

Poetry.

ODE TO A GOLD COIN.

The following Ode was written in Ghoreal Malabar, by Dr. Leyden. Dr. L. had quitted his native hills of Scotland to try his fortunes in India. He had an eye to gold, but he had also a noble desire to promote the cause of letters by exploring the Indian Languages. It was in the last stage of disease, induced by that unhealthy climate, that he penned these touching lines. How many a California adventurer would find the tears start into his eyes on perusing these strains of a saddened heart!

Slave of the dark and dirty mine,
What vanity has brought thee here?
How can I bear to see thee shine
So bright, whom I have bought so dear?
The tent-ropes flapping lone I hear
For twilight's converse, arm in arm;
The jackal's shriek bursts on my ear
When mirth and music went to charm.

By Ghoreal's dark, wandering streams,
Where cane-tufts shadow all the wild,
Sweet visions haunt my waking dreams
Of Teviot loved while yet a child;
Of castled rocks tremendous piled
By Esk or Eden's classic wave,
Where loves of youth and friendship smiled
Uncurs'd by thee, vile yellow slave!

Fade, day-dreams sweet, from memory, fade!
The perish'd bliss of youth's first prime,
That once so bright on fancy played,
Revives no more in aftertime.
Far from my sacred, natal clime,
I haste to an untimely grave;
The daring thoughts that soared sublime,
Are sunk in ocean's Southern wave.

Slave of the mine! thy yellow light
Gooms baleful as the tomb fire drear,
A gentle vision comes by night
My lonely, widow'd heart to cheer;
Her eyes are dim with many a tear
That once were guiding stars to mine,
Her fond heart throbs with many a fear!
I cannot bear to see thee shine.

For thee, for thee, vile yellow slave,
I left a heart that loved me true.
I crossed the tedious ocean wave,
To roam in climes unkind and new.
The cold wind of the stranger blew
Chill on my withered heart—the grave,
Dark and untimely, met my view—
And all for thee, vile yellow slave!

Ha! comest thou now, so late to mock
A wanderer's banished heart forlorn,
Now that this frame the lightning shock
Of sun-rays tipt with death hath borne?
From love, from friendship, country torn,
To-morrow's fond regrets the prey,
Vile slave, thy yellow dress I scorn,
Go mix thee with thy kindred clay.

INTRODUCTION "TO THE ORIGIN OF THE BRITISH CHURCH."

PREFACE.

It is common for Roman and other schismatics to assert that the Anglican Branch of the Catholic Church had no existence previous to the Reformation. The former is interested in perpetuating this now notorious fallacy, since he is well aware that with devout and earnest Christians, the unbroken and continued existence of our Lord's body, "the Church," is a Scriptural necessity, and they both feel and know that it has ever existed on earth, and that that can only be His Church which has continued from apostolic times up to our own. The latter hopes to find an excuse for unwarrantable separation from a branch of the Church which they admit to be, at least, Holy.—That the Anglican, Scotch and Irish Branches and their descendants do as unquestionably belong to the Catholic Church, as the Church of Rome is, even yet, admitted to do, is a fact which all history shows, and which it is the object of the following tract to elucidate most clearly, and if adherence to primitive Catholic truth be any indication of our parentage, then indeed is the Holy Catholic Church of England, Ireland and Scotland richly entitled to the claim, since in all things she "holds fast the faith once for all delivered to the Saints,"—cleaving to the Scriptures as the Rule of Faith, and in all doubtful points unhesitatingly appealing to the primitive Church of the first centuries, when as yet she spake with one mouth, to aid in the solution of those doubts. Whether the Church of Rome can say as much is a question for her to answer, but as her rulers change the foundation on which they build their arguments to suit the times, it is plain that in doctrine, at all events, Rome is forced to wear a coat of many colours. To-day she appeals to the Fathers and antiquity, to-morrow she claims to be in a transition state, and presumes to develop truths heretofore unknown.

