

was corrected by Pope Gregory the Great, A. D. 600, whose Sacramentary contains most of those collects which we now use.—Our Reformers, however, observing that many of these Collects were affected by the corruptions that were introduced into the Romish Church,—some being abridged, others receiving additions, and many altogether omitted,—entered upon a strict examination of them all, corrected what was unsound, removed interpolations, expunged the new ones that had been inserted, and restored the old ones that had been left out. Another review took place at the Restoration; when every thing that was deficient in the Collects was supplied, and a correction made of all that was improperly expressed. While we can respond the honest boast that our Common Prayer “corresponds with the best and most ancient Liturgies that were used in the Church, in the most primitive and purest times,” we have the satisfaction of knowing also that in the Collects especially “we offer up those consecrated devotions, which from the mouths and hearts of holy men, have, from age to age, ascended like incense up to Heaven; and have been a more pleasing and acceptable sacrifice to the Almighty than ‘thousands of rams and ten thousands of rivers of oil.’”

Why these admirable prayers received the name of *Collects*, “Ritualists,” observes the writer last quoted, “have given various and apparently contradictory accounts. Yet if we remember, that different Churches had different usages, and that the same Church, in different ages, was not uniform in its practice, these various accounts will be found reconcilable, and may all probably be true.

“Some say they were called Collects, because many distinct petitions are collected into one body, and united in one prayer.

“Others think that they took their name from being collected out of the Holy Scriptures; for the Collects for Sundays and Holidays are for the most part taken out of the portions of Scripture appointed to be read as Epistles and Gospels for the day, or at least they are generally accommodated to them.

“Ecclesiastical writers of great authority relate, as Cassander has observed, that Collects derived their name from their being repeated in the stations, or religious assemblies of the Roman Church. On these occasions, it was customary for the Bishop or Priest, after the Introit, when the people were collected, to recite prayers of this kind upon the collection of the people, or the people so collected. Hence by a little deviation from the original meaning, *Collects* became the general name of prayers conceived in this manner and form.

“But in ages more early than those, of which the writers mentioned by Cassander speak, the Greek *epiklesis*, and the Latin *Collecta*, meant the collection, recitation, and recommendation, publicly made by the Bishop or Priest, of the Prayers which had been privately offered up by the people.—The private prayers were made by the people kneeling; the Collect or public recitation, was afterwards pronounced by the minister alone, the people all standing.

“To me, says Cassander, it appears not improbable, that all these Prayers, which were made at any meeting of the people, even in the morning and evening Service, were called *Collects*; and it is certain, that the ancient Church first called these prayers *Collects*, from their being used when the people were come together, and collected in religious assemblies.”

We have already adverted to the advantage of brevity and variety, which the Collects afford; there should not be omitted the benefit they also supply, in the frequent appeal to the Saviour's merits and mediation which they contain.—Our Saviour earnestly urged upon his disciples that they should present their petitions to the throne of grace in his name: in the Collects, therefore, by the repeated obedience we give to that injunction, we are furnished, as it were, with a safeguard against the error of those who deny his divinity and thus impair the efficacy of his cross and passion.

On the Collects for the several Sundays and holidays in the year, it is not the design of these essays to offer any particular remarks: the consideration of those which are stated use, on every occasion of divine Service, will form the subject of the next and concluding essay of the present series. C. R.

* Shepherd in loco.

THE CHURCH.

COBOURG, SATURDAY, JUNE 1, 1839.

Within two or three days of this date, in the year 1660, Charles II. ascended the throne of his ancestors, amidst the acclamations and festivities of exulting multitudes. The nation almost to a man, rejoiced in the restoration of the monarchy, and felt as if liberated from manacles and chains. The glories of Oliver Cromwell's usurpation,—the terrific splendour which he had thrown around the name of England,—his truly-royal and powerful interposition on behalf of the persecuted Vaudois,—and we may add, his general abstinence from those crimes which usually stain the usurper's purple,—could not reconcile the heart of England, degenerate and corrupt as it had become, to an iron and unaccustomed despotism. The immense majority of the titled and landed aristocracy—the clergy—the followers of the liberal professions—and the sturdy yeomanry, whose fortunes were linked in with those of the possessors of the soil,—although compelled by the might of the Protector to smother for many a long year their unquenched indignation and unextinguished loyalty,—like hounds in the leash or the lion on the spring, were only waiting for a favourable opportunity to shew themselves with availing and seasonable force, to raise up aloft the trampled Crown, to cleanse the Mitre from ashes and pollution, and replace it on Episcopal brows.

