

The Church.

"Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein and ye shall find rest for your souls." — JEREMIAH, vi. 16.

VOLUME XIII., No. 7.]

TORONTO, CANADA, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1849.

[WHOLE NUMBER, DCXXXI.

Poetry.

VERSION OF THE "STABAT MATER."

BY THE DEAN OF LIVERPOOL.

By the Cross I stood with weeping,
Stood the sinless Mother weeping,

Where Her Son adored.

Hear her tortured spirit groaning,
Herked to her pious moans—

Through her soul hath pierced the sword.

How desolate! how lowly!

Was she, the Mother of the Holy;

She most women highly blest,

Whom the earth was weeping,

And her hand still givings distress.

Her child thus seen distract,

Breathes the man, who cold and fearless,

Can behold her lone and cheerless,

Staggering 'neath the penal blow?

Or the rising pane can smother,

To behold Christ's holy Mother;

Sharing Christ's woes, and shamed woe?

For the love of us poor offending,

Saw she Jesus meekly bleeding,

To the torture and the rod.

Him, in whom her soul delighted,

By the shades of death benighted,

Wield his spirit unto God.

Wield thy power of dire affliction,

Let me taste thy agony and pain,

Feed thy griefs entwined dart.

Brand, O God! thy Son's affliction,

And his mournful crucifixion,

On the tablets of my heart;

And of the ark tribulation,

And of the soul's salvation, do thou do.

Place me by the Cross to sorrow;

Feeble for the Man of sorrow;

While life's changeful shadows roll;

With the weeping Mother weeping;

With her griefs communion keeping,

Such communion craves my soul.

Thus the death of Jesus bearing,

And the lifeless shroud bearing,

Let my strips survey.

Let in angry flame I perish

Grief, the day of wrath I cherish

Jesus, Thee, my hope and stay.

While earth is to earth returning,

Let my soul, corruption sprouting,

Wing to Paradise the way.

ORDINATION AT KINGSTON.

From the *Gospel Messenger*, Aug. 22.

Very truly yours, D.

WESLEYAN METHODISM.

(From the *West of England Conservative*.)

We said just now that the doctrines which John Wesley maintained, are in the present day forgotten by those who have promised to receive *ex animo* his interpretation of the New Testament, and his volumes of sermons. Our impression is, that had the "Venerable Father" of Wesleyanism lived in the present day, the restoration of the truth of the Church of England, in all their fulness and integrity, would have commanded his earnest sympathies, and secured the services of his well-stored mind and able pen. He was, in fact, what men would now call the Tractarian mover of his times. The grounds upon which we come to this conclusion, are neither few nor slight; and, that our readers may form a just opinion for themselves, we will present them with a few extracts from his writings, on what are termed the distinctive features of "Tractarian" teaching. In some of these we meet with language, which, if used by "young Clerics" of the present day, would rouse the Protectors, and afford "ingratitude" to make him shake his sample materials for an Ecclesiastical paragraph or two, in the pages of our contemporary. We shall for the present confine ourselves to the 105th Sermon, "on Constant Communion," which we should like to see circulated as a tract. We will, however, first quote a few sentences from a sermon preached on laying the foundation stone of the City Road Chapel, April 21, 1777, in which we have a plain statement of Wesley's intentions and desires. In this Sermon, he appeals to the Primitive Church, and the Church of England; and, to the offertory—the prayer for the Church militant—and the Holy Communion. I remarked on the difference of this method in conducting ordinations from that with us, and learned from some gentlemen from England, and those who had been ordained by witnesses in England, that the Church of England, which, in his day, was at a very low ebb. The secret why other revivals of religion had failed is thus given:

"It cannot be denied that there have been several considerable revivals of religion in England since the Reformation. But the generality of the English nation were little profited thereby, because they that were the subjects of those revivals, preachers as well as people, soon separated from the Established Church, and formed themselves into a distinct sect. So did the Presbyterians first, afterwards the Independents, the Anabaptists, and the Quakers. And, after this was done, they did scarce any good, except to their own little body. As they chose to separate from the Church, so the people remaining therein separated from them, and generally contracted a prejudice against them. But these were immensely the greatest number; so that, by that unhappy separation, whose doctrines he so clearly understood, and so fully explained.