Anglo-Catholics have much cause to be thankful that such ground is taken by their erring brethren of Rome, for as the Rev. Dr. Wordsworth remarks, "Its very name is ominous against it. What is Development? The explication and evolution of something that was wrapped up in embryo. St. Paul gives us a very pertinent illustration of this process with respect to doctrine. He speaks of a mystery. What is a mystery? A thing con-

cealed, undeveloped. He speaks of a mystery of iniquity or rather of lawlessness. He says that this mystery is already at work, and he adds that in time it will be developed." If this be applied to the Papal supremacy, we shall see how the mystery is working. Cardinal Bellarmine says, "the whole cause of Christianity (Romish of course) depends on the supremacy of the Pope." A late Romish Doctor who has been eulogised by Pope and Romish bishops, says, "First, the power of the Bishop awoke, then the power of the Pope. Nor would a Pope arise but in proportion as the Church was consolidated. Christianity developed first in the form of a Catholic, then of a Papal church." This is the declaration of a modern Roman Catholic doctor who has been and is the beloved of his brethren, and whose book has been received by the Church to which he belongs, with amazing admiration. We Anglo-Catholics reject the Papal yoke as a modern invention, unauthorized by scripture, unknown to the early Church. We declare that there have ever been in the Church three orders, of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon. We declare that the Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation, and are our rule of faith, and cannot be added to or taken from. We appeal fearlessly to antiquity to aid us in our doubts. Rome condemns us for declaring that Christianity was first a Catholic, and then a Papal Church—a fact now set forth by one of her most devoted adherents—let us lay hold of this great fact, let us cling lovingly to the mother who has nourished us with the milk of the gospel, and who now is, as she ever has been, Catholic, Holy, and Apostolic—not Papal.

It would not be difficult to prove—indeed, scarcely anything more easy—that the Anglican Church adheres scripturally to the original constitution of the Church, while the Roman Church, under the process of development, is fast departing from all scriptural rule. Her boasted descent from St. Peter as a nascent Pope, is, as her great enemy, history,* shows, hollow and empty, while support is given to the Greek, Syrian, Anglican, Irish, Scotch and American churches, veritable branches of the Catholic Church, in their retention of the office of Archbishop or Primus. All that we know respecting the early history of the Roman See, is derived, ultimately, from Irenæus, who flourished in the second century, for Eusebius professedly gives the whole of his statement on the authority of Irenæus, and according to him the two most glorious apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, were the co-founders of the Church of Rome, and he informs us that when they had thus jointly founded that Church, they jointly delivered the episcopate of it to Linus. With respect to either of the two co-founders ever having been himself Bishop of Rome, Irenæus is totally silent, and he also tells us that each church possessed an accurate list of her Bishops, beginning with him to whom the episcopate had been originally committed by the apostles themselves. St. Peter and Paul conjointly consecrated Linus Bishop of Rome, as in the present day two or three, but not one Bishop, (as occurred in the Roman Schism in America,) must be present at the consecration of a Bishop. Seniority has always a claim on our respect, and in the Church of Christ it would not be unscriptural to give the primacy of honour to an elder sister—"Primum inter pares"—but the arrogant pretensions of Rome to a Primacy of Power, civil and ecclesiastical, and that of an arch-regal kind is contrary to the laws of God, and to the history of the Church in early times.

In the same manner that we protest against the errors of Rome so do we protest against the errors of other schismatical bodies, who discarding the evidence of all antiquity and acting in direct contradiction to all scripture rule, set up altars of their own, and take upon themselves the ministration of the Word and sacraments "heaping to themselves preachers, having itching ears," driven about by every wind of doctrine, each having a psalm or an hymn of his own composing, and dividing and separating men from the Church, preventing that holy union which should render them "of one mind." Hereafter we propose to show how the Anglo-Catholic Church has alone been the blessed means of keeping God's Word intact, while other so called churches have fallen away into still more grievous error. Finally let us pray God to pour out abundantly His Holy Spirit on our Zion, that the blessings of peace may be upon her, and that she may continue steadfast, unmoved, always abounding in the works of her God, inasmuch as she knows that her labour is not in vain in the Lord. That she is undergoing troubles, the most careless amongst us must see, that her old and many enemies are leagued against her is also true; but

* The President of France, acting under the instruction of the Priests of the Roman Church in France, has prohibited the teaching of history in the schools.

the Lord is on our side, and we will not fear what man can do unto us. The Lord of Hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge.

