

LITERATURE.

NEW WORK.

The Church of England Independent of the Church of Rome in all Ages. By the Rev. J. WILLIAMS. London: Parker. Part VIII.

We are not sorry to notice the turn which our controversy with Rome is evidently now taking, and that men are beginning to look back into the beginning of things, and enquire by what means the Bishop of Rome acquired authority in England. In all disputes on the differences of our doctrines the chief difficulty, in fact the only one, is to settle clearly what are the doctrines of the Church of Rome; for in this matter she is "everything by turns and nothing long."

"Omnia transformant sese in miracula rerum, Iguemque, horribilemque feram, fluxumque liquentem. Verum ubi nulla fugam repetit fallacia, victus In sese vertit."

History she cannot falsify—and, moreover, this part of the argument is indispensable to our own existence as a Church.

The earliest Church in Britain held, as we do, "The Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction in this realm." The power he afterwards gained was usurped, in direct contradiction to the canons of the Catholic Councils of Ephesus and Nice; the assertion that the Church in Britain was founded by Romish missionaries is only equalled in impudence and untruth by the Irishman's assertion, who declared, when tried for stealing a musket, that he bought it when it was quite a pistol, and had kept it till it became a gun, and when it got up to a cannon he should sell it to the Ordnance. Mr. Williams' book proves beyond a doubt—taking even the lowest view of the matter, that it was a common opinion among the early bards of Wales and this country, that Christianity had existed here from the very earliest periods, free from the errors, and independent of the power of—Bede states the power of the Pope—and the Christian religion in this country as commencing in the reign of Lucius. Yet, the manner in which this fact is mentioned proves that Christianity was known and preached in Britain before that time.—Bede represents Lucius as sending to Rome to request admission into the Church—this, of course, implies a previous conviction of the truth of Christianity on the part of Lucius; and the existence of twenty-five different accounts of the mission to Rome may fully justify us in not believing the latter circumstance, and lead us to regard it as a Romish fabrication—so that the most that can be made of Bede's testimony is that Lucius was converted by the preaching of a British priest!! In the Council of Arles, which was held long after the time of Lucius, we find the independence of the British Church recognized, and the Bishop of Rome styled brother by the Bishops of York, London, and Carlisle, and evidently considered as an equal—not such a brother as he afterwards became, when the Church in England might have complained, in the words of another youngster, we "gained nothing under him but growth, and besides the nothing that he so plentifully gave the something that nature gave his countenance took away." The Church of Rome considered Horius and his fellow-Bishops as Catholic Bishops—what then will she say to Mr. O'Connell, who violates her infallibility by calling Augustine the first of that holy order; we leave them to settle the difference, and would advise the honourable cad to the Catholic omnibus to "agree with his adversary quietly," or next day of confession he must feel the weight of that retaining penalty which she inflicts on those who question her infallibility.

Not only does the history of the early British Church establish her independence—her doctrines also were evidently averse to many of Rome's earliest dogmas; but on these points we must refer our readers to the book itself;—its size will fit it for general reading, and the plainness and clearness of its style adapt it to all orders; it contains facts useful to all in every age, particularly to the present, when the watch-word of all, both Romanists and English Catholics is, "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."

THE COLONIAL CHURCHMAN.

LUNENBURG, THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 1840.

OUR CONTEMPORARIES.—We have of late been favoured by the *Christian Messenger* and *Guardian*, with more than usual notice, not indeed of the most flattering kind. The former, having conceived some very dreadful ideas of the papal tendency of certain publications called the "Oxford Tracts," has been pleased to link us with them, and to hold us up accordingly as most unsound in the faith. Nay, further, (for what are we of the Colonial Churchman, that they should murmur against us) it has in a long article from the *Congregational Review*, breathing the gall of bitterness against the Church of England, and warmly commended by the *Christian Messenger*, endeavoured to identify that Church—the great bulwark of the Reformation) with papal Rome.—Our readers will scarcely believe that any public writers, and especially any so well able as the Editors of the *Christian Messenger*, from early education and long acquaintance with the Church, to form a correct judgment, could have the hardihood to advance such an unfounded charge. But so it is; for these are days when envy, wrath, malice, and all uncharitableness, are foundation enough for attacks upon all that is venerable and good in the land.

