

## Reviews.

**FLOREAT ECCLESIA: A MANUAL OF CHURCH POESY:** By Miss ROSA RAINE, Authoress of "The Queen's Isle," &c. London: John Hughes, 12, Ave-Maria Lane, 1851.

If there is little to startle or excite, in this small volume, there is much to please and edify. The fair authoress demonstrates herself to be a dutiful and loving daughter of the Anglican Church, and her comprehensive sympathies find congenial themes in all legitimate endeavours to build up and extend the Heaven-founded fabric.

Miss Raine is not altogether a stranger to the readers of the *Church*. Not long ago we transferred to our columns a telling lyric from the volume under review, entitled "A Guinea a Year," the delicate and well-directed satire of which, we are certain, was generally appreciated.

The versification of *Floreat Ecclesia* is correct and flowing—the illustrations pertinent and artistically managed—and a refreshing vein of piety pervades its pages. Wanting the breadth and richness of the *Christian Year*, it is still not unworthy to occupy a place on the same shelf with that exquisite galaxy of sacred song—and in saying this we confer upon the volume the highest measure of praise which it is possible to bestow.

Almost at random we select the following stanzas, which will be read with peculiar interest by many an Anglo-Canadian.

## THE EMIGRANTS HOME.

From the home of their fathers where soft breezes blow  
To a far distant land the poor emigrants go;  
From the dear haunts of childhood, the cot by the hill,  
The daisy-starr'd meadow, the bright flowing rill;  
They are parted for ever, to visit no more,  
The Church where their ancestors worshipp'd of yore,  
From whose ivy-hung steeple such harmonies swell,  
In the far-floating sound of the sweet Sabbath-bell.

They go forth, the wild perils of ocean to brave;  
They will raise the log hut where dark forest-boughs  
Wave;

They will fell the old trees—and the broad prairie plain  
Shall smile with ripe harvests of full golden grain:  
Fair children shall gather around the bright hearth;  
They will learn to forget the dear land of their birth;  
A new village will spring in the fern-shadow'd dell—  
Ah! where is the sound of the sweet Sabbath-bell?

Oh! Church of the father-land rise in thy might—  
Let the steps of lone exiles be guided aright!  
Soon may the white steeple in beauty be seen  
Up-peering the dark foreign foliage between:  
It will seem to the hearts of the long banished land  
Like a soul-cherish'd glimpse of their own native land:  
So shall joy light the spot where the emigrants dwell,  
With the home-thrilling sound of the sweet Sabbath-bell.

BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE, October 1851. Toronto: T. Maclear.

What, this number of the good old Scottish Tory, lacks in brilliancy, it makes up for in solid and useful matter. The papers on New Zealand, and California contain a mass of well digested information. Alison contributes one of his excellent historical essays, the subject being "The Italian Revolution" of 1848—and Bulwer's "Novel" which improves as it grows older, is "advanced a stage."

## THE ANGLICAN CRISIS.

The heading which he have adopted for this article is borrowed from a source to which we have been heretofore indebted for similar obligations. Those of our readers who need not our information of that fact, will not be surprised, that the able and thoughtful article, from which we have taken it, should have turned our attention to its subject. And even to those who have not seen the article to which we allude, it will be no matter of surprise, that our thoughts should have taken that direction. For we have published within the last few months several articles, which, although neither designed as, or in fact forming, a series, are not without their connexion, either with each other, or with the present subject.

That the Church of England is at present involved in a crisis, we suppose few would be disposed to deny. It is a trite remark, that to the great bulk of mankind, the events of their own time, and even the events of the day which is passing over them, always appear in the light of a crisis. The remark is undoubtedly true. But it is also true, that there are great crises, important stages in the progress of events, of which the contemporaries and actors do not perceive the importance. The two truths are not unconnected. The consciousness of the tendency first alluded to, prevents men from having confidence in their own opinions, and in avoiding the vulgar error, which raises every difficulty into a crisis, they fail to estimate the value of the actual crisis which is going on. We believe that many of the actors now upon the stage in England, do not at all understand the importance or extent of the crisis which at this moment exists in the Anglican Church. Those who are most impressed with its importance, consider it as merely a struggle between different parties in the Church; while a very much larger number regard it as being nothing more than an outbreak, occasioned by the absurd opinions of a few Oxford clergymen, and the ridiculous practices of some parish ministers. These treat the whole affair with contempt. For ourselves, we must so far subject ourselves to their

contempt, as to assert our belief, that we are in the midst of a crisis, not merely of the Anglican communion, in the widest sense of the phrase, but of the whole Western Church, including all the Churches and sects which rightfully or wrongfully claim to be Christian west of the Adriatic, and those which, in any part of the globe are in communion with, or descended from, any of them.

