

The Berran.

THEY RECEIVED THE WORD WITH ALL READINESS OF MIND, AND SEARCHED THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, WHETHER THOSE THINGS WERE SO.—Acts xvii. 11.

VOLUME II.—No. 35.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1845.

[WHOLE NUMBER 87.]

THE PAINTER'S ART FAILING.

• • • Thou seek'st to give again
That which the burning soul, inhabiting
Its clay-built tenement, alone can give—
To leave on cold dead, matter the impress
Of living mind—to bid a line, a shade,
Speak forth, not word, but the soft intercourse
Which the immortal spirit, while on earth
It tabernacles, breathes from every pore—
Thoughts not converted into words, and hopes,
And fears, and hidden joys and griefs, unburnt
Into the world of sound, but beaming forth
In that expression which no words, or work
Of cunning artist, can express. In vain,
Alas! in vain!

The Rev. R. M. McCheyne, after attempting a portrait of his deceased brother, from memory.

A TRACTARIAN'S TESTIMONY TO THE PROTESTANT CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, FROM DECLARATIONS OF HER CHURCH-DIGNITARIES, AND THE DECISION OF HER HIGHEST CHURCH COURT.

As it may interest some to hear on what grounds a clergyman of, so called, "Tractarian" opinions has come to the resolution of declining, for the future, ministerial engagements in the Church of England, their attention is requested to the following statement:

In common with others I have hitherto subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, and taken the usual oaths in the confidence that the interpretation which I put on them was a sense they admitted. So much seemed justifiable from the silence of authority, and the absence of any legal or formal decision against it. Popular notions, it is true, were opposed to this view; but as a matter of very plain and simple duty, I should never have thought of allowing any unauthorized opinions to do so cruel an injury with me to the Church in which I was baptized and brought up, as to make me believe that she required of her ministers to renounce what appeared to me clear Catholic truth.

A very learned and pious clergyman had published a document, No. 90 of the "Tracts for the Times," to prove argumentatively that the former decrees of the Church of Rome, which all admit to be Catholic, do not necessarily come in collision with the Articles of the Church of England; and another had professed to show historically that the said articles were meant to include Roman Catholics in the English communion. However the publications of these two divines might be censured and disapproved by individuals, so long as their views were not authoritatively condemned by the Church of England, I felt that I had a right to retain my opinions without resigning that position into which it had pleased God to call me. Whatever may be thought of such a view hereafter, when men are able to look at it calmly and free from prejudice or bias, I believe the Church of England, however fettered and externally different, to be inwardly and essentially the same as the ancient Churches of Alexandria, Jerusalem, or Antioch—when they were Catholic of course—and though not in external communion with the great body of the Western Church, not to be necessarily in worse case on that account, than was the Church of Antioch under the governance of St. Meletius (fourth cent.) who, as is generally known, lived some years, and at length died, out of communion with the Church of Rome, notwithstanding which he had been canonized. Of course, therefore, I would not believe, without overpowering evidence, that the Church of England imposed anything in her Articles or elsewhere, which was contrary to the faith of the "Church throughout the world;" and consequently I was resolved not to give up a position, which it was, to my mind, so clear a duty to maintain, unless it could be shown, first, either that it was a violation of the standing laws of the Church of England, or, second, the Church of England should in some way unequivocally declare against it.

As regards the first alternative, I shall have more to say hereafter. At present it will be enough to observe that I did not, prior to legal decision, think it could be a violation of the strict letter of the laws, amongst other reasons, because so many of her divines ever since the sixteenth century, had more or less upheld and taught the same doctrines. I do not mean that any one had held all equally, and to the same extent, with myself; but some one, and some another, which must be remembered in connection with, and as a corroboration of, the position maintained by Mr. Oakeley, in his pamphlet, viz., that the Articles were intended to include Roman Catholics when they were first promulgated.

As regards the second—If it were said, as it was, that the doctrine of the Church of England had been gradually changing—i. e. growing more Protestant, this no one could be bound to believe, unless the Church herself made it unmistakably evident. There are two ways, I thought, in which she might do this. Either by a formal decree of Convocation, ratified by the Legislature; or if, from the long disuse of Convocation, such a course were found impracticable, in due time there must be sufficient proof of what her present mind was, without supposing it to be had the formality of a decree. This virtual judgment of the Church of England, about which I can no longer feel any real doubt, is a reason for withdrawing from the ministry. For surely in an organized body of men where great freedom of speech is allowed, presided over by bishops and other dignitaries, who periodically address the clergy in their respective dioceses and archdeaconries, on all the most prominent religious questions of the day (to say nothing of the ecclesiastical courts, which I reserve for a separate place,) long time could not elapse after so grave a

