

The Church.

"HER FOUNDATIONS ARE UPON THE HOLY HILLS."

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 IV.]

TORONTO, CANADA, SATURDAY, JULY 3, 1841.

[NUMBER 52.]

Poetry.

HYMN BEFORE SUNRISE, IN THE VALE OF CHAMOUNI.

BY S. T. COLERIDGE.

Besides the rivers Arve and Arveiron, which have their sources in the foot of Mont Blanc, five conspicuous torrents rush down its sides; and within a few paces of the Glaciers, the Gentiana Major grows in immense numbers with its "flowers of loveliest blue."

Hast thou a charm to stay the morning star
In his steep course? So long he seems to pause
On thy bold awful head, O sovran Blanc!
The Arve and Arveiron at thy base
Have ceaselessly; but thou, most awful form!
Rise from forth thy silent sea of pines,
How silently! Around thee and above
Deep is the air and dark, substantial, black,
An ebon mass: methinks thou piercest it,
As with a wedge; but when I look again,
It is thine own calm home, thy crystal shrine,
Thy habitation from eternity!
O dread and silent morn! I gazed upon thee,
Till thou, still present to the bodily sense,
Didst vanish from my thought: entranced in prayer
I worshipp'd the Invisible alone.

Yet, like some sweet beguiling melody,
So sweet, we know not we are listening to it,
Thou, the meanwhile, wast blending with my thought,
Ye, with my life and life's own secret joy;
Till the dilating soul, enrapt, transfused,
Into the mighty vision passing—there
As in her natural form, swelled vast to heaven!

Awake, my soul! not only passive glad
Thou'st o'erest! not alone these swelling tears,
Mute thanks and secret ecstasy! Awake,
Voice of sweet song! Awake my heart, awake!
Green vales and icy cliffs, all join my hymn.

Thou first and chief, sole sovran of the vale!
O struggling with the darkness all the night,
And visited all night by troops of stars,
Or when they climb the sky or when they sink:
Companion of the morning star at dawn,
Thyself earth's rosy star, and of the dawn
Co-herald: wake, O wake, and utter praise!
Who sank thy sunless pillars deep in earth?
Who filled thy countenance with rosy light?
Who made thee parent of perpetual streams?

And you, ye five wild torrents fiercely glad!
Who called you forth from night and utter death,
From dark and icy caverns called you forth,
Down those precipitous, black, jagged rocks,
For ever shattered and the same for ever?
Who gave you your invulnerable life,
Your strength, your speed, your fury, and your joy,
Unceasing thunder and eternal foam?
And who commanded (and the silence came)
Here let the billows stiffen, and here rest?

Ye ice falls! ye that from the mountain's brow
Adown enormous ravines slope amain—
Torrents, methinks, that heard a mighty voice,
And stopped at once amid their maddest plunge!
Motionless torrents! silent cataracts!
Who made you glorious as the gates of heaven
Beneath the keen full moon? Who bade the sun
Clathe you with rainbows? Who, with living flowers
Of loveliest blue, spread garlands at your feet?
God! let the torrents, like a shout of nations,
Answer! and let the ice plains echo, God!
God! sing ye meadow-streams with glad voice!
Ye pine groves, with your soft and soul-like sounds!
And they too have a voice, you piles of snow,
And in their perilous fall shall thunder, God!

Ye living flowers that skirt the eternal frost!
Ye wild goats sporting round the eagle's nest!
Ye eagles, playmates of the mountain storm!
Ye lightnings, the dread arrows of the clouds!
Ye signs and wonders of the element!
Utter forth God, and fill the hills with praise!

Thou too, hoar mount! with the sky-pointing peaks,
Oft from whose feet the avalanche, unheard,
Shoots downward, glittering through the pure serene
Into the depth of clouds, that veil thy breast—
Thou too again, stupendous mountain! thou
That as I raise my head, awhile bowed low
In adoration, upward from thy base
Slow travelling with dim eyes suffused with tears,
Solemnly seemest, like a vapour cloud,
To rise before me—Rise, O over rise,
Rise like a cloud of incense, from the earth!
Thou kingly spirit thronged among the hills,
Thou dread ambassador from earth to heaven,
Great hierarch! tell thou the silent sky,
And tell the stars, and tell your rising sun,
Earth, with her thousand voices, praises God.

