

The Church.

"HER FOUNDATIONS ARE UPON THE HOLY HILLS."

THEREFORE I WILL NOT BE NEGLIGENT TO PUT YOU ALWAYS IN REMEMBRANCE OF THESE THINGS, THOUGH YE KNOW THEM AND BE ESTABLISHED IN THE PRESENT TRUTH.—2 PETER 1, 12.

VOLUME II.]

COBOURG, UPPER CANADA, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1839.

[NUMBER XXXV.]

Poetry.

TO A ROBIN RED-BREAST SINGING IN WINTER.

Oh! light of heart and wing,
Light-hearted and light-winged, that doth cheer
With song of sprightliest note the waning year,
Thou canst so blithely sing,
That we must only chide our own dull heart,
If in thy music we can bear no part.

Thy haunts are winter-bare,
The leaves in which thou didst so lately keep
Are being trodden to a miry heap;
But thou art void of care,
And singest not the less, or rather thou
Hast kept thy best and boldest notes till now.

Thou art so bold to sing
Thy sweetest music in the saddest hour,
Because thy trust is in the love and power,
Which can bring back the spring;
Which can array the naked groves again,
And paint with seasonable flowers the plain.

But we are woe-sad,
When as for us this earthly life has shed
The leaves that once arrayed it; and instead
Of rich boughs, foliage-clad,
A few bare sticks and twigs stand nakedly,
Fronting against the cold and angry sky.

Yet would we only see
That hope and joy, the growth of lower earth,
Fall from us, that another truer birth
Of the same things may be;
That the new buds are travelling up behind,
Though hid as yet beneath the naked rind,

We should not then resign
All gladness, when spring promises depart,
But 'mid our winniest bareness should find heart
To join our songs with thine,
Strong to fulfil, in spirit and in voice,
That hardest of all precepts—to rejoice.

R. C. Trench.

THE OAK.

The oak but little reck's it
What seasons come or go,
It loves to breathe the gale of spring,
And bask in summer's glow;
But more to feel the wintry winds
Sweep by in awful mirth,
For well it knows each blast must fix
Its roots more deep in earth.

Would that to me life's changes
Did thus with blessings come—
That mercies might, like gale of spring,
Cause some new grace to bloom;
And that the storm which scattereth
Each earth-born hope abroad,
Might anchor those of holier birth
More firmly on my God!

Spirit of the Woods.

THE LIFE OF DR. DANIEL FEATLEY.*

DANIEL FEATLEY, of Fairclough, was the second son of John Feastley, sometime cook to the president of Magdalen College, Oxford. He was born at Charlton, in Oxfordshire, in March 1582. He was educated at the grammar-school adjoining Magdalen College, where he was a chorister, then admitted scholar of Corpus Christi in 1594, and probationer-fellow in 1602, being then bachelors of arts. He soon after proceeded M.A., and gained very great credit for the manner in which he performed his exercises. He then applied himself wholly to the study of divinity, and became profoundly learned in the fathers, councils, and school-men. His renown as a preacher, a scholar, and a disputant, was now so great, that Sir Thomas Edmonds, being appointed ambassador to the court of France, made choice of Feastley to accompany him thither as his chaplain. In this service he spent three years, and was considered to have reflected much honour on the English nation by his contests with the most learned papists and doctors of the Sorbonne. He evinced in these discussions talents so remarkable, that even his opponents could not forbear giving him the titles of *acutissimus* and *acerrimus* [most acute and most shrewd].