Above all, the Christian Patriot, with a spirit akin to that of the gentle and heroic Falkland, hailed the dawn of the TWENTY-NINTH OF MAY with a fulness of joy which words and even looks must have been feeble to express. The hour had come, when Religion was about to free herself from those weights and burdensome yokes which a morose and persecuting bigotry had long imposed upon her. As at the Reformation, she had emancipated herself from the superstition of Rome,—so at the Restoration, she shook off the fanaticism of Geneva. It is not easy to conceive the sensations which would overpower the feelings of many a nobleman and country gentleman, when, returning from exile, they repaired to the churches so long closed against them; and heard that form of Prayer, so long disused, while their recollections were carried back to the troubles and woes which had almost shipwrecked their fortunes, had slain their relatives and friends, and clothed the land with mourning. Yet can we fancy some surviving loyalist, with

suffused eyes, viewing the vacant spaces in the rustic congregation,—once filled by a happy tenantry, who died fighting for their King. We can imagine the thoughtless and dissipated cavalier, driven perhaps into the extreme of licentiousness by the extreme of fanaticism,—we can imagine even him, on treading again the aisles where his ancestors lay buried, and on viewing their monuments, loathing the course of his past irregularities, and chastened by sorrow into holy and virtuous resolves! And if we turn from single scenes, such as we have attempted to describe as illustrative of the feelings of the more distinguished Royalists, how must the honest face of “merry England” have shone with gladness, as the bells pealed cheerily from every church-tower in city, town, and hamlet, dispelling by their familiar and homely music the dark and gloomy spirits of Democracy and Dissent!

But we need not dwell longer on the extraordinary and almost extravagant exultation, with which the morning of the Royal Restoration was ushered in. It is fully recorded in the page of the historian; nor does even the republican dare to deny it, but ascribes it to a momentary intoxication of the public mind. And it is consolatory to know that the principle of Monarchy, though sorely menaced in England, is still deeply rooted in the minds of her people; and that though it may receive a shock in the conflict which we see approaching, all the world over, between Monarchy and Protestantism on the one hand, and Democracy and Infidelity linked with Popery on the other, it will, guarded by Him whose kingdom ruleth over all, issue triumphant from the contest. From these reflections we can deduce a warning applicable to our own most critical position in this Province.

Danger is generally most formidable at a distance; and when we read of the Chartist meetings, of the torch-light gatherings, and of the manufacture and open sale of pikes and fire-arms in some of the districts of England, we are too apt to forebode a general disruption of the frame of society, and the commencement of a civil war! The alarming circumstances stare us full in the face; but we do not think of the checks and counterbalances which a mighty nation can offer to such exhibitions of lawless insubordination.

Notwithstanding that an imbecile and anti-Protestant ministry have tarnished the honour of England in every quarter of the globe, and submitted her once stainless flag to every insult; notwithstanding that profligacy dares to shew itself within the very precincts of the royal palace, and a high-born maiden, the daughter of a chivalric and gallant race, is slandered almost to death like the “wrong'd Hero” of our matchless Shakspeare; notwithstanding that the destinies of the Empire are swayed by the accidental influence which the almost equalized balance of parties has given to a faction, democratic and anti-Protestant in its views; notwithstanding that the sympathy of a Lord High Commissioner, and an un-British Cabinet in his wake, seems warm and strong for ingrate rebels and butchering brigands, and loyalty is either chilled with insulting silence or mocked at as an antiquated prejudice, as an owl that ought to be put to flight by the full blaze of modern enlightenment; notwithstanding that internal convulsion, foreign humiliation, and threatened Colonial dismemberment are amongst the misfortunes which incapable and unprincipled rulers have been engendering, England is still the impregnable citadel of Monarchy. It is in the very nature of her noble people to be loyal. The bias of their education—their domestic training—their inherent mental conformation—the very prayers which are breathed in the sanctuary and spoken at the domestic altar,—all rivet and establish the principle of Monarchy. They would be unhappy without the various gradations that mark society. They would, if deprived of them, lose the strongest incentive to honourable ambition; and having nothing above them, they would soon cease to have any thing below them.

Over such a people, faction and innovation may hurriedly sweep, and work some mischief in their devastating flight; they may even succeed in uprooting for a season the goodliest oaks of the forest, and scattering ruin and desolation around; but their fury would soon be spent, the sun would soon emerge from the clouds, and nature re-appear in fresh beauty and unaltered majesty.

