

THE BEE GULL.

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

VOLUME IV.—No. 16.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, JULY 15, 1847.

[WHOLE NUMBER 172]

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

There was gladness within the mother's breast
As she welcomed the Sabbath morn,
And gazed on her baby's calm, happy sleep
By the light of the early dawn.
And the fervent prayer of her yearning heart
Went up through the silent sky;
And her praises, like fragrant incense, rose
To the Majesty on high.

Ere the thirsty sunbeams had drunk the dew,
Which on health and greensward lay,
Ere the first rosy tint of the distant east
Had brightened to perfect day,
The father knelt low at the footstool of grace,
Rich mercies he asked for his boy,
Ascribing all glory and honour to him
From whom cometh blessing and joy.

It was mid-day, and in those hallowed courts
Which their sainted fathers trod,
The parents presented their treasured child,
And yielded him up to God:
They brought him to Jesus, his promise to plead,
And to share in his covenant rite;
While Christians around responded their prayer,
And angels looked down with delight.

There are who regard the baptized as pure,
From sin's sore disease made whole,
And not needing the Spirit's converting power
To cleanse and renew the soul.
Vain thought! Not to all the circumcised host
Was Caanan's fair heritage given;
And many who here bear the Christian name
Are unwritten, unknown in heaven.

Received by the visible Church of God,
Partaking the outward sign,
The heart may be stony, and cold, and dead,
A stranger to things Divine.
The blessings which Jesus so dearly bought
May neglected, unclaimed remain,
Earth's ploughs may be only in record renounced,
And the vow may be made in vain.

Ah, solemn their duty who take that vow
For the sinful, helpless child;
Uncastingly ought they to watch and pray,
Lost, by worldly snares beguiled.
He should fail to tread in the upward path
Which tendeth to endless life;
And lacking the armento by heaven supplied,
By lost in unequal strife.

The salvation offered by God to man,
Salvation from sin and death,
Is sought for alone by the contrite heart,
Received by a living faith.
No outward washing can aught avail,
While the soul remains impure;
And the covenant must be accepted, and sealed,
Ere its blessings are made secure.

Churchman's Penny Magazine.

CHARGE

DELIVERED BY THE RIGHT REV. JAS. THOS. O'BRIEN, D. D., LATE BISHOP OF OSSORY, FERNS, AND LEIGHTON, 1815.

From the Dublin University Review.

REVIEWER'S REMARKS.—The Bishop of Ossory, in his second charge, shows that Tractarianism and Popery and all other species of the same class, are the results of the common false principles of superstition. The subject which chiefly comes under his notice may be reduced to the three heads of—
the theory of development, the mythical theory, and the circumstances, hopes, and condition of the residuary part of the Tractarian body which still remains amongst us. In handling these, the Bishop always prefers the profounder mode of treatment, showing the radical falsehood of these men's principles, rather than the repugnance of their conduct to the spirit or letter of the Formularies of the Church of England.

Although Mr. Newman's elaborate essay upon the theory of developments was not published at the time when this charge was delivered, yet the foundations of that theory had been so completely laid in his sermons, that to subvert the doctrine of these is, in fact, to confute the essay. We believe that the following remarks give a blow to the theory, which, being struck upon its centre of gravity, is sufficient to overturn it all:

“I do not, of course, mean to sift this theory, for which, indeed, we have no time. But I cannot avoid adding a word on one fundamental point. The author would represent that, according to the views of our own Church, the only question of any importance which can be raised in the case, is not one of principle but of fact—not whether there are developments in religion, but whether certain developments are true or false? I must take leave to add, that (passing by the question which he declines answering, viz., By whom is the truth of developments to be determined,) there is another of very great importance, about which a very wide difference exists, namely: How is their truth or falsehood to be tried and established? This question is one to which you perceive the writer has given, in the substance of his theory, a very different answer from that which is rendered by our Church, and one which puts the written word of God in a very different place from that which it occupies in our articles.

“From the activity of the human mind there will be not merely inferences from the revealed truths, but a comparison of different truths, to determine their mutual relations; and hence what may be called theological dogmas and theories of religion, even where there is not the ability or the mental habits which would lead to the framing of complete systems of religion in detail. This is a natural fruit of the activity of the human mind. And it is almost, if not altogether, as much a natural result of the great diversity of minds, that great diversity should be found in such developments: where, as what they should represent is one. And it is a most important problem, no doubt, to adjust such differences, not merely so as to make subjective religion one instead of being indefinitely various, but to make it one by making it agree with objective religion, which is its true archetype. Now the mode of doing this presented to us in this

theory, is by a closer examination, and a more exact analysis of our own ideas: whereas the true mode, as indicated in our articles, is by renewed and deeper study of the word of God.