THE FALSEHOOD OF THE NAG'S HEAD CONSECRATION FARTHER PROVED.*

What has been already said [in "The Church" of April 3rd] in answer to Mr. Ward, is sufficient to prove the Nag's Head consecration to be a mere fable, invented, without any colour of truth, in order to nullify the orders of the Church of England. But, that I may as much as possible take away all occasion for scruples out of the minds of honest men, who labour under the yoke of Popery, and who have been misled by these and the like insinuations, I shall farther prove the falsehood of this story, by such arguments as did not naturally fall in with Mr. Ward's objections.

The first thing I shall take notice of in this case, is errors in chronology, which manifestly appear in the relation of this fable; and this has ever been a certain sign among all critics, of the falsehood of any fact. Dr. Champney, in his book of the "Vocation of English Bishops," fixeth the date of this Nag's Head consecration, some time before the 9th of September, 1559, which cannot be, because Parker and the rest could not be consecrated without a commission from the Queen. Now Parker's commission does not bear date till the 6th of December following; besides, his election was not confirmed by the dean of the Arches, until the 9th of the same month, both which are undeniable proofs that he could not be ordained before that time. Besides, there are fourteen more who are said to be consecrated at the same place, and at the same time, which is as incredible as the former, because it appears that some of them were not so much as consecrated in the same year. If this be not a certain undeniable evidence of the falsehood of this story, I know not what is.

2. Another very manifest argument of the falsehood of this story, is the profound silence of all Popish writers (a generation not much inclined to silence) during the whole reign of queen Elizabeth, and the beginning of king James's, of any such ridiculous consecration as this is. We do not find a word of it even in Sanders' wild book, "De Schismate Anglicano," although he has there collected together all the scandal that could well be invented of the reformation, yet he is as mute as a fish with respect to this matter, which nobody can suppose to be owing either to his modesty or good will to us, for he had as little of the one as he had of the other;

and therefore it is certain that this story was the product of some other more modern genius than his.

Besides him, there are a great many others, as Harding, Stapleton, Parsons, and even Kellison, before his reply to Sutcliff, were absolute strangers to any such account of our consecrations as this is, which evidently appears by their writings. I shall instance only in Kellison, whom I take to be the inventor of this story. Before this noble project came into his head, he argued against our orders, because he thought our first ordainers were apostates and heretics, and because they did not use the Popish ordinal, but not one word of the Nag's Head, or of bishop Scory's form there. His words are these:

"They will, peradventure, say, that their first bishops, priests and preachers, were ordained by ours, before they departed from us, and that they ordaining others, still continued the succession. But this evasion is not sufficient; for first of all, either our pastors were lawful or unlawful; if lawful, then are theirs unlawful, who preached against the commandment of ours, yea, then are they usurpers, who thrust out their lawful pastors, and settled themselves in their rooms. If unlawful, then do they absurdly challenge succession from them; because none can succeed lawfully to unlawful predecessors, if they have no other title but from them. Secondly, although some of their apostates were made priests and pastors by our bishops, yet all were not such; Luther and Calvin, the first founders, and many others, were not bishops, and so could not ordain priests and pastors, and they which were true bishops among them used not the matter and form of ordination. And if they had truly ordained their ministers, as their apostate bishops might have done if they had used the matter and form of order, because power of consecrating and ordering, which divines call *potestas ordinis*, is never abolished; yet besides order, jurisdiction and mission from a lawful pastor is also required, for St. Paul saith, 'Quomodo predicabunt, nisi mittantur?' How shall they preach except they be sent? And seeing our pastors were so far from sending them, that they forbade them all pulpits, and preaching, from them they could have no mission. And so they cannot prove their ordinary mission." Thus far Kellison.

Now here it is observable, that the manner of his opposition runs thus: first, that it is not lawful to separate from lawful pastors. Secondly, if we say their pastors were unlawful, ours could not be lawful, because deriving their authority and mission from them. Thirdly, that though our first bishops were true bishops, yet all were not such, as Luther and Calvin—but then the mission of Luther and Calvin is nothing to us, for we do not pretend to prove any mission from them. Fourthly, that our bishops did not use the true matter and form of ordination. Fifthly, that their bishops gave them no jurisdiction, but rather opposed them.