On his return to England, he repaired to his college, and took, in 1613, his bachelor of divinity's degree. Soon after, he was presented, by a gentleman, who had been one of his pupils, to the rectory of Northill, in Cornwall. But he was scarcely settled in his new sphere, when he received an invitation from Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, to become his domestic chaplain. Accordingly, he repaired to Lambeth, and received the rectory of that parish in exchange for Northill. In 1617, at the archbishop's desire, he was made doctor of divinity. On this occasion he so puzzled Dr. Prideaux, the professor, with his arguments, that a quarrel began, and the primate himself was forced to interpose. Antony de Dominis, archbishop of Spalatro, was present, and was so pleased with Feastley's acuteness, that, being then master of the Savoy, he gave him a brother's place in that hospital. Soon after, Archbishop Abbot presented him to the rectory of Allhallows, Bread Street, which living he subsequently exchanged for that of Acton, Middlesex. He was also made the third and last provost of Chelsea College. During his residence at Lambeth he held several disputations with Jesuits, and was once admitted to a scholastic contest with the king (James I.).

In 1625, having married a short time previously, he retired from the service of the archbishop, during the great plague of that year, to Kennington, where his wife had a house. At a period somewhat later, he is said to have incurred the displeasure of Archbishop Laud, by a passage in one of his books relating to St. George. For this he was compelled to make a humble submission. From 1626 he entirely laid aside his polemical divinity, and devoted him-

* From the Church of England Magazine.

self without reserve to the study and practice of piety and charity.

But on the breaking out of the civil wars, Feastley had his full share of persecution. This was the more remarkable, because he was a distinguished champion of Protestantism, a man of moderation, in doctrinal views agreeing with the puritans, and esteemed but a little while before one of their special favourites. His conscientious attachment to the Church, however, was held to be reason sufficient to authorise the treatment he endured. In Nov. 1642, a party of soldiers, being quartered at Acton, when they understood that the rector was precise in his obedience to the canons and rubrics, came to the church, broke open the doors, defaced and profaned the interior, pulled down the font, destroyed the windows, burned the railing in the chancel, declaring at the same time, that "if they had the parson there, they would burn him with his popish trinkets." They were very solicitous to take vengeance on the church-Prayer-book; but that a child of Dr. Feastley's family conveyed out of their reach. These zealous reformers also took care to plunder as much of his property as they could. Therefore they lived at free quarters in his house, drank and ate up his provision, and burned down his barn full of corn, together with two stables.

In the following February, they committed the same, or indeed worse outrages at his other living of Lambeth: for on Sunday, the 19th of that month, five soldiers came armed to the church, with the resolution, as it seemed, of murdering the doctor. He had left his house to attend the service; but was saved by a timely intimation of his danger. The ruffians, however, disappointed in meeting him, wreaked their malice on the assembled congregation, one of whom they mortally wounded, and shot another dead upon the spot; declaring, that if they could but get the doctor, "they would chop the rogue as small as herbs to the pot, for suffering pottage (that was the contemptuous appellation they bestowed on the book of common prayer) to be read in his church." Others, in yet more disgusting language, vowed that "they would squeeze the pope out of his belly."

In spite of this outrageous conduct, Dr. Feastley had the courage, a Sunday or two after, to appear again in his pulpit at Lambeth, and, observing some of the sectaries at church, openly to declare his opinions: for which, three mechanics of his parish preferred articles against him to the committee for plundered ministers. As he passed to and fro to this committee, he was not only hooted at by the mob, but was twice in actual danger of his life from personal violence: this he represented to the chairman, and requested protection; but was coolly told by that functionary, that he knew nothing of the matter, and was bade at once to make his answer to the charges.

These charges were very frivolous and absurd. They were chiefly to the following effect,—that he had preached in favour of bowing at the name of Jesus, in defence of the surplice and organs, and against extempore prayer; that he had railled in the communion-table in his Church, and refused to administer the sacrament to those who did not come to the rails; that he seldom preached, and yet pressed hard for his tithes; that he would not lend money to king or parliament; and that he had said that the whole tenour of the Gospel was against that which was preached, in almost every pulpit in London, by those who incited the people to bloodshed and battle. These accusations were most of them false or exaggerated: for instance, whereas he was said to preach very rarely, he proved that he had been a constant preacher for thirty-two years both in England and France, besides being a voluminous author; and that within the last year, he had preached either twice or thrice every week, though he had been engaged in writing annotations on all St. Paul's epistles, and in answering the treatise of a popish priest. But the committee refused to hear his witnesses, and to admit his evidence, (an injustice, as he observes, never committed by the Star-chamber,) and at once proceeded to deprive him of his living. This, however, was a case of wrong so glaring, that the House of Commons refused to sanction it; and Feastley was for some time longer permitted to retain his benefice.