“Our sixth article is founded upon the belief, not merely that in Holy Scripture we have a divine and infallible informant as to the truths of religion, but it is the only such informant that has been vouchsafed to us: that it reveals to us the various truths which God intends that we should know and believe concerning His nature and His will, His dealings with us, and his purposes towards us: concerning our own nature, and our relation to Him, our duty in this life, and our prospects in another. Moreover, we cannot doubt that not only the amount of the knowledge which Revelation gives us, but the way in which it is given, is adapted to our nature and to our wants by His infinite wisdom. And the article referred to is founded upon an intelligent perception and a right use of the mode actually adopted in the Bible. For while some portions of the volume are framed to supply us directly with information concerning the momentous subjects referred to, the immediate purpose of other portions is something very different: but we are not to suppose that we are to derive the knowledge intended for us from the former, independently of the latter, or from any portions of the Holy Scriptures independently of the rest.

“In fact, the various constituent parts which go to make up Divine truth, are not arranged in the Bible in due sequence and connexion, after the manner of an orderly treatise; they are scattered, so to speak, through the entire book—what is deficient in one place being supplied by others: what is obscure in one place, being made clear by others: some places taking away the difficulties which others have created: errors into which we should fall if we knew but a certain portion, being guarded against by the remainder: and limitations and modifications which a particular part, whether doctrinal or preceptive, requires, being to be found elsewhere, and it may be, not in one place, but in several,—so that, to possess ourselves of the whole body of revealed truth which God has provided for us, the study of the entire Bible is absolutely necessary.

“The unsystematic structure of Revelation, as we receive it, no doubt makes it necessary to exercise our reason upon it for the purpose of drawing from it the body of Divine truth, which we are to believe. But this office which is thus put upon his reason, and which is very clearly recognised in the Article referred to, does nothing to disturb the proper relation of man to revelation, which is to receive what is given him, and *not to add thereto, or to diminish anything from it*. It gives no warrant to this theory of the way in which our religion is to be worked out by reason: that is by making the great idea of the great objects of religion, which the statements of revelation about them have impressed upon our minds, the subjects of contemplation, meditation, investigation, and analysis: and forming theological dogmas from what they are, what they contain, and what they infer: and then a new series, or successive series, of the like dogmas from what the former lead to in the way of consequence, what they require in the way of symmetry or antagonism, and so forth. This is giving openly to Reason a larger share in our religion than to Revelation—making religion more the work of man, than the gift of God in His Holy word. It does not, indeed, give man a larger share in the work than every false system has always really given to him, but larger than any has ever ventured to give to him avowedly. In fact, it would appear as if, when once it was settled that Holy Scripture is actually a Revelation from God—putting any human scheme upon a level with it, offered too violent a shock to our natural feelings of reverence for what is divine, to be openly attempted. And, accordingly, those who have *laughed for doctrines the commandments of men* have never put them forward distinctly as the *commandments of men*.

The Jews pretended that the unwritten traditions by which they corrupted or set aside the Divine law, were from God himself, given when the law was given, and preserved by oral tradition. In the same way, the unwritten traditions by which the Church of Rome overlaid and corrupted the Gospel, were derived by her from the same Divine source from which the Gospel itself came—either as received from Christ's own mouth by the Apostles, or as dictated to them by His Holy Spirit, and preserved inviolate in the Church; and therefore—on the ground of a common origin—claiming the same authority with the written word itself. And so too in the modification of the Romish principle, which was so long and so confidently maintained by Tractarians, in which Traditional Interpretations of Scripture were combined with Scripture itself, as an integral part of the Rule of Faith—such interpretations were only raised to the rank of Scripture on the ground that they were actually a part of the teaching of the Apostles, which could be proved to be theirs, by the same kind of evidence by which the Scriptures themselves are referred to their authors. All these are figments indeed; but they show how deep seated is the instinctive feeling that it is to Divine Inspiration, and not to human reason, that faith is due: and that, if we have a Revelation from God, we cannot, without intolerable presumption, put any thing of man's upon a level with it—his inferences, his comments, or his interpretations.”