"But it is not so in the present revival of religion. The *Methodists* (so termed) know their calling. They have heard abundance said upon the subject, perhaps all that can be said. They have read the writings of the most eminent pleaders for separation, both in the last and present century. They have spent several days in a general conference upon this very question. Is it expedient (supposing not granting, that it is lawful) to separate from the established Church? But still they could not see sufficient cause to depart from their first resolution. So that their fixed purpose is, let the clergy or laity use them well or ill, by the grace of God, to endure all things, to hold on their even course, and to continue in the Church, mangle men or devils, unless God permits them to be thrust out."

He renounces all connexion with those of the body who separated from the Church. His words are:

"None of these have any manner of connexion with the original Methodists. They are branches broken off from the tree: if they break from the Church also, we are not accountable for it."

"These, therefore, cannot make our glorying void, that we do not, form any separate sect: but from principle remain, what we always have been—true members of the Church of England."

Now one of the great stumbling-blocks of the present age—one of the most fearful doctrines of so-called "Tractarianism," is that of Sacramental efficacy. Of JOHN WESLEY'S views on Holy Baptism we have ample evidence in his Journal, and his Notes on the New Testament, and we may easily believe what he thought of it, when he tells us that he was nine years of age before he *sinned away Baptismal grace*. His exposition of the Holy Communion in the sermon from which we are going to quote is plain and beautiful: the production of a reverent mind moulded by the study of antiquity. However much his professed followers may contend that in after-life

I think it greatly desirable that a free and friendly intercourse should be maintained between our clergy and those across the Lakes on the line. The Rev. brother of our diocese who accompanied me, and I, were cordially received and welcomed, and I am sure that on our part our spirits were refreshed by the visit. We saw together some thirty or forty of our English and Canadian brethren. We felt that they were for the most part like-minded with ourselves, and that in labours and toils, many, perhaps all of them, were far more abundant than we had opportunity or call to be. There was excited too, a feeling of confidence and of strength—a sense of the reality of the "One Catholic Church," by the fact of this association with brethren of another nation, and the weakness which we are tempted to feel sometimes in view of our disadvantageous position (outwardly), as compared with the multitude of sects which are arrayed against us, was entirely forgotten in the assurance, that we form an integral portion of one of the strongest and most influential spiritual communions upon earth.

"The following discourse was written about five and fifty years ago, for the use of my pupils at Oxford. I have added very little, but retouched much; as I then used more words than I do now. But I thank God, I have not yet seen cause to alter my sentiments, in any point which is therein delivered."—1788, J. W.

Amongst the reasons adduced for constant communion says:—

"A second reason why every Christian should do this as often as he can, is, because the benefits of doing it are so great, to all that do it in faith and obedience to Him; viz, the forgiveness of our past sins, the present strengthening and refreshing of our souls.

"The grace of God given herein, confirms to us the pardon of our sins, and enables us to leave them.

"As our bodies are strengthened by bread and wine, so are our souls by these tokens of the body and the blood of Christ. This is the food of our souls; this gives strength to perform our duty, and lead us on to perfection. If, therefore, we have any regard for the plain command of Christ, if we desire the pardon of our sins, then we should neglect no opportunity of receiving the Lord's Supper. Then we must never turn back on the feast which the Lord has prepared for us. We must neglect no occasion which the good Providence of God affords us for this purpose. This is the true rule; so often are we to receive as God gives us opportunity."