question was once fairly brought forward, without supplying sufficient evidence to settle it. For Convocation, if it were called, could be composed of certain existing bodies, such as the bishops, the dignitaries, and the proctors, who are chosen by the incumbents of each diocese to represent the rest of the clergy. Of the vote of the bishops, as a body, there can be no room for hesitation, a majority of them having in their charges condemn the Catholic principle of interpretation in No. 90. We may judge of the opinions of the other dignitaries by the charges of the archdeacons, and, again, by the proceedings of the Board of Heads of Houses at Oxford. As to the main body of the clergy, I do not see how any doubt can be seriously entertained, if we consider the tenor of recent votes at Oxford, the university in which, of the two, it was believed there were most grounds for hope, where a great part of the voters were clergymen; and where, more especially, on a recent proposal to bring forward No. 90, and its principle of interpretation for condemnation, the proceeding was deprecated and advocated by nearly equal numbers, all on the one side disapproving the principle of that Tract; on the other, a large number being avowedly moved by considerations of personal respect for the author, and a desire to prevent disturbance or commotion in the university. What doubts, then, can I have any longer of the virtual decision of the Church of England? On this ground alone I conceive it would be wrong, and indeed, practically impossible for me, with my opinions, to continue an acting minister of the Church of England.

But the other alternative, which I now come to, sets this in a stronger, and yet more indisputable light. The highest amount of probability is not quite the same as certainty, and though I can no more doubt of what would be the decision of Convocation, if it could speak on this point, than I could if it were proposed to abolish episcopal ordination or the liturgy, yet there remains the other alternative, to consider what the actual law is; for if this were clearly with me, some might still think my position justifiable, and that I ought to retain it, however much spoken against. But I am saved from every shadow of doubt by the late decisions of the Court of Arches, the natural and lawful exponent of the standing laws, possessed of the power to enforce obedience to them. Here not only has Mr. Oakeley been condemned in language very significant of the general line of interpretation which the Court would supply to our forerunners, but in the same case, the whole doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice, and the use and name of an altar, has been declared contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England.

First, the use of stone altars, on the ground of their being altars, was declared contrary to the discipline of the Church of England, and the doctrine of the mass contrary to her doctrine. Let us contrast the language of No. 90 with that of the Dean of Arches. At the end of his remarks on the Thirty-first Article (masses) Mr. Newman says, "On the whole, then, it is conceived that the Article before us neither speaks against the mass in itself, nor against its being an offering for the quick and the dead for the remission of sin." The Dean of Arches, in his judgment says—"There is no doubt that at the time of the Reformation the altars in the English churches were of stone, fixed and immovable. At the time of the separation of the Church of England from that of Rome, amongst the many points of difference between them, one of the most important was that respecting the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Supper of the Lord, which, as is declared by the 28th Article of our Church, cannot be proved by holy writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture." In the reign of Henry VIII. the feeling against this doctrine was not so decided as it afterwards became; nor did any material change take place in the early part of the reign of Edward VI., for we find in his first Prayer Book, 1549, that the mass was still to be celebrated in the order for the Supper of the Lord, "commonly called the mass;" and the word "altar" was used in different parts of the service as set forth in that book. But in his second Prayer Book, 1552, the terms "mass" and "altar" were altogether omitted. The order was for "the administration of the Lord's Supper or holy communion;" the table was to stand in the body of the Church, or in the chancel where morning and evening service were appointed to be read; and the priest, instead of standing in the midst of the altar, was to stand at the north side of the table; and so on through the service. He then goes on to speak of the order for "plucking down and removing of altars, and the substitution of honest tables in their place," which, says he, was for the avowed purpose of moving and turning the simple from the old superstition of the Popish mass. The change intended, therefore, must have been something more than nominal; it must have been substantial. If a change of name only had been intended, there could have been no necessity for removing the altars, since they could have served the office of tables. Subsequently he quotes from Archbishop Grindal's injunctions in 1571: "All altars to be pulled down to the ground, and the altar stones defaced, and bestowed to some common use; the prayers and other service appointed for the administration of the holy communion to be said and done at the communion-table." On which the judge observes, "Nothing can more clearly demonstrate the determined manner in which the measures for the utter subversion of the superstitions connected with the Popish mass were carried on than these orders and injunctions, the great object being the annihilation of the fixed immovable

stone-altars, and the substitution of wood movable tables in their places." This seems to me to go as far as any one could have desired: it even settles the question of the term "altar," so much and so long disputed between High and Low Churchmen in the English Church; and it rules that whether the thirty-first Article speaks against "the doctrine of the mass," as is commonly believed, or not, at least the doctrine of the Church of England, as interpreted by the Court of Arches, is energetically opposed to it.