[The reviewer omits that part of the charge which refers to the mythic theory. The charge proceeds thus:]

“A man's best security against Romish errors does not lie in his clear perception or sincere rejection of the errors themselves, but in the clearness with which he apprehends, and still more in the cordiality with which he embraces, the opposite truths. It is often asserted, and too often weakly admitted, that the members of our Church have no such safeguard. It is often stated, sometimes insidiously, sometimes, it may be supposed, ignorantly, that the whole difference between us and Rome is, that she has added certain errors to the truth, and that we have rejected them: so that, whatever is positive and substantive in our religion, is common to it with Romanism; and in whatever they differ, ours is but negative. But however current it is, this is a false and injurious representation. It is a

true account, indeed, of a part of our differences with Rome; but it is altogether erroneous, as regards another part:—Rome has not merely added to the Faith certain doctrines which we hold to be false, but she has added to the substance of some fundamental doctrines, which can receive no addition without being thereby corrupted and falsified. And with regard to such additions, it would be altogether a mistake to describe her as holding the truth, and something more. She cannot make the addition without converting the truth into its opposite. And the correct account to be given of our difference in such cases is, that we hold the truth, and that she rejects it, and holds in its stead her own corruption of it:—while our doctrine is, to say the least, no less substantive and positive than hers.

This is plainly the case in our leading differences. When we assert, for example, that the rule of Faith is Scripture alone, we surely assert a positive, not a negative, truth; and when Rome asserts that it is Scripture and tradition, she plainly cannot be described as holding the truth that we do, and something more. The effect of the addition which she makes, is manifestly to deny and reject the truth as held and set forth by us.

“Again, the same is no less true of our differences concerning the manner of a sinner's justification before God. We hold that he is *justified by Faith only*. Here is surely no negation, but a positive doctrine, if there be any. You know the complicated scheme of justification which Rome has substituted for this simple truth. It is unnecessary to analyze it, in order to show that, in this momentous matter, she does not hold what we do, together with something more; no one who is acquainted with the Roman doctrine of justification, I suppose, would be likely to fall into such a mistake. But the Council of Trent has itself guarded against the possibility of it by expressly anathematizing all who maintain that a sinner is *justified by Faith only*.

“So far, I trust, is clear. And I should hope that you will have no difficulty in seeing, further, that if a man had dropped this doctrine out of his creed, even though he saw clearly some of the errors of the Romish doctrine of justification, and, in consequence, sincerely renounced it, he would have parted with his best security against finally embracing it. This is but a part, indeed, of the loss which he would incur: but it is the only part to which it is necessary to draw your attention. It can hardly be necessary to say, that it is not what man disbelieves, but what he believes, that gives substance and reality, its principle of life and growth to his religion. But it may be necessary to remark, that it is the latter, and not the former, which constitutes his best and surest safeguard against temptations to abandon his religion for that of Rome. And you will further remark, that it performs this lower office through its discharge of the higher. Suppose a member of our Church—I do not mean Divine, but an ordinary member—to see clearly, and honestly to renounce, the errors of the Church of Rome, he may never think of them again, unless they are brought before him in controversy; so far as his conduct and his motives, his devotions and his meditations, his hopes and his fears—so far as his whole daily walk as a Christian is concerned—they are to him as though they had no existence. While upon the positive truths that he believes, he feeds and lives: they are continually engaging and exercising his religious affections—guiding, restraining, and animating him in his daily course. The consequence is, that negative truths have a tendency to lose their hold of the mind, and positive truths to take firmer possession of it. And if one who has reduced his differences with the Church of Rome to the former class, be brought under strong temptation to go over to Rome, he is very likely, speaking generally, to find, that he has left himself without any effectual means of resistance. All the truths from which, if his mind be a religious one (which I am supposing all along,) he has been drawing comfort and support, the Church of Rome will supply no less than his own Church.

“And, as to the errors of the former, why, it is probable that, however important they appear to him at the outset, they have been, in the way that I have described, gradually becoming of less and less importance in his eyes. And that Church is in no want of adroit advocates, living and dead, who can furnish such explanations and apologies for all her errors, as will be likely to take away all the little importance that they still retain in his mind; whereas one who had kept in their proper place the positive truths which his Church teaches, and which the Church of Rome rejects, and above all, that wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, to which I have so often referred, would be likely to find in them an effectual safeguard if brought into the like temptations. He would feel that he could not renounce his differences with the Church of Rome, without renouncing what had been affording him spiritual sustenance and spiritual comfort: what had been the spring to him of his highest enjoyments and his brightest hopes—what he loved most and prized most; and he would feel, that Rome could bestow nothing on him—nay, could promise nothing to him which would in any degree compensate for what she required him to give up. And so it might be confidently expected that the latter would be preserved under temptation to which the former would fall an easy prey.”