His advice, therefore, is to the following effect—and here again, we have an appeal to the Primitive Church:—

"Let every one, therefore, who has either any desire to please God, or any love for his own soul, obey God and consult the good of his own soul, by communicating every time he can; like the first Christians, with whom the *Christian sacrifice was a constant part of the service of the Lord's Day*. Four times a week always, and every Saturday day besides. Accordingly, those that joined in the prayers of the faithful, never failed to partake of the *Blessed Sacrament*. What opinion they had of any who turned his back upon it, we may learn from that ancient Canon." If any one who believes join in the prayers of the faithful, and go away without receiving the Lord's Supper, let him be excommunicated, as bringing confusion into the Church of God."

His answers to the objections against this practice are to our mind as simple as they are conclusive. One or two we select:—

"What has been said on this pretence against constant communion, is applicable to those who say the same thing in other words, 'We dare not do it, because it requires so perfect an obedience afterwards, as we cannot promise to perform. Nay, it requires neither more nor less perfect obedience than we promised in our Baptism.' You then undertook to keep the commandment of God by his help; and you promise no more when you communicate."

But one more extract shall suffice. In replying to those who contend that the Church only enjoins Communion thrice in the year he remarks:—

"But, secondly, we cannot conclude from *three* thrice a year. The plain sense of them is, that he who does not receive thrice at least, shall be cast out of the Church; but they by no means excuse him who communicates no oftener. This never was the judgment of the Church; on the contrary, she takes all possible care that the *Sacrament be duly administered, wherever the Common Prayer is read; every Sunday and holiday in the year*."

We are somewhat curious to see what reply can be given to the above; and to learn what cause of surprise it is that those who have so taught in their infancy, and imbibed such sentiments from the writings of Wesley himself, should, when they have come to maturity, and are able to use their own judgment, prove true and faithful Ministers of a Church, whose doctrines he so clearly understood, and so fully explained.

THE COPTIC CHURCH.

(From the *Colonial Church Chronicle*.)

I spent the winter months in Egypt and Nubia, having ascended the Nile as far as the second cataract, and of course not the least amid all the topics of interest which were presented to the mind were those connected with the past history and present condition of Christianity in a country whose population, as I observed a different mode of conducting the service of ordination from that prevalent with us. The first day at morning prayer was the presentation of the candidates—first those for Deacon's orders, and then the persons to be ordained Priests. This was done by the Archdeacon of Kingston. The persons to be ordained were then by the Bishop commanded to the prayers of the congregation, and an offering was taken up. After morning prayer was said, the Bishop's chaplain of the Oath of Supremacy; then the examination of the persons to be ordained Deacons—the ordination of the Deacons, and the reading of the Gospel by one of them. After that, the exhortation to them to be ordained Priests—then examination and ordination. After this followed the sermon, which was by the Bishop—the offertory—the prayer for the Church militant—and the Holy Communion. I remarked on the difference of this method in conducting ordinations from that with us, and learned from some gentlemen from England, and those who had been ordained by witnesses in England, that the Church of England, which, in his day, was at a very low ebb. The secret why other revivals of religion had failed is thus given:

"It cannot be denied that there have been several considerable revivals of religion in England since the Reformation. But the generality of the English nation were little profited thereby, because they that were the subjects of those revivals, preachers as well as people, soon separated from the Established Church, and formed themselves into a distinct sect. So did the Presbyterians first, afterwards the Independents, the Anabaptists, and the Quakers. And, after this was done, they did scarce any good, except to their own little body. As they chose to separate from the Church, so the people remaining therein separated from them, and generally contracted a prejudice against them. But these were immensely the greatest number; so that, by that unhappy separation, whose doctrines he so clearly understood, and so fully explained.

"But it is not so in the present revival of religion. The *Methodists* (so termed) know their calling. They have heard abundance said upon the subject, perhaps all that can be said. They have read the writings of the most eminent pleaders for separation, both in the last and present century. They have spent several days in a general conference upon this very question. Is it expedient (supposing not granting, that it is lawful) to separate from the established Church? But still they could not see sufficient cause to depart from their first resolution. So that their fixed purpose is, let the clergy or laity use them well or ill, by the grace of God, to endure all things, to hold on their even course, and to continue in the Church, mangle men or devils, unless God permits them to be thrust out."