Secondly: the case of Mr. Oakeley, who claimed to "hold without teaching any Roman Catholic doctrine," has come before the same Court; and, as one might feel pretty confident of before-hand from the former case, his claim was condemned. It is true he made no defence; but will any clergyman now, who holds similar views, undertake to stand his trial in hopes that he may be able to make a successful defence, or gain anything by an appeal to her Majesty, the Queen, in Privy Council? If, then, this be too chimerical a notion to be entertained, we must consider the question as finally settled. And to be sure it seems absurd to ask any longer whether all Roman Catholic doctrine may be held by the minister of a Church, which not only condemns the doctrine of the mass but, according to the judge, has swept away the very form and name of an altar, in order that she might show the essential difference of her doctrine on this awful subject from that of the Church from which she was separating.

It certainly seems to me, that what are called moderate or primitive views are condemned in the stone-altar case. "The doctrine of the early Church was this (says the writer of the 51st Tract for the Times, published in the fourth vol. dated 1837.) that in the eucharist an oblation or sacrifice was made by the Church of God, under the form of his creatures of bread and wine, according to our blessed Lord's holy institution in memory of his cross and passion; and this they believed to be the pure offering; or sacrifice which the prophet Malachi foretold that the Gentiles should offer; and that it was enjoined by our Lord in the words—'Do this for a memorial of me;' and that it was added to when our Lord or St. Paul spoke of a Christian altar; and was typified by the passover, which was both a sacrifice and a feast upon a sacrifice. The eucharist, then, according to them, consisted of two parts,—a commemorative sacrifice, and a communion or communication. There is one Jesus Christ, (says St. Ignatius,) who is above all; haste ye, then, altogether as to one temple of God, as to one altar—as to one Christ Jesus, who came forth from one Father, and is in one, and to one returned."

In another part of the preface to the Tract it is asserted, "that there was no change of doctrine as to the Christian sacrifice involved in the alterations and additions made in Edward the VI's Second Book." But the judge says, that the change between these two books was the most important possible. The Tract (written to prove the doctrine of a commemorative sacrifice to be a doctrine of the Church of England,) says, "that whereon the commemorative sacrifice is offered, is an altar in respect of that sacrifice." But the judge shows that the name and notion of an altar were done away at the Reformation; inasmuch that the disputes which were raised between High and Low Churchmen in Charles I's reign were not as to the altar at all, but only where the table should be placed. Probably that is, as some say, with a view to decency only. The credence, or table of preparation, as immediately connected with the principle of an altar is, of course, likewise condemned.

With one more quotation from the judgment in this important case I will conclude. The Dean of Arches says—"We all know that after the Reformation, one of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, which was renounced by the Church of England, was the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and it will be found that the material (stone) and form (fixed at the east-end of the chancel) of the altar in the Roman Church are connected with this doctrine of Transubstantiation and with the eucharist as a sacrifice." Afterwards, "the altars were destroyed, and tables of wood set up in their stead; and it is this fact which is alone material for the purpose of the present question."

I confess, then, I cannot see how this judgment is reconcilable with, so called, Anglo-Catholic, any more than Roman-Catholic doctrine on the eucharist. It was passed after a full hearing on both sides, in which the ablest ecclesiastical lawyers were employed, and it ended by reversing the sentence of an inferior court.

Another Roman Catholic doctrine, that of "Purgatory" (and not the "Romish doctrine," as it is said) there was something in the justification, see No. 90, Article xxxii. 6.) has been also condemned; but it was in Mr. Oakeley's case, which, except so far as it strengthens the other, I purposely avoid saying, because it was not defended. However, I may just observe, that the judge takes this as an instance to show that he is speaking not only of the doctrine of the Council of Trent, but that of the Council of Florence and other earlier councils. By inference many other doctrines of the same school are pronounced inconsistent with the legal interpretation of the Church of England.

In conclusion, I remark, that the fate of this controversy has turned upon a doctrine, surely of all others the most important, more than which there is none its maintainers have shown harder to establish as a doctrine of the Church of England; witness the length of the entire in Tract 51; and yet it has been generally the point for which individuals of "Tractarian" opinions have

been censured by those in authority during the last few years.