But when Dr. Sutcliff set aside these objections, by proving the justice and piety of our separation, and the validity of our forms and the jurisdiction of our bishops—Kellison being thus beaten out of his holds, is forced to take refuge under the protection of a lie, which is this of the Nag's Head fable. For in the year 1608, he published a reply to Dr. Sutcliff, wherein this story had its first life; nor was it ever heard of before this, notwithstanding there were so many very proper occasions to mention it. You see Kellison himself takes no manner of notice of it in his "Survey of the New Religion," which was published in the year 1605, though it was more to his purpose than all that he has there urged. If there had been any truth in this story, it had certainly been produced before the year 1608, which is almost fifty years after the time when the thing was supposed to be done; especially since there is so much depends upon it, as the validity of our whole reformation. And we cannot suppose it to be concealed out of any favour or tenderness towards us; for indeed if it had been true, it had been no tenderness to the souls of men to have concealed it so long; and therefore we must conclude this fable to be the invention of a man, pressed hard by an adversary, who had nothing else to say for himself.

3. Another argument, to prove this a fiction, is the silence, also, of the factious puritans of that age, who, no doubt of it, if there had been any thing of truth in the Nag's Head story, would soon have cast it in the teeth of the orthodox bishops and clergy, as the readiest and surest way to overturn the apostolical order of bishops, which they were so much displeas'd with. This had been a ready way to silence all arguments, if they could once show, that the Episcopacy contended for by the orthodox, was only nominal and not real; but they were so far from urging any argument of this nature, that they called our bishops popish and anti-Christian, because they had their orders by succession from the popish bishops.

I find a manuscript quotation to this purpose in the margin of the preface to "Parson's Discussion," which I have, and which I take to be written by a papist; the words are taken out of a book written by one *Prudent Ball*, a Nonconformist, which I never saw. The words are these: "Coverdale and Scory made Parker the first Archbishop of Canterbury, in queen Elizabeth's time; they received their orders of Cranmer, and he of Pope Clement the VIIIth, who gave him Popish anti-Christian orders." Shows how well pleased they were with our orders upon the account of this succession. But if any body should think this quotation not so well attested as it ought to be, I refer him to "Baneroff's Dangerous Positions," &c. where he will find much of the humour of that set of men in this, as well as in other instances, taken out of their own writings; and will any body say, that if these men had known any thing of this story, that they would not have produced it; and instead of hard words, they would have produced one hard argument, especially when it was such as was just upon the level with their own capacities.

But it is evident, by the books then written in defence of Episcopacy by bishop Ilson, Hooker, Saravia, and others, that the subject of the then debate, was the Divine Right of Episcopacy; and can any body think that those empty wretches would not have been glad to rid themselves of such an untoward subject, if they could so easily have taken away the ground of the debate, by saying, that though Episcopacy were of Divine right, yet that their adversaries could pretend to no such right, because they wanted consecration, or at least that they were forced to be contented with a ridiculous one, which was rather worse than none.

4. The public manner of this ludicrous consecration is another plain argument against the truth of it; for if they were put to such shifts, as is pretended, they would have chosen some other more private place than a tavern

to have acted it in, at least they would never have permitted a known enemy to be there, as Neal was, to report the same to the world, and so to make themselves a laughing-stock to friends and foes.