We believe this is the third crisis, or step, in a great struggle which is now entering upon its tenth century of existence. The first being the Hildebrandine conflict, and the second, the Reformation. The third crisis, like both the others, we might say like every other crisis, is an attempt to put upon a right footing, affairs which have taken a wrong direction. Both the more ancient efforts have failed, and it is not improbable that the third may also fail; but both of the others made some progress towards their proper object. They failed because of mistakes, both in what was attempted, and in the mode of attempting it; yet either of them did enough to entitle it, and those who moved in it, to the gratitude of mankind. Our readers perceive that we consider the present crisis, as not having arisen out of a temporary state of things in the University of Oxford, or in the ambition of the individuals who call themselves Archbishop of Westminster and Successor of St. Peter. On the contrary, we believe, that it is the consequence of what has gone before it, in the history of the Church, and that the Church of England would have been agitated just as she is now, had Pius IX, Cardinal Wiseman, and Drs. Pusey and Newman, all remained in obscurity, or even never been born. It is, of course, much more probable, that the places of such "weak ministers" as Lord John Russell, Bishop Hampden, and Mr. Gorham, would have been filled no matter by whom, had they not arisen at the moment when it was necessary that an attack should be made upon the liberties of the Church.

In the origin of the Anglican Crisis, there are several causes at work. A few numbers back we took occasion to speak of the various schools into which Churchmen are divided. We attempted to shew, that while the true position of the Church was upon a certain body of mysterious doctrine, which has acquired the name of "The Sacramental System," there were, on both sides of that position schools which destroyed the truth, by explaining away, upon opposite principles, the mysteries of the true system. On the one hand, we hear much of "the simplicity of the Gospel," a phrase not to be found in the New Testament,\* and of simple doctrines, which are nowhere to be met with in the Sacred Scripture, while little is said of "the mystery of the Gospel," or "the mystery of Christ," phrases which do occur.† On the other side, we hear a great deal about mysteries, but find a great impatience of their remaining such; they must all be brought down to the level of the human understanding, although in process they may be sometimes transmuted into absurdities.

In that article we took occasion to remark, that while on one side of the truth, the errors took altogether one direction, that of exaggerating that which may be called the physical element in religion; on the other, they divided into two classes, which, while they agreed in rejecting, or at least, in undervaluing, that element differed from each other in magnifying, one the spiritual, and the other the intellectual, element. We further observed, that those errors which are connected with exaggerated ideas of the spiritual element, have a continual tendency to run off into that other class which reduces religion to a merely intellectual system. This last system is the true extreme antagonist of Romanism, rejecting its truths and its errors together, and certainly fulfilling the condition which is now popularly required in religion, of being as far from Romanism as possible. We however, are not prepared to acquiesce in any such negative test of truth. We hold, that, even in human knowledge, extreme opinions are generally errors, and truth, agreeably to the old adage, lies between. But in religion, which to be true, must be revealed, and must contain doctrines not discoverable by the human intellect, a merely intellectual scheme must be the most remote from truth.

These three systems, the Sacramental, the Romish, and the intellectual, or rather the schools which hold them fully or partially, are now struggling for the mastery of the Church of England, and one or other of them must prevail. It is amusing to observe the so called "Evangelicals" rejoicing for the first time, in the possession of the primacy, and flattering themselves that they are about to become the ruling party in the Church of England, while in reality they are on the eve of extinction. The system as in itself, as all history has shewn, a tendency to fall over to the intellectual system; which is now, as it has ever been, the

\* The phrase, "the simplicity that is in Christ," indeed occurs in 2 Cor. xi. 3; but it is plainly used not with any reference to doctrine but to conduct. The simplicity there meant, is the simplicity of unhesitating obedience, of undoubting faith, for it is contrasted with the condition of Eve, who was beguiled by the subtlety of the serpent. It has no relation to the doctrine of Christ, which it is very strange to call simple; since it involves the most stupendous mysteries.