It will be observed, that throughout the preceding statement, while I have professed myself generally of "Tractarian" opinions, and as one who required the principle of interpretation contained in No. 90, to enable him to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles, I have avoided the direct appropriation to myself of particular doctrines. For the sake of clearness, I will here mention one which I do most firmly hold;—namely, that in the sacrament of the eucharist there is a true sacrifice, and that in respect of that sacrifice, it is an altar whereon the blessed eucharist is offered. This is enough for all present purposes.

A clergyman holding such a doctrine cannot undertake ministerial duties in the Church of England, or any other engagements which involve subscription. Points more or less open for three hundred years, and, as I believe, of the deepest import, have been settled. I resign, therefore, all claim to subscribe the articles according to my former interpretation. Sept., 1845. WILLIAM F. WINGFIELD.

CLERICAL CELIBACY.

"The gloomy monument" of Hildebrand. From the most remote Christian antiquity, the marriage of clergymen has been regarded with the dislike, and their celibacy rewarded by the commendations, of the people. Among the ecclesiastical heroes of the four first centuries, it is scarcely possible to point to one who was not, in this respect, an imitator of Paul rather than of Peter. Among the ecclesiastical writers of those times, it is scarcely possible to refer to one by whom the superior sanctity of the unmarried to the conjugal state is not either directly inculcated, or tacitly assumed. This prevailing sentiment had ripened into a customary law, and the observance of that custom had been enforced by edicts and menaces; by rewards and penalties. But none had triumphed over tradition, and had proved too strong for Councils and for Popes.

When Hildebrand ascended the chair first occupied by a married Apostle, his spirit burned within him to see that marriage held in her impure and unallowed honours a large proportion of those who ministered at the altar, and who banded there the very substance of the incarnate Deity. It was a profanation well adapted to rouse the jealousy, not less than to wound the conscience, of the Pontiff. Secular cares suited ill with the stern duties of a theoretic ministry. Domestic affections would choke or enervate in them that corporate passion which might otherwise be directed with unmitigated ardour towards their chief and centre. Clerical celibacy would exhibit to those who trod the outer courts of the great Christian temple, the impressive and subjugating image of a transcendental perfection, too pure not only for the coarser delights of sense, but even for the alloy of conjugal or parental love. It would fill the world with adherents of Rome, in whom every feeling would be quenched which could rival that sacred allegiance. From every monastery might be summoned a phalanx of allies to overpower the more numerous, but dispersed and feeble antagonists of such an innovation. In every mixed churchman it would find an active poison. The people, ever rigid in exacting eminent virtues from their teachers, would be roused but ineffective zealots of greedy discipline from which they were themselves to be exempt.

With such anticipations, Gregory, within a few weeks from his accession, convened a council at the Lateran, and proposed a law, not, as is commonly supposed, merely the marriage of priests, but commanding every priest to put away his wife, and requiring all laymen to abstain from any sacred office which a wedded priest in light presume to celebrate. Never was legislative foresight so verified by the result. What the great Council of Nicea had attempted in vain, the Bishops assembled in the presence of Hildebrand accomplished, and for ever, laid aside on an eucharist, and for ever, lamentable indeed were the complaints, bitter the reproaches, or the sufferings. Were the most sacred ties thus to be torn asunder at the ruthless bidding of an Italian priest? Were men to become angels, or were angels to be brought down from heaven to minister among men? Eloquence was never more pathetic, more just, or more unavailing. Prelate after prelate silenced these complaints by austere rebukes. Legate after legate arrayed with papal menaces to the reconstrains. Monks and abbots preached the continence they at least professed. Kings and barons laughed over their cups at many a merry tale of compulsory divorce. Stots pelted, heated, and besmeared with profane and filthy baptisms the unhappy victims of pontifical rigour. It was a struggle not to be prolonged—broken hearts pined and died away in silence. Excommunications subsided into murmurs, and murmurs were drowned in the general shout of victory. Eight hundred years have since passed away. Amidst the wreck of laws, opinions, and institutions, this decree of Hildebrand's still rules the Latin Church in every land where sacrifices are offered on her altars. Among us, but not of us,—valuing their rights as citizens, chiefly as instrumental to their powers as churchmen—ministers of love, to whom the heart of a husband and a father is an insupportable mystery—teachers of duties, the most sacred of which they may not practise—compelled daily to gaze on the most polluted imagery of man's fallen heart, but denied the refuge of nature from a polluted imagination—professors of virtue, of which, from the death of the righteous Abel down to the birth of the fervent Peter, no solitary example is recorded in Holy Writ—excluded from that posthumous life in remote descendants, the devout anticipation of which enabled the patriarchs to walk meekly, but exultingly with their God—the sacerdotal caste sit down in every Christian land,

the imperishable and gloomy monument of that far-sighted genius which thus devised the means of papal despotism, and of that short-sighted wisdom which proposed to itself that despotism as a legitimate and laudable end.—*Edinburgh Reviewer—Macaulay.*

SAINT-WORSHIP.