5. There was no necessity for such a proceeding as this is, because they neither wanted an ordinal, nor a competent number of bishops of the Protestant religion to use it, nor yet a church, to go to perform this ordinance in. For in the first place there was an ordinal ever since king Edward's time, and which was established by the act of uniformity in the first year of this Queen, notwithstanding Bonner's quibble to the contrary, in order to save his bacon, and which Scory and Coverdale, two of king Edward's bishops, were themselves consecrated by, and therefore there was no deficiency upon the account of an ordinal, which was of Protestant extraction. 2. There was a sufficient number of Protestant bishops then alive: there were no less than four, viz. Barlow, Hodgskins, Coverdale, and Scory. For Barlow did not die until about the year 1570, which was ten years after this consecration. For Curtis, his successor in the See of Chichester, was consecrated, May 20, 1570. Secondly, Hodgskins was then alive, because we find the Queen nominated him for one of the consecrators in her letters patents, and certainly she would not have named a person that was then dead. Thirdly, and as to Coverdale, we have not only the Queen's letters patents, to testify his being then alive; but also bishop Godwyn, in his catalogue of the bishops of Exeter, takes notice of his return from banishment, after the Marian persecution. "Elizabetha regnum adepti, in patriam quidem eversus est; sedem vero relicta repetere non curavit. Londini grandaevus decessit, et in parochiali ecclesia S. Bartholomaei, Sepultura est traditus." "Elizabeth coming to the crown, he returned to his country, but having left his See he did not care to be restored. He died very old at London, and he lies buried in the parish church of St. Bartholomew." 4. Scory lived until the end of the year 1585, which was twenty-five years after this consecration; so that you see here are bishops enough to perform this office, without being obliged to popish bishops for a consecration, not to say any thing of Bale, bishop of Ossory, or the Suffragan of Thetford, who were also named in the Queen's Mandate for the consecration. Lastly, that there were churches enough, whose doors must fly open to such a consecration, will I believe, hardly be disputed by any body of common sense, who considereth that the laws and government were at that time on the side of the reformation. So that weighing all these things according to common laws of reason, there could be no manner of necessity, but on the contrary, it would have been the height of folly and madness, to act such a part as the Nag's Head consecration is described to be.

6. There is not one sufficient witness produced to attest this matter of fact, and without such a witness, no fact can be proved; one witness indeed they pretend to have, but he is such a witness, as impartial men must own to be very incompetent; for it does not appear that he ever testified it upon oath, or before a public notary, as a witness ought to do; so far from this, that he was never produced to have affirmed it before any person of impartiality. Nor do I believe, that this pretended witness, Mr. Neal, ever said it at all, because if he had told any body this, he must have told it to Bonner, who is said to have sent him to the Nag's Head to see, and to give an account to his master what was done. But it plainly appears by bishop Bonner's case before mentioned, that he never told him one word of it, otherwise he would have urged this in his plea; and consequently we may reasonably conclude, that this Mr. Neal never said it, and therefore they have not so much as one witness to attest this fact.

To number up all the improbabilities and inconsistencies of this ridiculous story, were endless; it has not so much as one mark of truth belonging to it. It is neither attested by sufficient witnesses, who lived in the time when it was supposed to be done, nor is it founded upon any probable circumstances, peculiar to that age, nor upon any record whatsoever; but on the contrary it evidently appears to be invented to serve the turn of a contemptible faction, who had nothing else to say for themselves.

I shall conclude this chapter with the account which Dr. Heylin giveth of our first consecrators in opposition to this fable. And this is an historian which the Romanists themselves often express an esteem for, not that he is to be regarded the more for that reason; but because he really is in himself such a man as Tully describes a good historian to be. *Ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat.*

"But to proceed," says Heylin, "unto the consecration of the new archbishop; the first thing to be done after the passing the royal assent for ratifying of the election of the dean and chapter, was the confirming of it in the court of Arches, according to the usual form in that behalf; which being accordingly performed, the Vicar-General, the dean of the Arches, the proctors and officers of the court, whose presence was required at this solemnity, were entertained at a dinner provided for them, at the Nag's Head tavern in Cheapsid; for which though Parker paid the shot, yet shall the Church be called to an after-reckoning. Nothing remains to expedite the consecration, but this royal mandate, which I find dated on the 6th of December, directed to Anthony Kitchin, bishop of Landaff; William Barlow, late bishop of Bath and Wells, Lord elect of Chichester; John Scory, late bishop of Chichester, Lord elect of Hereford; Miles Coverdale, late bishop of Exeter; John Hodgskins, Suffragan of Bedford; John —, Suffragan of Thetford; and John Bale, bishop of Ossory, in the realm of Ireland, requiring them or any four of them at the least, to proceed unto the consecration of the Right Reverend Matthew Parker, lately elected to the metropolitan See of Canterbury. The first and the two last, either hindered by sickness, or by some other lawful impediment, were not in a condition to attend the service; which notwithstanding was performed by the other four, on Sunday the 17th of that month, according to the ordinal of king Edward VI, then newly printed for that purpose; the ceremony performed in the chapel at Lambeth-house, the east end whereof was hanged with rich tapestry, and the floor covered with red cloth; the Morning Service read by Pearson, the archbishop's chaplain, the sermon preached by Dr. Scory, Lord elect of Hereford, on those words of St. Peter, 'The elders which are among you I exhort,' &c. 1 Pet. v. 1. The letters patent for proceeding to the consecration, publicly read by Dr. Yale; the act of consecration, legally performed by the imposition of the hands of the said four bishops, according to the ancient canons, and king Edward's ordinal; and after all a plentiful

