectionate regard for the latter."

The plate consists of a beautiful and most exact model in silver of St. John's Church, Thorold: It weighs fifty-four ounces, and was