We are engaged in our apostle's condemnation of the most fatal of the corruptions beginning to appear at Colosse, saint-worship. This corruption we dwell on at the greater length, because it is, as we think, the centre point of the whole epistle. We have shown the manner of the introduction of this incipient evil amongst the Colossians—its fearful progress in the western church, till, at the second Council of Nice, and the Synod of Trent, the full-blown idol-worship was established. The copious prophecies also of this apostasy have been adverted to; and the proofs of the present doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome exhibited from her acknowledged formularies. We have proceeded also to the melancholy task of showing the strong leaning to popery, including the invocation of angels and saints, which has marked more and more, in rapid progression, the writings of the Tractarian divines. We go on to the specific grounds of the apostle's condemnation of this demonolatrous worship; and shall afterwards have to consider, as we proposed, his judgment on the third class of corruptians at Colosse flowing from it; namely, the austerities imposed, without a pretence of divine authority, by the Judaizing, Platonizing, and Pythagorizing doctors; which will bring us to St. Paul's description of the real method of man's sanctification, as contrasted with all this superstitious, by rising with Christ to an earthly and idolatrous religion, and setting our affections on him as our only Mediator, at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

Some appearance of controversial discussion is unavoidable in the progress of our high argument. We must place the nonser abominations in its true light. We must not allow general objections to the theological debate, and demands for a false peace to prevail on us to give those evils by our silence the time to work themselves again unobserved into the minds of our younger clergy. The peace of Christ must be founded on the truth of Christ. It is otherwise treachery to our Master's cause. The Jesuits have been complaining for three centuries that they have been misunderstood. Dr. Wiseman does the same up to this moment. We must not, therefore, wonder that the Tract divines follow them in this; in other things. But we must not suffer the general reluctance to controversy which pious men most justly feel, to repress our boldness for Christ on a great occasion like the present. We must stand with the priests of Baal, or the prophets from Isaiah to Malachi, with their idolatrous contemporaries, as our blessed Lord with the Scribes and Pharisees, or St. Paul with the Galatians, "stand forth on the Lord's side;" and "quit ourselves like men." We must take care, indeed, in doing this, not to exaggerate facts, not to impute motives, not to proceed on mere reports or rumours, not to be betrayed into the least personality or acrimony; much less to suit up the way of a return to the paths of the Gospel to those who have been partially drawn aside; on the contrary, we must ever speak the truth in love. And, above all, we must connect what we say in condemnation of error with a direct and clear exposition of the person and glory of Christ as the only Mediator and Intercessor; and then in a spirit of humble prayer to God for his grace and blessing, we must contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. It is a crisis of our Protestant Church. The Reformation was gained by a public and decided avowal of the truth of the Gospel, and an unshrinking protest against the idolatry of Rome. Human encroachments followed in the wake of this faithful testimony; but did not precede it. It was the tone of the public mind, awakened by the Scriptures, that led to the laws which established the Reformation in various other countries, and, above all, in our own. The pulpit and the press must retain what they then won.

I speak thus because the ground of our apostle's condemnation of the angel-worship at Colosse touches the most vital points of Christianity. They are no common or subordinate matters. A presumptuous intrusion into things not seen,—the inflation of the carnal mind,—a total separation and abscission from Christ—such are the real sources of this idolatry, and such its tremendous consequences; whatever garb of humility or of zeal in the external ordinances of religion they may assume, or even of what is accounted wisdom by the world. This is a case of life and death.—*The Bishop of Calcutta, on the Epistle to the Colossians.*

REJOICE WITH TREMBLING.

There are seasons when there appears a reality, a life, a warmth, in our religion. Our love is ardent, our faith steadfast, our hope towering. Our mountain stands strong; and then we say, that we shall never be moved; that emotions so deep and powerful must be lasting. But let a few days, or perhaps only a few hours pass away, and what is our language then? "The Lord hath hid his face from us, and we are troubled." All our lovely feelings are gone. Our soaring hopes are changed into gloomy apprehensions; our glowing joys into a most distressing coldness. We still make a Christian profession; but we look into ourselves, and can see little or nothing there; which warrants it, nothing which distinguishes the sanctified from the worldly heart. Now, this painful experience should caution us against attaching too much importance to lively frames and feelings. When we enjoy them, it should teach us to expect their departure; when we are destitute of them, to remember that by prayer and rec-