† Ephesians iii. 4, vi. 19—see also Colossians i. 26, 27.

favorite of the ruling powers of the world. Those powers have honoured Dr. Summer, because things were not yet ripe for a worse man. He may keep the archiepiscopal throne warm for a few years, till Dr. Hampden, or some other "Liberal," is ready to occupy it. In the meantime the "Evangelicals," blinded by their hatred of Rome, yield to the blandishments of the court, and join in attacking that school, whose principles have really the greatest similarity to their own, and aiding that whose tendencies are decidedly anti-Christian, and which, designs them no other favor than that they shall be the last deposed.

Each of the three, schools, which are now really struggling for mastery, with some possibility of success; that is, the sacramental, the Romish, and the Intellectual, has a natural connexion with a certain view of the Church. The idea of a Church which, although visible, "has authority in matters of faith," is an essential principle of the Sacramental system. The Romanist exaggerates authority into infallibility, and the visibility of the Church into the visibility of its head. The Rationalist denies the visibility of the Church and its authority altogether. Each of these false systems acquires an ally by these errors. The pretended visible head of the Church acquires, by his position as such, no small amount of spiritual, or seemingly spiritual, as well as of temporal power. All of these he eagerly employs in the support that school, which acknowledges his claims. Those, on the other hand, who deny the authority and visibility of the Church, reduce the associations, which they call Churches, to the condition of mere religious clubs, in all respects subject to the authority of the civil governments, which recognize and protect them. When this idea is coupled with the fact, or the notion, that any such institution is endowed by the state, the right of the state to govern it absolutely, is easily and naturally inferred. This notion is easily introduced where there is an ancient and extensive endowment, which has been long protected by the state, and the laws respecting which have come to form a considerable part of the national code. When it is introduced, there is no difficulty in coupling with it the other idea, to which we have adverted, and it then follows, that the Church is a department of the state. In the United States this consequence does not practically follow, partly, because the state of things is not what we have supposed, and partly, because of the jealousy of the intermeddling of government, which is one of our national characteristics. We consider our government, not so much in the light of the supreme earthly authority, as in that of certain powers, delegated to certain persons, for certain purposes. In a word, we regard the state itself as a great club, which has no right to meddle in the concerns of any other club. But the Erastian principle finds its vent here, in the shape of an over-weening regard for the rights of the laity, and a profound deference for public opinion.

No one is more attached than ourselves, to the principle of lay participation in the government of the Church. But that is a very different thing from the monopoly of all power, which is in some places, and at some times, exercised by them among us, although never directly claimed upon any principle, other than the principle that they have the power, and therefore, the right, to starve the clergy, who resist them in carrying their notions into effect.

This brings us to a part of the subject, which will be better understood by adverting, for a few moments, to the nature of a Church. In so doing, we shall require no more accurate definition, than that it is a religious society for the conducting of public worship. A definition which will include all the Churches and pseudo-Churches in the world. As a religious society, there belongs to every Church two-things, which are in fact the two great divisions of religion, the *Credenda* and the *Agenda*, the things to be believed and the things to be done. But besides these things, which belong to the Church as it is religious, and intended for the conducting of public worship, there is another, which belongs to it simply as a society, that is government. Every Church must have these three things, and they must be regulated by the laws of the Church; which distribute the powers of government establish the terms of Communion, and prescribe the ritual, however bald, or however gorgeous that ritual may be. But these laws, like all other laws, are liable to be disobeyed, and accordingly as they are observed with more or less accuracy, the members of the Church are more or less imbued with her true spirit, and the character of the Church is more or less disguised in the eyes of those who take a practical, not a theoretical, view of that character.—When the spirit which pervades the true institutions of the Church, ceases to pervade her members, the Church is practically in an unsound state and is, moreover, in danger of having her theories bought to a conformity with their practice; since her laws are liable to be altered by the governing portion of the society, and that portion will partake of the spirit of the whole body, out of which it is taken. Or if that is not the case, the laws will cease to be enforced, and the belief and practice of the whole body will be gradually drawn farther and farther from the written standards of the

Church itself. There are, or have been, so called Churches which have a ritual which is never used and others in which it is not easy to find an individual who really receives the dogmas of the un-repealed Church symbols.