We think that no one need be alarmed about the stability of the Monarchical institutions of England, unless he supposes the duration in power, for years to come, of the party now holding its reins with all the unskillfulness but without the merit of Phaeton's destructive temerity. It is impossible that a nation of Protestant freemen can much longer endure their present degradation and dishonour; and every day accelerates the approach of a period when the matured mind of our beloved Queen, bursting through the clouds that intercept but cannot dim the lustrous purity of her vestal diadem, will unfold its royal and growing excellencies to the gaze of an enraptured people, and gathering strength with time, will restore the glories of the Elizabethan age. Then, like the lady in Milton's exquisite “Mask,” will her christian virtues, strengthened with years, put to flight the revelling herd of Comus that infest her royal abode; and then will the pure graces of a Charlotte or an Adelaide's Court diffuse their holy influence throughout the land.

If, however, the waves of insurrection, swelled by the tributary waters of schism, superstition and infidelity, should dash fiercely round the foundations of the English throne, and our honoured VICTORIA be compelled, like Maria Theresa, to throw herself upon the affections of her people, we have no doubt of the result which the undying spirit of Conservatism would achieve. The first Charles might not remain the only royal martyr in the Church's Calendar; the Church herself might be levelled to the dust; the royalists might be scattered like the Jews; but the day would come,—a TWENTY-NINTH OF MAY would smile again upon our father-land, when in the language of the Service appropriated for that memorable day, “God, in his infinite and unspeakable goodness, [would] in a most extraordinary and wonderful manner, disappoint and overthrow the wicked designs of those traitorous, heady, and high-minded men, who, under pretence of Religion and His most holy name, had contrived and well nigh effected the utter destruction of this Church and Kingdom.”

Whatever affects England,—the heart of the Empire,—affects us, its extremities; and from both at home and the neighbouring republic, we may gather lessons that, if well applied, will, in all human probability, deliver us from the miseries of anarchy and the further effusion of blood. It is not altogether within our province to speculate on the future destinies of this strangely-circumstanced but bountifully-gifted Province, or to descant at large on the nature of those changes which political empirics may recommend, and which, if carried into operation, must vitally affect our existence as a portion of the British Empire. We avert

our face from the horrors that must ensue if Imperial firmness and might shall not soon be effectually interposed to crush the cankering worm of rebellion, and destroy for ever the wantonness of piratical sympathy; we shudder at the phantoms which the imagination conjures up, in the event of England dropping the Colonial sceptre from her grasp, and thus wilfully parting with the locks of her strength; and we mourn, with a prophetic sorrow, over the reflux of barbarism, infidelity, and despotism which will deluge the whole world, if the sun of Protestant England should suffer a partial eclipse, as it did in the bygone times at which we have rapidly glanced. Yet resentfully as we may regard the Colonial history of the last few years,—unsettled as the present may seem,—and despondingly as we may anticipate the future,—as christian patriots, we must not, shall not droop in the season of darkness and uncertainty. Conscientiously attached to the principles of Church and State, we shall maintain them at every personal sacrifice; and although, in these extraordinary days, the advocate of those principles must expect little of honour and advantage, and much of obloquy and discouragement, we shall never eschew them either to gain smiles on the one hand or to escape frowns on the other.—The unhappy Charles,—in this respect truly unhappy, because fearfully criminal,—surrendered his trust and ablest friends to the cruel mercies of their enemies; and though as yet no scaffolds or axes are prepared, a fearless and uncompromising assertion of those principles to which the Sovereign owes her throne, is too often visited by banishment from courtly favour and incapacity to serve the State! It is not, therefore, on temporal grounds, or on motives of selfish interest, that we would urge our fellow-subjects to the observance,—strict, hearty, and unwavering,—of the duty of loyalty; but it is because we believe that the cause of loyalty is the cause of God, and that, if cast down for a period it will re-assert its lost sway,—courted back and enthusiastically welcomed by those who were once its bitterest opponents.

As we understand there is a great probability that the present Editor of the *Christian Guardian* will be relieved from his labours at the approaching Wesleyan Conference, we are desirous, before his involuntary retirement, of still further exposing the means by which he has attempted to create and sustain an excitement on the subject of what he terms a “Dominant Church.” We take this opportunity of performing so disagreeable a duty, because it is our sincere wish, upon the anticipated change of editorship, to resume those friendly relations with the *Christian Guardian* which for the last twelve months we have found it utterly impossible to maintain.