Against so foul a calumny, it is sufficient to record an indignant denial of the charge, and a defiance to those who slanderously affirm it, to produce from the Articles, Homilies, Formularies, or Standard Divines of the Church, any other evidence than that of the purest and most uncompromising Protestantism.

As to what the "Oxford Tract" writers may have said or done, let them answer for themselves. We have not read more than extracts from their works, from which it is not easy to form a right opinion.—He that would condemn them, or approve them in toto, would probably be equally wrong. We believe their authors are men of extensive learning, ardent piety, great humility, and godly lives,—such as their calumniators might well desire to take for their pattern. But whatever they are, they are not—the Church:—their opinions are to go for no more than they are worth, and are binding upon no man. If they are found to be at variance with the scriptural doctrines for which our reformers lived, and died,—let them, and not the Church, bear the blame.—For ourselves popery will be no more suited to our palate, coming from Oxford—(which Heaven forbid) than from Rome.

We are not, either, among the alarmists of the day who are startled at what they conceive the increasing strides of Roman errors.—The multiplication of chapels in Great Britain, we rather look upon as nothing more than the doing now what they ought to have done long ago, and providing for the spiritual wants of their own people, who had been multiplying in the country through several generations, without such provision. Neither do we regard the establishment of their Seminary at Halifax with alarm. They have surely an equal right to have one there with the Presbyterians, or with the Baptists at Horton, or the Methodists at Sackville, and cannot be blamed for exerting themselves to educate their children in their own way. It is professedly for 'Roman Catholics,' by the terms of their prospectus, and it will

be prudent for Protestants to let it be so; and if there is danger, it will be our own faults if our children are exposed to it.—Whatever may be our condemnation of the errors of the church of Rome, or however freely these may be pointed out in our columns, we have no feelings but those of kindness for individuals that belong to her. Many of them, both clergy and laity, we have been delighted to number among our valued friends.

By the *Guardian* we are accused of making an "attack" upon the Church of Scotland, and are denounced for the same in no measured terms, and in a style of bitterness so different from the usual honied words of the cautious Editor, that we are led to believe some extra aid has been called in for the occasion. Charges of bigotry, intolerance, and uncharitableness, are heaped upon us with great liberality; and we are threatened with terrible things if we do not behave ourselves in future to the satisfaction of the Reverend Editor.—Now in the first place, we take leave to remark, that such charges come with a somewhat ill grace from those who in the same breath attribute to us the murderous desire of subverting Presbyterianism at the point of the sword. This may be charity north of the Tweed, but not over the border, nor in quiet Nova Scotia.—In the next place, we beg to deny having made any attack whatever upon the Church of Scotland. We did indeed extract from an English paper, in our *Journal of the 5th September*—(has the *Guardian* been asleep ever since?) as an article of intelligence, the account of an interesting ecclesiastical case which occurred in Scotland. But let any one read that article over and say whether it deserves the name of an 'attack;' certainly not so much so as many that have appeared in the columns of the *Guardian* against the Church of England. But whatever it was, we are not the authors of it; and we expressed none of the "satisfaction" and "eagerness" they describe, nor uttered one word good or bad on the subject. And the best of the affair is, that those ominous words about the "knell," which are still ringing in the ears of our accusers, and which they ascribe to us, came from the mouth of one whom no doubt they are proud to call a true son of the Kirk—even the EARL OF DALHOUSIE! To his Lordship then we recommend them to go for an explanation, and not to us. We disclaim all harsh or unfriendly feeling towards the Church of Scotland. On the contrary, we have ever been taught to regard her with respect, and to look upon many of her ministers as ornaments to their profession, and lights in the world. At Halifax our Clergy have ever shewn themselves ready to supply the spiritual necessities of the Kirk congregation, and the kindest feelings used to subsist between the members of each communion. And so may it be still, if a meddling and grasping spirit do not lead any of the ministers of that Church to interfere with the rights and privileges of the Established Church, or seek to draw away her members, or join the radical party that are striving to pull her into the dust.

Some columns of the *Guardian* have been lately occupied in the inquiry, why the Presbyterian Church in this province does not receive the same allowance from Government as the Church of England; and the position is boldly taken that the one is as much an Establishment as the other. If that were true, indeed there might be some reason for the