Dr. Feastley had been appointed a member of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, where he distinguished himself, and was commissioned to undertake the works alluded to above. While he was thus attending the assembly, he received an intimation from the king (Charles I.) to whom he had been chaplain, that his majesty was displeased at his being a member of that body, and forbade him any more to appear there. According to some accounts, this message was merely a stratagem of Feastley's enemies to silence him. But be this as it may, he wrote an answer to Archbishop Usher, through whom the intimation purported to come, which answer was intercepted and copied, with several additions, to be laid before the committee of examinations. The real contents, it would seem, after explaining to the king the reasons of his conduct, were only to consult the archbishop on some points of doctrine, to acquaint him with certain proceedings of the assembly, and, on account of his being in straitened circumstances, to request his interest with the king, that he might be appointed to the vacant deanery of Westminster. This application was, to say the least, ill-timed, as it furnished a kind of pretext for the severities now exercised on Feastley. He was abused by the public press as a spy and traitor, expelled the assembly, committed prisoner to Lord Petre's house in Aldergate Street, plundered of every thing, deprived of his two livings, and, to complete the mockery of justice, the articles which the house had previously refused to sanction, were now revived, and ordered to be read in Lambeth church, as if they were the ground of the sequestration.

Dr. Feastley was not idle in his imprisonment. He preached constantly every Sunday to his fellow-sufferers, till forbidden by Pennington, the mayor of London. He also employed himself in writing. One of his works composed at that time was in answer to a popish challenge. To this he wrote a reply, at the command of the House of Com-

mons; though, even for this, they were with difficulty prevailed on to allow him, under special restrictions, the use of his own library, which had been promised to the person who succeeded him at Lambeth. His enemies shewed thereby both their respect for and their fear of Feastley's talents.

Afterwards a report was spread that he was turned papist. He had incurred the hatred of the anabaptists, by a treatise entitled "The dippers dipped;" and they resorted in revenge to this atrocious calumny. Feastley replied to it by a manifesto from his prison: "For my judgment and resolution in point of religion, I profess, before God and his holy angels, and the whole world, that what I have heretofore preached, written, and printed against the errors, heresies, idolatry, and manifest superstitions of the Romish Church, I believe to be the truth of God; and that I am most ready and willing, if I be called thereunto, to sign and seal it with my blood." And then, because he understood that men were now insulting the episcopalian, and demanding "where are they now that dare to stand up in defence of the Church hierarchy, or book of common prayer, or any way oppose or impugna the new intended reformation, both in doctrine and discipline of the Church of England? I do here protest," says he, "that I do and will maintain, by disputation or writing, against any of them, those three conclusions, viz.:

"First, that the articles of religion agreed upon in the year of our Lord 1562 by both houses of convocation, and ratified by Queen Elizabeth, need no alteration at all, but only an orthodox explication in some ambiguous phrases, and a vindication against false aspersions.

"Secondly, that the discipline of the Church of England, established by many laws and acts of parliament,—that is, the government by bishops (removing all innovations and abuses in the execution thereof),—is agreeable to God's word, and a truly ancient and apostolical institution.

"Thirdly, that there ought to be a set form of public prayer, and that the book of common prayer (the calendar being reformed in point of apocryphal saints and chapters, some rubrics explained, and some expressions revised, and the whole correctly printed, with all the Psalms, chapters, and allegations out of the Old and New Testament, according to the last translation,) is the most complete, perfect, and exact liturgy now extant in the Christian world."