REVIEWER'S REMARKS.—The peculiar danger of such a merely negative Protestantism lies in this, that it makes no provision for supplying those real wants of human nature by truth, which false religion so ostentatiously promises to supply by error:—

“There is always enough of a sense of guilt and of danger, even in the most thoughtless, to make it pleasant to them to obtain peace and safety. Indolence, love of pleasure, and love of the world, make it desirable that what is to procure this for should be done by others: while the pride and self-righteousness, which are just as much ingredients in our nature, make it desirable that something at least should be done by ourselves. And, moreover, a sense of the presence of God is intolerable to fallen man, and he naturally desires that religion should be so framed as to interpose something between this dread and his soul.

“All these irregular desires are connected with some real wants of our nature. And for all its real wants, the Gospel makes a full provision. But it

makes this provision in a way which is not intended, nor fitted, to gratify our ill-regulated desires, but to mortify and subdue them. And, on the other hand, false religion, while it makes but a delusive provision for our real wants, accommodates itself to all those mis-directed cravings.

“But these cravings are deeply seated, and widely diffused—restless and importunate—and Christianity was soon modified to meet them. And this was the more readily done, because the corruptions by which it was brought into accordance with the demands of the carnal mind were, at the same time, those which were the best fitted to augment ecclesiastical power.

“But, however early these changes began, they were consummated in the system of the Church of Rome. You know enough of its various corruptions to know that they are but expedients to meet and gratify those desires of our fallen nature to which I have referred, which Christianity, in its uncorrupted state, modifies and subdues, chastens and exalts. But among these corrupt devices to satisfy such cravings, perhaps the corrupt notion of ‘the Church’ holds the highest place. It gives our fellow men to stand between us and God—it gives practically their acts and our own—our own observances—and if need be, self-inflections—as what we are to look to for pardon and peace: it, in short, concentrates in itself, or has collected about itself, all the most destructive errors of Romanism, and has supplied the most effectual means of upholding them all.

“The Romish Theory of the Church has indeed proved to be an engine of boundless power, not merely for exalting unduly the clerical order, and confirming and extending ecclesiastical tyranny, but for deforming and degrading all that is most excellent and most valuable in religion. And in the form in which it is attempted to be re-constructed by Tractarians, it seems capable of doing all the evil in both ways that it ever did.

“Many will think that this is a weak exaggeration: that whatever evil this theory may be able to do in the latter way, it is preposterous to fear much injury from it in the former. To restore, indeed, the reign of superstition and of ecclesiastical tyranny at the present day, will, no doubt, be regarded by many as too chimerical an enterprise to be attempted by sane men. At least it will be confidently imagined that, if a spirit of ecclesiastical domination were now to show itself, we may trust to the lights of our age to keep it within due limits:—there is, it will be thought, in our day too much freedom, too much intelligence, too much information: the rights of conscience are too well understood, and too highly valued, to leave any room for fears on this head.

“I trust we have some better security than this from such dangers, for I believe this to be a very poor dependence. It is impossible to say what extent of superstition, observances—what extent of tyranny over the reason and conscience—an enlightened age will submit to, in return for having allowed to it such a spirit of inquiry. The various false religions on the face of the globe show what burdens men in every stage of civilization, up to the very highest, will bear—all that they will consent to believe, all that they will do, and all that they will suffer—in exchange for the false peace which they find in what is common to all false religions—the being enabled to look for forgiveness to some outward acts to be done by themselves or by their fellow-men—being enabled to take refuge from a sense of quiet and a fear of punishment, in a belief in the power of men, and the virtue of ceremonies and austerities, to give security and innocence to the soul.”

GLEANINGS FROM CHARLES SIMEON.