He renounces all connexion with those of the body who separated from the Church. His words are:

"None of these have any manner of connexion with the original Methodists. They are branches broken off from the tree: if they break from the Church also, we are not accountable for it."

"These, therefore, cannot make our glorying void, that we do not, form any separate sect: but from principle remain, what we always have been—true members of the Church of England."

Now one of the great stumbling-blocks of the present age—one of the most fearful doctrines of so-called "Tractarianism," is that of Sacramental efficacy. Of JOHN WESLEY'S views on Holy Baptism we have ample evidence in his Journal, and his Notes on the New Testament, and we may easily believe what he thought of it, when he tells us that he was nine years of age before he *sinned away Baptismal grace*. His exposition of the Holy Communion in the sermon from which we are going to quote is plain and beautiful: the production of a reverent mind moulded by the study of antiquity. However much his professed followers may contend that in after-life

I modified some of his opinions, they cannot, by any sophistry of reasoning, get rid of this. In 1788, three years before his death, as if to provide against any such contingency, he adds this note: *

"The following discourse was written about five and fifty years ago, for the use of my pupils at Oxford. I have added very little, but retouched much; as I then used more words than I do now. But I thank God, I have not yet seen cause to alter my sentiments, in any point which is therein delivered."—1788, J. W.

Amongst the reasons adduced for constant communion says:—

"A second reason why every Christian should do this as often as he can, is, because the benefits of doing it are so great, to all that do it in faith and obedience to Him; viz, the forgiveness of our past sins, the present strengthening and refreshing of our souls.

"The grace of God given herein, confirms to us the pardon of our sins, and enables us to leave them.

"As our bodies are strengthened by bread and wine, so are our souls by these tokens of the body and the blood of Christ. This is the food of our souls; this gives strength to perform our duty, and lead us on to perfection. If, therefore, we have any regard for the plain command of Christ, if we desire the pardon of our sins, then we should neglect no opportunity of receiving the Lord's Supper. Then we must never turn back on the feast which the Lord has prepared for us. We must neglect no occasion which the good Providence of God affords us for this purpose. This is the true rule; so often are we to receive as God gives us opportunity."

His advice, therefore, is to the following effect—and here again, we have an appeal to the Primitive Church:

"Let every one, therefore, who has either any desire to please God, or any love for his own soul, obey God and consult the good of his own soul, by communicating every time he can; like the first Christians, with whom the *Christian sacrifice was a constant part of the service of the Lord's Day*. Four times a week always, and every Saturday day besides. Accordingly, those that joined in the prayers of the faithful, never failed to partake of the *Blessed Sacrament*. What opinion they had of any who turned his back upon it, we may learn from that ancient Canon." If any one who believes join in the prayers of the faithful, and go away without receiving the Lord's Supper, let him be excommunicated, as bringing confusion into the Church of God."

Knowing thus much of their history, I confess that it was with no slight expectation of finding much that was interesting amongst the Copts, and with the resolution to "hope all things" of them, that I made my inquiries—not so much respecting the theory of their Church, as regarding its actual working and practical character. I grieve to say, my impressions were of a very painful kind. It seemed to me impossible to shut one's eyes to the deadness and decay of intellectual and spiritual life which seems everywhere to prevail.

The bishops, as you are selected from the monastic clergy, and I believe among them some would

be modified some of his opinions, they cannot, by any sophistry of reasoning, get rid of this. In 1788, three years before his death, as if to provide against any such contingency, he adds this note: *

"The following discourse was written about five and fifty years ago, for the use of my pupils at Oxford. I have added very little, but retouched much; as I then used more words than I do now. But I thank God, I have not yet seen cause to alter my sentiments, in any point which is therein delivered."—1788, J. W.

Amongst the reasons adduced for constant communion says:—

"A second reason why every Christian should do this as often as he can, is, because the benefits of doing it are so great, to all that do it in faith and obedience to Him; viz, the forgiveness of our past sins, the present strengthening and refreshing of our souls.