It will be recollected by those who are in the habit of watching the current of political events, that in the course of last autumn the *Guardian* had resorted to various schemes for furthering his crusade against the Church of England. Amongst these, he endeavoured to raise the groundless alarm that there was a danger of Tithes being levied,—and that there was a remote probability of Church Rates being imposed. At the time that these wicked insinuations were most industriously propagated, we narrowly watched the effect they were likely to produce; and although in some instances they were not without an unfavorable impression on the minds of the credulous and ill-informed, we had the satisfaction to observe that they did not succeed in fanning the flames of agitation to any serious extent. Of this the best proof is to be found in the almost total failure of the petitions against the Church, set on foot by the *Guardian*, and confessedly promoted by a contemporary and co-operating journal, the successor of Mackenzie's *Constitution*. So far, therefore, the machinations of the *Guardian* were defeated, without any opposition on our part; and it may seem needless for us to put forth any strength against an opponent who has already fallen by his own weakness. But as a specimen of the arts by which the Canadian public have been instigated to hate and dread our National Church Establishment, we will venture a few remarks on an attempt made by the *Guardian* to press the subject of Church Rates in England into an argument against the Church in this Province.

In the *Guardian* of the 24th October last, was published a collection of extracts from English papers under the head of “*Annual workings of a dominant Church*,” and to these the attention of his readers was directed by an editorial remark in the same paper. These extracts, eleven in number, were designed to shew to those who know little or nothing about England, that the Church there was very unpopular, and that opposition to Church rates was a matter of almost constant occurrence. They were called,—though the source from which they were derived was not acknowledged,—from the lowest radical and sectarian prints; and from self-evidence, they are replete with falsehood and exaggeration.

We are ready to admit that, two or three years ago, a Church-rate was refused in several parishes in England; that then indeed, from the “heavy blows and great discouragements” of those in power, the cause of the Establishment presented a very disheartening appearance. But whence did this originate? Churchmen, long unused to opposition, were taken by surprise; but directly they shook off their apathy, they defeated their opponents in almost every encounter. In almost every contest respecting Church-rates for the last two years, the Establishment has been triumphant. The English Wesleyans, to their credit be it said,—aye, and the few Dissenters who are so for conscience sake, and not on mere political and factious grounds,—have come forward and supported the Church; and in many cases, former opponents subdued by argument and startled by the outward progress of Popery, have become converted into strenuous and conscientious friends.

The *Guardian* would make his readers believe, that the poor are cruelly oppressed by these rates; but with reference to this, we remember reading, a short time ago, the account of a contested rate at Bedford, where a poor man walked nine miles to be present and record his vote for the “Church of the poor.” We have also taken the trouble to look through a file of English papers from August 1833 to April 1839; and out of seventeen Church-rates contested during that period, we find only one rejected! If the *Guardian* must meddle with this subject at all, is he not bound, as an honest man,—to say nothing of his religious profession,—to place the whole truth before the public? Is he not bound to tell his people, as a Wesleyan minister told the parishioners of Windsor, “That the Church-rate is the right of the poor, as being a long established mode by which places of worship are maintained for their use;” and would he not be stepping more closely in the steps of John Wesley, if, with the minister above alluded to, he were to declare,—“I should ill sustain my character and profession as a Wesleyan minister, did I not come forward in these ec-

clesiastically perilous times, and lend my humble aid in defence of the venerable establishment of our country?”

Many of our readers perchance may ask, What is a Church Rate? It is an annual sum, we briefly answer, levied on the householders of every parish, for the sustentation and repair of the parish Church, and for providing whatever may be requisite for the due performance of public worship, and the opposition to this ancient and reasonable impost is one of the devices of modern radicalism.—Dissenters have objected to its payment from pretended scruples of conscience; but, says Mr. BARON GURNEY, in a late charge, when sentencing a Dissenting teacher for exciting a riot on the subject of Church-rates,—“till within the last ten years, no man living had ever heard of ‘conscientious scruples’ upon this particular subject from any class of Dissenters, nor until questions of conscience had been mixed with political feeling. If a man purchased a house, he gave a price subject to all burdens upon it, and he calculated that he should have to pay certain rates and certain taxes, and in proportion to those so had he estimated its value, and he (the learned Baron) had never heard that any one of these persons had paid over to his landlord any sum he might have saved in consequence of the reduction of any tax; and until any man had done that, the less he said about his conscience the better. The Church-rate was an ancient rate payable by law. It was the duty of all men to pay it, as it was the duty of all men to submit to the law.”