The following works will be found very valuable by the anxious inquirer:—"Evans on the Validity of Anglican Orders"; "Kip's Double Witness of the Church"; "Southey's Book of the Church"; "Faber on Romanism"; "A Presbyterian in Search of the Church."

GENEVA!

We quote the following for the benefit of those who think it such a mistake to place "Rome" and "Geneva" as opposite extremes.

"A correspondent of the Record makes a communication from Geneva, which the editor 'knows that the writer is afflicted in making,' that—

"In the 'city of Calvin,' in this city of Geneva, once so brilliantly adorned with the 'light of truth,' and whose faithfulness and strength had caused it to be surnamed 'Protestant Rome,' and the 'Throne of the Bible,' is now exhibiting alarming signs, or rather frightful evidences of its fall; the perfidious and lamentable work of him whom the Lord Jesus calls 'a liar and a murderer from the beginning,' and who, when he speaketh or maketh a lie, speaketh of his own, or acts according to his own darkness. But while the labourers slept the enemy came and sowed tares in the beautiful field of the Bible. From the middle of the last century unbelief, first furtively, and then more boldly, insinuated its 'various doctrines,' among the revelations of heaven; and through it, this same Lord Jesus, whom all the families of Geneva had acknowledged, and for the most part worshipped, as the Son of God, God manifest in the flesh, and the eternal and perfect Saviour of his Church, is become nothing more in the eyes of masters, parents, governors, and preachers of the word, but a superior and remarkable Being, no doubt, yet, after all no longer 'Emmanuel,' and especially, no longer, 'The Lord our Righteousness.'

"It is owing to this that in the school-book and analysis of one of the best scholars of the new college we read the following instruction, given to four or five hundred youths in that institution, from the lips of the Protestant chaplain officially appointed to it, and that this minister (as he is called,) affixed his signature to it, certifying that it was a faithful and good report. It is as follows:—

"One can therefore understand that the account given of the creation of the world, as narrated by Moses, is only an allegory suited to the popular traditions or superstitious of that period. Thus for example, it would be, one feels quite absurd to admit that the serpent ever spoke, as well as that the eating of an apple, or such kind of fruit, brought the punishment of God to man, even to the suffering of death.

"It would not therefore be reasonable to take this narration literally. Again it would be gross superstition to suppose that the being which the Bible calls the Devil, or Satan, is anything more than those evil thoughts which proceed from the heart, and are called sin."

EPICUREANISM.

St. Luke, in the seventeenth chapter of the book of "The Acts of the Apostles," writes, that, when St. Paul was at Athens, "certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoics encountered him." Of these, "some said, what will this babbling say? others, he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods, because he preached unto them Jesus and the Resurrection." In this circumstance, we suppose that every Christian of the present day resembles the great Apostle of the Gentiles. In whatever city he may abide, he will be met by philosophers; of whom some will be Epicureans, and will regard him as a babbling; while others will be Stoics, who will consider Jesus and the Resurrection as strange gods. These two sects of heathen philosophers are far from being extinct, but may be met with everywhere; at least, those may be met with, whose similarity of doctrine or practice will prove them to be at least the collateral descendants of Zeno or Epicurus.

The two sects which have been named, like the other sects of heathen philosophers, had each its own system of theology,—both dogmatic and moral. It is remarkable that the dogmatic system of the two sects arrived by different courses, at what was, practically, the same result.

They both accepted the popular mythology of Greece; they never thought of denying the existence of Jesus, and his Olympic rabble; and they both agreed to set aside these so called divinities from any practical share in the government of the world. But they arrived at this conclusion by different ways. The Stoic considered that Zeus was in some sense the governor of the world, but then he was not a free agent. All the actions of gods and men were the consequence of a fate, to which they were bound by a certain law of nature; a law which had been enacted without a legislator, and which was enforced, or enforced itself, without the aid of any personal agent. All the acts of Zeus himself were equally with the course of the

planets, the growth of the plants, and the falling of a stone left without support, the effects of this one cause; the unreasoning obedience to this inexorable law.