dinner, for the entertainment of the company which resorted thither. Among whom Charles Howard, (eldest son of William, Lord Effingham, created afterwards Lord Admiral, and Earl of Nottingham,) happened to be one, and afterwards testified the truth of all these particulars, when the reality and form of this consecration was called in question by some captious sticklers for the Church of Rome.

"For so it was, that some sticklers for the Church of Rome, having been told of the dinner which was made at the Nag's Head tavern at such times as the election of the new archbishop was confirmed in the Arches, raised a report that the Nag's Head tavern was the place of consecration. And this report was countenanced by another slander, causing it to be noised abroad, and published in some seditious pamphlets, that the persons designed by the Queen, for several bishoprics, being met at a tavern, did then and there lay hands upon one another without form or order."

Now I appeal even to a prejudiced reader, that has not lost his senses, which of these two accounts looks most like a true history: whether their fable of the Nag's Head, which has so many inconsistencies in it, and is founded upon no evidence; or this account which Dr. Heylin giveth of Parker's consecration, the facts which he relates are founded upon what ought to be the foundation of all history, viz. public records; but their story has no such foundation, it is all hearsay work, which was never before reputed a competent testimony to assert a matter of fact. I have now done with it, and let it rest in the same pit of oblivion with the first inventors of it.

THE STUDY OF THEOLOGY.

All persons, not absolutely strangers to our history, are aware, that, so far as it was practicable, and the age allowed, our Reformation was, in all respects, conformed to the example of the ancient Catholic Church. Hence was the order of Bishops retained in England, and that new form of ecclesiastical government rejected, which, by the advice of Calvin, was adopted in other Churches.—Hence were certain ancient doctrines, though most abhorrent from the sentiments of Calvin, established and confirmed by our Church. Hence, almost at the commencement of our Reformation, in the year 1571, was that remarkable canon respecting preachers sanctioned by the consent of a full provincial synod, and further confirmed by the royal authority of Elizabeth: "Let preachers, above all things, be careful that they never teach aught in a sermon, to be religiously held and believed by the people, except that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament; and which the Catholic Fathers, and ancient Bishops, have collected from that very doctrine." Hence, among the directions and rules, which, with the advice of the Bishops, King James, the successor of Elizabeth, recommended to the special care of the Vice-Chancellor, the Heads of Colleges and Halls, the two Professors, and the two Proctors in the University of Oxford, when the puritanical faction was more than usually strong there, the following direction was inserted; it is the seventh in order:—"That theological candidates be admonished to give their labour and study to books of a nature most consonant with the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England; that is, to employ their time in reading the fathers, councils, scholastic writers, ecclesiastical historians, and polemical divines; and that they pay not so disproportionate attention to compends and abridgements, as to make them the foundation of their theological studies."—*Bishop Bull.*

THE CHOICE OF BISHOPS.

The Bishops of the Church of England are chosen by what is called a *cogné d'évêque* (a leave to elect) from the Crown to the chapter of a vacant see. Perhaps the most important point of view in which the system of electing our prelates can be placed, is its conformity to ancient usage. The chapter of a cathedral may be considered as representing the clergy of a diocese, inasmuch as before the settlement of parishes a band of ecclesiastics lived around the mother church of a diocese, under the personal inspection of their bishop, and left their homes as itinerants to evangelize the surrounding country.