It does not appear that any one was bold enough to accept this challenge, Feastley's talents and learning being too well known and appreciated. He continued in his prison, till, through the hardships he suffered there, he fell into a drowsy; and then he made his petition to the parliament, backed by his physician's certificate, that he might be permitted to remove to Chelsea. It was long before this poor request was granted; but at the beginning of March, 1645, he was allowed, on giving good bail, to repair to Chelsea for six weeks. There he spent his time in piety and holy exercises; but, instead of recovering, he grew daily worse and worse. At length, perceiving that his end was near, he made his will. This document commenced with the following words:

"A model of an intended will, to be confirmed and executed if ever peace return upon Israel. First, for my soul, I commend it to Him whose due it is by a three-fold right; my Creator, who infused it into me; my Redeemer, who freely ransomed it with his dearest blood; my Sanctifier, who assisteth me now in the greatest and latest assaults of temptation. As for human merits, I renounce them all, accounting nothing in this kind more truly honourable and meritorious than the contempt of all merits: according to that of St. Bernard, 'it suffices for merit to know that merits do not suffice.'

The next day he made a confession of his faith to certain friends, adding, "that the doctrine which he had always preached, and the books which he had printed against anabaptists and other sectaries, were agreeable to God's word; and that he would seal the Protestant religion, as it was established by the acts of three pious princes, with his blood." He then declared his abhorrence of the covenant, and proceeded, with reference to Church government: "I dare boldly affirm, that the hierarchy of bishops is most agreeable to the word of God, as being of apostolical institution, the taking away whereof is damnable; and that by consequence both the Presbyterian and Independent governments are absurd and erroneous, neither of them being ever heard of in the Church of God till of late at Geneva: nor is there so much as any colour for them in holy writ. It is evident, that as the priests in the Old Testament were above the Levites, so in the New the apostles were above the disciples; and that the seven angels of the seven Churches in the Apocalypse were seven bishops; and that Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna, and Timothy of Ephesus. And for the laity, no pregnant proof can be produced that they ever meddled with the priests' function, or had any power to ordain ministers. And these things (said he) I intended to have published to the world, if God had spared me longer life; which I might through his goodness have enjoyed, had I not been unjustly imprisoned."

The following day, April 17, 1645, was the last day of those six weeks which had been allotted him. On that day, feeling himself just upon the threshold of eternity, he prayed very earnestly against the enemies of the Church; and then, with many heavenly ejaculations, he commended his soul into the hands of his faithful Creator, and apparently departed. Just then his nephew came in, and found him, as he was told, dead, but could not be restrained from administering a restorative, and imploring him to speak once more. Dr. Feastley opened his eyes, and breathed forth the lamentation, "Ah, cousin H, the poor Church of God is torn in pieces." "More," adds his biographer, "he said not, but sweetly and gently groaned out his wearied and fainting spirit, and resigned his soul into the extended arms of his merciful Redeemer."

Dr. Feastley was a man of prodigious learning, and of true piety. In his natural disposition he was kind and courteous, but most resolute and zealous when he felt himself called

upon to dispute for the truth. His doctrinal sentiments were, as I have before remarked, much in unison with those of the Puritans; and he so far complied with the current of the times, as to be a witness against Laud—conduct which those who read his evidence will hardly justify;—yet he was faithfully attached to the Church of England, and for this attachment he suffered. His remains were honourably interred in the chancel of his church at Lambeth.

ROMAN LITURGICAL.

No. XII.

THE TE DEUM.