HIS DEVOTIONAL HABITS.—Grievous as these trials must have been to one of such zealous aims and ardent temperament as Mr. Simeon, it will easily be understood how he was enabled to endure them with meekness, and even regard them as “mercies,” when his eminent devotional habits at this period are considered. We have happily recorded them by one of his most intimate friends. He had been little more than a year in the ministry when he became acquainted with the late Rev. J. Housman of Lancaster: and this acquaintance soon ripened into a friendship which was affectionately cherished by both parties through life. Mr. Housman indeed had peculiar reason for his devoted attachment to Mr. Simeon, for he always recognized him as the instrument of bringing him to a knowledge of the truth; and Mr. Simeon in turn regarded Mr. H. with no common interest, as he believed him to be almost the first of all the members of the university to whom his ministry had been blessed. Mr. H. also, whilst yet a student at St. John's College, had been ordained Priest by Bishop Lincoln in the same year with Mr. Simeon. When preparing to take his degree the following year, Mr. H., being unable to reside in his own college, was invited by his beloved friend to come and share with him his rooms at King's. Here he resided for more than three months; and, as they had a sitting-room in common, he became familiarly acquainted with all Mr. Simeon's feelings and habits. Of his example, conversation, and counsel, Mr. H. was wont ever after to speak in terms of the liveliest gratitude. “Never did I see such consistency, and reality of devotion—such warmth of piety—such zeal and love. Never did I see one who abounded so much in prayer. I owe that great and holy man a debt which never can be cancelled.” During the period of his residence at King's, (as Mr. H. informed the Editor in 1837), Mr. Simeon invariably rose every morning, though it was the winter season, at four o'clock; and after lighting his fire, he devoted the first four hours of the day to private prayer, and the devotional study of the Scriptures. He would then ring his bell, and calling in his friend with his servant, engage with them in what he termed his family prayer. Here was the secret of his great grace and spiritual strength. Deriving instruction from such a source, and seeking it with such diligence, he was comforted in all his trials, and prepared for every duty. The copy of the Scriptures which became the favourite companion of his devotional hours from this period,

“In Mr. Housman's Life it is stated that he received Priest's Orders, “on the 26th of October, 1783.”

a quarto volume of Brown's *Self-interpreting Bible*; which to the end of his life he was continually enriching with valuable notes of his own. So much did he prize this commentary, that in 1837, Jan. 19, he wrote to the author at Haddington, “Your Self-interpreting Bible seems to stand in lieu of all other comments; and I am daily receiving so much education and instruction from it, that I would wish it in the hands of all serious ministers.”

FRIENDS FROM JEALOUSY.—An important trait of Mr. Simeon's character, noticed by Mr. Preston, was the delight with which he observed the spiritual progress and growing usefulness of other ministers, even when there might seem to be a temptation to the feeling of jealousy, as if another were rising to supersede himself. On such occasions he would say, with evident joy and sincerity, “He must increase; I must decrease.” This truly Christian feeling was manifested in a striking manner on his return to Cambridge from the Isle of Wight. During his residence there, and for some time before, his friend and curate Mr. Thomason, who had previously performed only subordinate part in the ministrations at Trinity Church, had been called out to the vigorous exercise of all his powers in the work of the ministry. Through the grace of God he had been enabled to rise to the occasion. No one, who remembers his sermons at Cambridge during that year, when Mr. Simeon was for the most part disabled from duty, will be backward to acknowledge, that his improvement in the course of a few months was extraordinary. There was at that time a richness and fulness in Mr. T.'s discourses, such as was not always found in Mr. Simeon's. This devoted servant of Christ, who loved his Lord with all his heart, and was thankful for His sake, either to be abased or to abound, was much struck and delighted, on his return, with what he saw and heard from his beloved Colleague. After hearing him preach, he returned to a friend and said, “Now I see why I have been laid aside; I bless God for it.”

The generous and affectionate feeling which he habitually cherished, and on suitable occasions manifested, towards those who have successively stood to him in the relation of Curates, is gratefully remembered by every one of them. Considering that the term Curate—honourable as it is, and elsewhere attached to the office of the principal—is commonly regarded in this country as implying inferiority of rank, he was disposed to discard it. “Not my curate, he would say, ‘my brother.’ “Now, my brother, which part of the duty shall I take?” The privilege formerly enjoyed by these gentlemen, of supping with him in private, after the conclusion of the evening service on the Lord's-day, has been spoken of by more than one of them, as peculiarly delightful and refreshing. So congenial were the duties of that holy-day with the temper and taste of his renewed soul, that he generally appeared at the close of the day to be invigorated, rather than exhausted by them. “I am an eight-day clock,” said he, “now I am wound up for another week.” His prayers on these occasions (for he always closed with prayer) were, it may be presumed, some of the least reserved