The custom, therefore, of entrusting even in appearance the election of their diocesan to capitular bodies, is a recognition of an important right inherent in the priesthood of a diocese or diocese. So long, indeed, as the Bishops are endowed with worldly possessions, it is fit that the Crown, from which such endowments originally flowed, should have the privilege of selecting a prelate to fill them, upon the same equitable principle that assigns the patronage of parochial churches to the representatives of those who provided a maintenance for their incumbents. But the Church, as established in England, being of apostolical origin and constitution, depends not for existence upon political events. Were her endowments to be wrested from her, she would be found nobly to outlive the storm, and fully to substantiate in adversity those claims to the respect and confidence of mankind, which she has maintained so triumphantly during a long continuance of national liberality. It would then become the duty of her ministers to provide for continuing the succession of her prelate, and to choose among themselves, in their respective dioceses, according to the venerable usage of antiquity, individuals to preside over them.—*Soane's History of the Reformation.*

DESTRUCTION OF THE CANAANITISH NATIONS.

From Bishop Shuttleworth's Sermons.

Nothing can be more inconclusive than the argument attempted to be derived by the infidel writers against the spirit which dictated the severe injunctions of the Mosaic institutions, from the account transmitted to us of the destruction of the Canaanitish nations. Why have not the same persons been equally loud in their objections against the cruelty of that far more tremendous retributive dispensation recorded in the same sacred writings, of the destruction of nearly the whole human race by the general deluge? For I am not aware that any impugner of revelation has advanced this circumstance as a charge against the moral attributes of the Almighty, however he may have been inclined to question the probability of the occurrence. Undoubtedly, because the right of the Deity to withdraw that life which he has given, especially when that existence has been perverted by habitual sin from the original purpose for which it was bestowed, is a truth too self-evident to admit of an argument. Yet no people were, perhaps, ever contaminated by more debasing and more atrocious habits of crime and profligacy than the exterminated Canaanites. Witness the abominations of their infant sacrifices in the valley of Hinnom, and the recorded impurities of their domestic habits, to which it is sufficient only for a moment to allude. Why, again, does not the sceptic derive an equally forcible argument against natural religion from the fearful, physical, and moral catastrophes, which continue to pass daily before his eyes? Does the desolation of whole civilized provinces by war or pestilence, at the present moment, afford a weaker argument against an over-ruling Providence, than the punishment inflicted in former ages upon the most debased people who ever let down by their vices the dignity of human nature? The fact is, that revelation is at all events to

be attacked, and therefore arguments which, when applied against natural religion, convey not the slightest conviction to the mind, are cherished and dwelt upon by the writers now alluded to as perfectly unanswerable, when they can by any means be brought to set against the evidences of Christianity.

THE DESTROYER OF DEATH.

BY DR. CHALMERS.

When we look at the wide extent and universality of the ravages of death, how hopeless is our escape! We see no exception—it scatters its desolations with unsparring regularity among all the sons and daughters of Adam. It perhaps adds to our despair when we see it extending to the lower animals, or behold the lovely forms of the vegetable creation dissolving into nothing. It carries to our observation all the immutability of a general law; we can look for no mitigation of the inevitable destiny; we cannot reverse the process of nature, nor bid her mighty elements to retire. Is there no power then, superior to nature, and which can control it? To a law of the universe carries the idea of some fixed and unalterable necessity along with it; and of none more strict, more unflinching, and more widely extensive in its operation than the law of death. In the wide circuit of things, does there exist no high authority that can abolish this law?—no power that can overthrow death, that can grapple with this mighty conqueror and break his tyranny to pieces? We never saw that being; but the records of past ages have come down to us, and we there read of the extraordinary visitor who lighted on these realms where death had reigned so long in all the triumphs of extended empire. Wonderful enterprise! He came to destroy death. Vast undertaking! He came to depose nature from this consecrated immutability; and a law which embraced within its wide grasp all who live and move on the face of the world, he came to overturn; and he soon gave token of a power commensurate to the mighty undertaking. That nature, to whose operations we are so apt to ascribe some stubborn and invincible necessity, gave way at his coming; she felt his authority through all her elements, and she obeyed it. Wonderful period!—when the constancy of nature was broken in upon by him who established it—when the Deity vindicated his honour, and the miracles of a single age, committed to authentic history, gave evidence to all futurity that there is a power above nature and beyond it. What more unchanging than the aspect of the starry heavens, and in what quarter of her dominions does nature maintain a more silent and solemn inflexibility than in the orbs which roll around us? Yet, at the coming of that Saviour these heavens broke silence—music was heard from their canopy, and it came from a congregation of living voices, which sung the praises of God, and made them fall in articulate language on human ears. After this, who can call nature unalterable? Jesus Christ hath abolished death, he has made perpetual invasion upon nature's constancy, and she never in a single instance resisted the word of his power. "What manner of man is this?" said his disciples, "even the winds and the sea obey him!" Philosophers love to expatiate, and they tell us of the laws of the animal and vegetable kingdom. These laws may prove an impassible barrier to us, but in the hand of the omnipotent Saviour they were nothing, he reversed or supported them at pleasure; he blasted the fig-tree by a single word; and what to us was the basis of high anticipation, he made the subject of his miracles. He restored sight to the blind, he restored speech to the dumb, he restored motion to the palsied, and to crown his triumph over nature and her processes, he restored life to the dead—he laid down his own life and took it up again. The disciples gave up all for lost when they saw the champion of their hopes made the victim of the very mortality which he promised to destroy. It was like the contest and victory of nature—but it was only to make his triumph more complete. He entered—