To the Christian, praise is at all times a bounden, as it is a pleasing duty. He cannot look round upon the works of God, without feeling prompted to its exercise—far less can he bear the record of His merciful dealings in Grace as well as Providence, without a strong impulse to tell out his gratitude in a strain of praise. And when, after perusing the Book of God in our closets, we lay down the precious and comforting volume, what is more natural than a spontaneous burst of thankfulness for the joyous truths which that blessed volume reveals; and what more natural, too, than to give vent to those grateful emotions when, in the house of God, we hear the public proclamation of the same glad tidings! "We are to bless God," says the pious Dean Comber, "for our bodily food; how much more then for the food of our souls? The providing of which for us is the greatest mercy next to that of giving the Eternal Word to us. For if God had not written his word for us, we should not have seen either our sin or our danger, our duty nor our assistance, our Deliverer nor our reward, and shall we not praise him for this shining light? And particularly, what chapter is there, but it contains a peculiar reason of our thankfulness? Whether it instruct or reprove us, invite us to duty, or affright us from sin; whether it consist of promises or threatenings, precepts or examples, it ought to be concluded with 'We praise thee, O God,'—for illuminating our minds, quickening our affections, renewing our memory, reviving our hopes, awakening our sloth, or confirming our resolutions."

Constant witnesses of the mercy and goodness of God, in our creation, in our daily preservation, and especially in our redemption by the Lord Jesus Christ, it becomes us as St. Paul enjoins, (1 Thess. v. 18.—Coloss. iii. 16.) "in every thing to give thanks—teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in our hearts unto the Lord." And in this duty we have a higher injunction in the example of our blessed Saviour. After having partaken of his last Passover, he and his disciples "sung an hymn" before he departed from that upper chamber for the scene of his agony and crucifixion. In subsequent times, when his church was still a struggling and a persecuted society, a learned heathen gives testimony that in the assemblies which, for fear of their enemies, the Christians were accustomed to hold before day-light, a hymn was sung in honour of Christ as God. As described by this pagan enemy of the truth, how strong is the similarity which that exercise of praise bears to the hymn of thanksgiving which, in our Church service, succeeds the first morning Lesson! They spoke it in turn, and Christ in that strain of praise was addressed as God!

This would seem an incidental testimony in favour of the antiquity of the Te Deum,—one, indeed, which is strengthened by the character of its own construction, for if the composition be human the materials are certainly divine; but of this we have no certain record at so early a stage of ecclesiastical history. This Hymn is commonly ascribed to Ambrose, and is said to have been composed by that eminent Christian at the baptism of St. Augustin; but whether this be the case or not, it is certain that it was introduced into the service of the Church as early as the year 540, about 1300 years ago.

And that its position in the devout exercise of the ancient Church was similar to that which it receives in our Liturgy, may be inferred from ancient canons and authentic records,—amongst others, the council of Laodicea held A.D. 367,—which provide that a Psalm or Hymn should be sung after the reading of a portion of the Old and New Testament. This is a judicious custom, and one to be approved not merely upon the grounds already stated, that the declaration of God's goodness, as contained in his revealed Word, should be followed by some tribute of thankful praise,—but because also, "by this grateful variety, the mind of the devout worshipper is secured against distraction, relieved from languor, and enabled to proceed with attention and fervour."

The TE DEUM LAUDAMUS is so called from the first words of the Latin in which it was originally composed: rendered literally, they would thus appear in English, "Thee, God, we praise"; or as our Liturgy translates it, "We praise thee, O God."

"Of the various excellencies of the Te Deum," observes the author last quoted, "its methodical composition is not the least considerable. It is divided into three parts, each, in its original form, composed of ten verses. In its present state, it is observable that there is an odd verse, and that the first part consists only of nine; for the verses which were formerly the first and second, have since been united into one.

"The first is an act of praise, or an amplified Doxology.

"The second a confession of the leading articles of the Christian Faith.

"The third contains intercessions for the whole Church, and applications for ourselves."

In the first or eucharistical part, we begin with expressing our thankfulness to God, and acknowledging his unbounded sovereignty in earth and heaven. Not only is every created

* Soliti essent statim die ante lucem convenire, carmen que Christo dicere secum invicem."—Pliny, Lib. x. Ep. 97.
† Shepherd on the Common Prayer.