It is then possible, that, besides the genuine doctrines of a Church which are contained in her symbols and formularies, there should be prevalent within her pale another set of doctrines, which may be called her pseudo-doctrines, since they are believed to be such by her people. So there may be a false ritual usage, which in the eyes of the bulk of the members of the Church in a particular locality, or even throughout a branch of the Church may possess Church authority, although it has no other than that of custom. An instance of this sort, is the usage of preaching in a black gown in the Church of England, which by long use, has come to be supposed authorised by the Church, and the gown itself is currently called "canonicals;" although instead of being the canonical dress, it is virtually prohibited, in the performance of any part of Divine Service, by the regulations of that Church. The attempt however to return to the surplice, the true canonical dress, was popularly considered to be contrary to the laws of the Church.

But as there may be, in a Church, pseudo-crendenda, and false agenda, so there may be a government different from that which is prescribed by the constitutions of the Church; but then it can scarcely be called a pseudo-government, for it is too generally the real government. It is a power behind the government, which is greater than the government itself. It controls the government by controlling the means of subsistence of the members of the government, compels disobedience to the laws, by controlling the means of subsistence of those whose duty it is to enforce the laws. This power is possessed, by those who possess the patronage of the Church.

In the Primitive Church, the patronage of the Church was in the hands of its governors. Every clergyman was so long as he conducted himself properly, entitled to a subsistence out of the funds of the diocese to which he belonged, and none was entitled to more. Of this right to a subsistence; a clergyman could be deprived only by a regular judicial proceeding. The only patron from whom he received his original right, was the bishop who enrolled him among his clergy. This was done on two occasions, that of ordination and that of change of diocese. A bishop had an unquestioned right to refuse to enroll among his clergy, one who came from another Diocese; but the only consequence was, that the refused clergyman retained his right to a subsistence in his old diocese. If ordination were refused, the refused party, remaining a layman, was at liberty to provide for himself like other laymen. There was no such thing as a clergyman unprovided for, and no such great diversity of conditions among the clergy, as to render change of diocese very important to a man's pecuniary interest.

Among the bishops, the differences were greater; in a poorer or richer diocese, the bishop's income was materially smaller or larger. But then transmutation was very unusual, and in most cases impossible; while the income of the poorest bishop was sufficient to secure him from absolute want.

The connexion between the Church and the state, which commenced in the time of Constantine broke up all this. The difference in the value, and still more, in the political importance of particular sees, was greatly increased, and as the emperors assumed the right of naming the bishops, translations became first possible, then frequent. The institution of parishes introduced a similar inequality among the presbyters, as to their pecuniary condition, and the introduction of individual lay patronage, which accompanied that institution, was the introduction of a new element of power into the government of the Church. Thus was commenced that other government, of which we have spoken, and which has been sometimes not unhappily called the external episcopate.

The struggle for the possession of this external episcopate, or power of controlling the Church in and through worldly matters, external to her true character, though necessary to her existence, has been going on ever since its invention. It has been intimately connected with the conflicts about doctrine to which we have alluded, and the two together have now for about nine hundred years occupied the attention and employed the energies of the Western Church. In this long contest, there have been three stages, each of which is sufficiently marked to entitle it to the name of a great crisis. The Hildebrandine or Gregorian contest in the eleventh century, the Reformation in the sixteenth, and that which is now commencing in the nineteenth.

In all these, the question of patronage has been a prominent cause of the contest. The power of patronage has been sought by different ultimate objects; but by all as a means of controlling the Church, of participating in the external episcopate. The influence, when acquired, was to be used by some for the public good, by others for private purposes, by some for reformation of abuses in the Church by others for the consolidation, or enlargement, of their own temporal power. But in all, there has been a mixture of motives, and an adop-