"That undiscovers country, from whose bourne
No traveller e'er returns,
But he did. He broke asunder the mighty barriers of the grave; he entered and he reanimated that body which expired on the cross, and by that most striking of all testimonies he has given us to know that he hath fought against the law of death and hath conquered it.

UNIVERSAL TRADITION OF A DELUGE.

The universality of the deluge is also attested by profane history; for the fame of it is gone through the earth, and there are records or traditions concerning it, in all parts of this and the new-found world. The Americans (Indians) do acknowledge and speak of it in their continent, as Acosta witnesseth and Laet, in their histories of them. The Chinese have the tradition of it, which is the farthest part of our continent; and the nearer and western parts of Asia is acknowledged the proper seat of it. Not to mention Deucalion's deluge in the European parts, which seems to be the same under a disguise: so as you may trace the deluge quite round the globe in profane history; and, which is remarkable, every one of these people have a tale to tell, some one way; some another, concerning the restoration of mankind; which is an argument they thought all mankind destroyed by that deluge.—In the old dispute between the Scythians and the Egyptians for antiquity, which Justin mentions, they refer to a former destruction of the world by water or fire, and argue, whether [which] nation first rose again, and was original to the other. So the Babylonians, Assyrians, Phoenicians and others, mention the deluge in their stories. And we cannot, without offering violence to all records and authority, divine and human, deny that there hath been an universal deluge upon the earth; and if there was an universal deluge, no question it was that of Noah's, and that which Moses described.—*Dr. T. Burnet's Sacred Theory of the Earth.*

SCHISM.

From the Dublin Christian Journal.

Our apprehensions of the practical working of schism, or want of Christian unity, will be still more clear, if I repeat to you what a writer of some hundred years ago, a writer of as truly catholic a spirit as could be quoted, says concerning schism:—"What is schism in its beginning and progress? The sparks of it are kindled, when proud conceited persons are brain-sick in the estimation of their own opinions, and heart-sick in their feverish zeal for propagating them. "Ignorant souls think that every change of their opinions is made by such an accession of heavenly light, that if they should not bestir themselves to make all of the same mind, they should be betrayers of the truth, and do the world unspeakable wrong.—When they praise or censure men as they receive their peculiar discoveries and conceits, then schism is in the egg. "The flames of schism break forth, when several parties, in the same church or not, censure each other, and backbite and revile each other, perverting the words and actions of each to a bad sense; that is schism in the bud. "When people in the same church do gather into private meetings, not under the guidance of the pastors, to edify one another in holy exercises, in love and peace, but in opposition to their lawful pastors, or to one another, to propagate their singular opinions, and increase their party, and speak against those that are not on their side, schism is then ready to bring forth and multiply, and the swarm is ready to come forth and begone."

* From a work entitled "The Succession of Protestant Bishops asserted."