The Epicureans, on the other hand, did not deny that both gods and men were free agents, but the gods were too wise and too much concerned in taking care of themselves, and providing for their own pleasures, to concern themselves about the affairs of mortals. The course of nature carried on the business of the physical world, without calling for the interference of the gods. As for the moral world, in that gods and men both did what was right in their own eyes,—every individual taking care of himself, and leaving every other individual to do the same.

But although the dogmatic theology of these sects came so nearly to the same result,—their systems of moral theology were widely different. The moral theology of the Epicureans was closely connected with their dogmatic. The moral, however, seemed not to have been derived from the dogmatic; but rather the dogmatic from the moral. The connexion between the dogmatic theology of Zeno, and his moral precepts is not so apparent, but it had, no doubt, a real existence; but it seems clear that the dogmatic teaching was not a consequence of the moral.

The moral teaching of the Stoics was of a very harsh and rigid character. It set out from two strange principles,—that pain was not an evil, and that pleasure was not a good. When you came to examine these principles, they rested immediately upon a transparent fallacy. The Stoics restricted the terms good and evil, which other men used in various senses, to the single sense of moral good and moral evil. The assertion that pain, bodily pain was not an evil, and that pleasure, bodily, or even mental, pleasure, is not a good, sinks with this explanation to a contemptible and barren truism, of about equal value with the assertion, that a circle is not a vice, nor a triangle a virtue. In itself, and without the explanation, it is an absurd paradox, which may be ingeniously maintained, but which no human being can really believe. But, in truth, it was in neither of these senses, that the assertion was really intended to be understood, or that it furnished the basis, as it did of a very noble character. Although put absolutely, it was to be interpreted comparatively. Pain, bodily pain, was no evil in comparison with moral evil. It must be submitted to, whenever the wise man was reduced to a choice between them. So pleasure, bodily, or even mental pleasure, was not a good in comparison with moral good. It was to be rejected whenever it could not be attained without the commission of moral evil, or the neglect of moral good. This doctrine was not very different from the Christian doctrine of self-denial. But it was not by any means generally adopted among the Stoics,—a few exalted spirits understood, and received, and acted upon, it. These were the real Stoic philosophers. The common herd of those who bore that name were of a different stamp. Some received the maxims of their founder, in the paradoxical sense, boldly maintained the paradox to display their intellectual ability, and affected to act upon it to raise the public idea of their moral worth. Such were merely contemptible hypocrites and as such are held up to scorn by Lucian—Others understood the maxim in the sense of the fallacy, and were as deficient in practical good sense, as the others in practical morals.

Advertisements

DR. MELVILLE,
CORNER OF YORK AND BOLTON STREETS,
TORONTO.

August, 1855.

2-6m

DR. BOVELL,
John Street near St. George's Church,
TORONTO.

Toronto, January 7th 1852.

23-1f

MR. S. J. STRATFORD,
SURGEON AND OCUList
Church Street, above Queen Street, Toronto.
The Toronto Dispensary, for Diseases of the Eye, in
rear of the same.

Toronto, January 13th, 1837.

5-1f

J. P. CLARKE, Mus. Bac. K. C.
PROFESSOR OF THE PIANO-FORTE,
SINGING AND GUITAR,
Residence, Shuter Street.

Toronto, May 7, 1851.

41-1ly

JOHN CRAIG,
GLASS STAINER,
Flag, Banner, and Ornamental Painter,
HOUSE PAINTING, GRAINING, &c., &c.
No. 7, Waterloo Buildings, Toronto.

September 4th, 1851.

6-1f

WILLIAM HODGINS,
ARCHITECT AND CIVIL ENGINEER.
OFFICE:—Directly opposite the Arcade, St.
Lawrence Hall, King Street, Toronto.

Toronto, February, 1852.

28-1f