These remarks we offer in explanation of the state of the case in England; we need not assure our readers that we do not desire the introduction of any such system here, any more than we wish the establishment of tithes. The latter have been provided against by a special enactment, and the special provision for religion must render their establishment here for ever unnecessary; no law exists in the Colonies for the collection of a Church-rate, and the appropriation for the maintenance of religion will necessarily be made to include the particular object for which a Church-rate was established.

These, too, are facts quite as well known to the Editor of the *Guardian* as to ourselves; and their perversion merely forms part of the system of vindictive though futile persecution in which, like the unfilial Canaan, he has so long indulged against the parent of Protestant Churches. Time and experience drove back the founder of the Brownists (Independents) into the Church, whose unity he had so lamentably marred; several of the Puritan preachers of the Elizabethan age died regretting the schisms to which they had given birth; and few honest men have ever raised their hand against the Church, without deeply regretting it in their calmer and better moments. That the present Editor of the *Guardian* may yet be visited with this honourable compunction, is our sincere wish; and though he is at present entangled in the meshes of a politico-religious controversy, and is too frequently goaded by the spur of a restless ambition, the day may come when his feelings will be softened towards our venerable Establishment, and when in the ensuing struggle between Popery and Protestantism, he will be glad to fight under the banners of the “State Church,”—more piously designated by a distinguished Wesleyan, “The Mother of us all.”

Scarcely had we written the above when, as if in direct testimony against the un-Wesleyan and anti-Protestant course which the Editor of the *Guardian* has thought proper to pursue, there came into our hands an Irish Journal containing an interesting description of a public meeting in Dublin, in commemoration of the centenary of Wesleyanism. On that occasion, where a Rector of the Established Church presided, the Rev. Adam Averell, President of the Conference, delivered, amongst other admirable remarks, the following sentiments, more worthy to be responded by the Editor of the *Guardian* than the taunts and libels he is in the habit of culling from seditious and unchristian prints:—

“In now celebrating the centenary they were thankful to Almighty God for continuing it for one hundred years. They had a fair prospect before them, for this was only the beginning of Methodism. He humbly trusted that they would never separate from the Church of England. From the prospects which he saw before him, he hoped that Primitive Methodism would soon extend through every part of the world, and that while it extended it would be closely united to the Church of England, and that they and the Church would continue one body. Let them (the Methodists) be the humble servants of the clergy—let them continue to live in the pure principles of the church, and jointly labour to carry the word of the Lord every where among the people, until all were united as one people before God.”

Mr. Revington, in following this speaker, said that “the meeting had now heard the oldest Methodist Preacher in Ireland, perhaps the oldest clergyman of the Church of England.” Mr. Robert Connolly of Limerick, in seconding a resolution, said:—

“There are two essential views to be taken of the church as established in these countries. You are to distinguish between its being a branch of the Apostolic and Catholic church as founded by our Lord Christ, and as a national institution, established in these realms by God's providence, under human authority. In the former sense you behold the church the real fold. We see it in this country, by the doings of the reformation, rid of those corruptions and erroneous and carnal inventions which still enslave the church of the apostasy. Yes, think in the church of England—in the apostolicity and uninterrupted course of its orders—in the pastoral mode of its ministrations—in its unsealed Scriptures—its widely opened Bible—its standard homilies—its pure liturgy—its scriptural articles, and its ancient creeds, we have truly a church, a healthy and a fruitful branch, of the catholic and apostolic church. When I draw a distinction between it in this capacity, and that of a national establishment, I don't mean to say that its nationality takes from its apostolicity. No! A nation without a religion, and a religion without an established church would be an anomaly which could not have the sanction of Him who does every thing decently and in order. Kings should be the nursing fathers and Queens should be the nursing mothers of the church. What I mean is, that though the church were not the church of England and Ireland, it would be not less the church of Christ. The church, as the church of Christ, could live without the patronage of England; so that should any Queen, instead of being a nursing mother, act the ungrateful part of a step-mother, it will be found that so vigorous is the constitution, and so independent of all human aid are the resources of that church, that it can live, and grow, and prosper by itself.”

“This, I say, is the spirit of old Methodism. I want to know is this meeting willing to pledge itself to it? (yes).—You have had a hundred years' trial of the church—for one hundred long years you have gone together in close companionship. I want to know, to-night, are you tired of the union? (hear, hear). I want to know will you, as a body—I speak not of individuals—I hold individuals in positive contempt—let them in their individual capacity do as they like—whether preachers or clergymen—but will the Primitives as a body ever leave the church? (no, no, and cheers). I am sure you will not. The body so nobly represented here will not. The aspect of the assembly, though you had given me no audible assurance, might have satisfied me. And as I must con-