

word only, but in his works; the sky, the ocean, the mountains, and the flowers. There is celestial eloquence in all these things. In a word, he must be free, noble, brave, tender, and true. J. W. N.

Review.

*A Short Catechism on the Duty of Conforming to the Established Church, as good Subjects and good Christians: being an abstract of a larger Catechism, on the same subject. By the Right Rev. THOMAS BURGESS, D. D., Bishop of St. David's. Ninth edition: London. Re-printed at St. John, N. B., by Lewis M. Durant & Co. 1837: With an Addition to the Re-print. 12 pp.**

"Q. Why did St. Peter say 'for the Lord's sake?'
"A. Because the Lord has taught us by his example to submit to the ordinances of those who rule over us; and not to give offence by disobedience. Matt. xvii. 27."

We very much doubt whether St. Peter used the phrase in question for the reason here assigned: at least we think we could assign a better reason. But let it be even as is here supposed, the example of our Lord shows to what kind of "ordinances" we must submit. His submission was in the case of "*custom or tribute*," a matter perfectly within the rightful and legitimate jurisdiction of the Civil government. Our Lord has never set us an example to violate conscience by a blind submission in religious matters to any Civil power: An instance of this kind would be in point, and would go far to sustain the unscriptural grounds Dr. Burgess has pursued—this instance, however, can never be exhibited. But why talk of such submission? Neither the laws of our land nor the Sacred Scriptures, require it.

"Q. Who is sworn to defend and uphold the Church, as established by law?"

"A. The King."

"Q. How do you mean—to uphold and defend the Church?"

"A. 'To maintain the Church in the unity of true religion, and in the bond of peace.' (See the King's Declaration, prefixed to the Thirty Nine Articles.)"

We grant that, for years after the Reformation, it was the desire of the Sovereign to bring all the subjects of the realm into a state of conformity to the Articles and Ceremonies of the State-Church, and for this purpose *penal* laws were made and enforced, with what effect history can best say. That the "Declaration" in question was made under these circumstances is evident not only from historic fact, but from the very face of the "Declaration" itself. But every person, not notoriously ignorant, must be aware of what is called the TOLERATION ACT, passed in the 1st year of WILLIAM and MARY, and extended by Statute 10. Ann. c. 2., for the relief of non-conformists who were liable to intolerant and oppressive laws which were a disgrace to the Statute-Book,—and more especially, of the further extension of the principle of toleration by the 52d. George III. c. 155, entitled "An Act to repeal certain Acts, and amend other

* Continued from page 125.

Acts, relating to religious worship and assemblies, and persons teaching, or preaching therein;" 29 July, 1812. To quote, therefore, Statutes, or "Declarations," made during reigns of religious intolerance, by which many were compelled unjustly to suffer, and before the Acts of Toleration were passed by which persons, conscientiously non-conforming to the Establishment are relieved from grievous oppression, in proof that the Sovereign is bound to "uphold and defend the Church" of England in the sense which Dr. Burgess attaches to the phrase, "unity of true religion," is perfectly inapplicable,—as much so as were we to quote against the Protestant Episcopal Church of England, Statutes passed in favour of the Romish Church during the reign of Popery.—Though the Sovereign is "sworn to uphold and defend the Church, as established by law," he or she, is not "sworn" so to do by the *oppression and destruction* of other Protestant Churches not so established; but by the Statute-laws of the land is pledged to "uphold and defend" even these in their just and *legal* rights and privileges.

"Q. Do not the laws require an uniformity of public worship, that is, that there should be only one form of public worship?"

"A. Yes."

"Q. What is that form of public worship?"

"A. The form of public worship, which is set forth in the book of *Common Prayer*."

Will the approvers of these answers and questions favour us with authenticated copies of, or extracts from, these laws; by which, regardless of private judgment, and established usages, the various Christian denominations under British rule, are *now* required to observe "*only one form of public worship*," and this form the one "which is set forth in the book of *Common Prayer*?" If such laws exist, what are the penalties of *non-conformity*? If any, we would ask why they are not inflicted? To what source are we indebted for this leniency? Is it to the indifference, or friendly feeling of the champions of the Establishment? We feel thankful to a gracious Providence that this Catechism is not LAW—nor GOSPEL!

"Q. What do you conclude from the form, character, and privileges of the Church of Christ?"

"A. I conclude *first*, that as there is one holy Catholic Church, for which Christ died, we have no covenanted hope of salvation, but as being faithful members of it."

This "one holy Catholic Church" is a *spiritual* Church, and is not confined to any one sect, whether established by law or not. It is true *out of* this Church there is *no* salvation: but it is not true, *out of the Church of England* there is no salvation—otherwise the Church of England is the "*one holy Catholic Church*," an opinion abundantly refuted as well by the previous arguments, as by the positive assertion, already quoted, of Archbishop Secker, one of the dignitaries of the Established Church.

"*Secondly*, that all true churches are parts of the one holy Catholic Church:—"

This cannot be denied: but how many *true* churches are there in the world? We think we have given

some reasons for Burgess's mode of Church, and this (76.) possibly in may be mistaken will the approve press terms, how believe are in the lar information the *British Empire* liberty of saying *episcopacy* essen of England, ther of this one holy

"And *Thirdly* from any true of it, it is to be fear: lie Church for w

Why not say Church of Eng not in communic of God and in meaning of the ed circumlocutio for all, not in Christ did not d in this state of *perish* eternally whom Christ be feared" the there is much i in the extreme- propriation to t of the boundle mankind. We can entertain, of these unchristi JUDGES! Tha and our eterna decisions; othe indeed prove "tion!"

"Q. Tell me uniting with th

"A. *First*, I true Church."

This reason as true as the C

"*Secondly*, The preferre established, the

"*Thirdly*, I Unity to separ doctrines and c and answers ev Christian fello

This can onl tablishment, as *separation*: b *uniting*, which therefore this i to assign a sim true Church: or D. D. to ou of ALDRICH i effectually dete

"*Fourthly*, covenanted sta and brotherly we are passe the brethren." meant the Chr not the same parated from i