

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, JUNE 15, 1839.

[NUMBER LII.]

Poetry.

THE CHILD TO HER MOTHER.

My mother, look not on me now
With that sad earnest eye;
Blame me not, mother—blame not thou
My heart's last wish—to die!
I cannot wrestle with the strife
I once had heart to bear;
And if I yield a youthful life,
Full hath it been of care.

Nay, weep not! on my brow is set
The age of grief,—not years;
Its furrows thou may'st wildly wet,
But ne'er wash out with tears.
And could'st thou see my weary heart,
Too weary even to sigh,
Oh! mother, mother! thou would'st start,
And say,—"twere best to die!"

I know 'tis summer on the earth,—
I hear the pleasant tune
Of waters in their chiming mirth,—
I feel the breath of June:
The roses through my lattice look,
The bee sails singing by;
The peasant takes his pruning hook,—
Yet, mother, let me die!

There's nothing in this time of flowers
That hath a voice for me—
The whispering leaves, the sunny hours,
The young, the glad, the free—
There's nothing but thy own deep love,
And that will live on high,
Then mother when my heart's above,
Kind mother! let me die!

JEWELRY.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.*

Regarded merely as literature, these publications possess a high interest, as coming from the University of Oxford. They are indeed the production of a few individuals, and have no claim to any sanction from the University itself. But they are the natural produce of its institutions, and indicate, like a float on the water, the setting and force of the current of its studies. In this point of view, without any reference to the opinions which they contain, they exhibit a return, and a very vigorous return, to sound principles of education. Every one will allow, that if a century back the University was comparatively torpid, yet the last fifty years have seen a great revival of activity. But its first movements, as generally happens in such cases, were irregular and even mischievous. Original thinking was the object professed. Clever men, too indolent or too conceited to inquire what other men had written before them, sat down to think out subjects by themselves, and what was still worse, threw out their thoughts as they came uppermost, with a boast that no authority had been consulted, and just as hastily as if the welfare of the world depended on the publication of some crude fancy.

By this class of writers the Greek philosophers and our own deep school of Platonism in Cudworth, Smith, Berkeley, Norris, and More, were set aside as mystics; and Locke, the man who, of all others, has done most to corrupt our ethics, unsettle our politics, and debase our metaphysics, was recommended with Paley and certain Scotch writers, as offering to young minds an easy and intelligible doctrine. As they had no supply of facts from experience and research, and the same indolence which would not read could not think, except very superficially, a kind of captious logic was the only field left for the exercise of ingenuity; and words, not things, formed the main end of their inquiries. In history nothing was attempted, because the very highest powers of originality cannot invent dates and facts. Or, if the subject was touched on, some novel German theory, half understood and uninvestigated, was seized on and put forward in a new dress. Of poetry (it is a remarkable fact, strongly indicating the poverty and shallowness of the prevailing principles) there was absolutely nothing. And in theology, to speak of the Fathers was to recall an antediluvian dream. Each man took his Bible, theorized on a text, discerned some new internal evidence, which was evidence perhaps to no one but himself, or offered to simplify a mystery by some rationalistic process, which ended in the unconscious revival of an exploded heresy.

Without any wish to depreciate the talents and personal worth of this school of writers, it is evident that such habits of mind, indulged in the presence of young men, must do harm. They strengthened, and, perhaps, in a great measure, originated the worst errors against which we are now struggling throughout the country. Men were sent out from the seat of their education with the belief that they were to think, not read, judge rather than learn, look to their own opinions for truth, instead of some permanent external standard, and pursue it indolently in their easy chairs, as if any real wisdom or goodness could be reached without toil. And the effects we now see before us.

Happily another school has succeeded of a different kind. One of the most prominent characteristics of the new publications from Oxford is, that they are really learned. They exhibit, indeed, far more depth and originality of thought, and far more of logical power and acuteness, than any writing of the former class;—but there has been added to this as a principle, that 'individual speculation is not to be substituted for solid learning.' And it is satisfactory to those who wish to see the English literature placed on a par with those monuments of labor and research which have been raised in Germany and by the Benedictine writers, that a commencement should have been made in this century, and made in the proper place—the University of Oxford. Already translations of the principal works of the Fathers have been undertaken, with a new edition of the original text. A translation of the epistles of ancient ecclesiastical writers, as the best basis of a sound church history, has also been

* From the Quarterly Review.

planned; and such a general interest in the subject has been thus revived, that the demand for ancient theology in England, coupled with a recent demand in America and other countries, not unconnected with similar circumstances, has entirely exhausted the market.

It is to be hoped that this restored theology will not be allowed, either in the University or elsewhere, to supersede the other sciences, and classic literature. The latter, indeed, it can scarcely dispense with; but the former are in danger of being neglected for a study so much more elevated and inspiring. Of physical sciences especially, it should be remembered, that, having very little root in themselves, they require occasional encouragement; and that, however humble in their sphere, they may be made very useful servants, when kept in their proper subordination: 'Principatum non habent, ancillari debent.' They are a part, though an inferior part, of the empire of human knowledge, and as such are not to lie unoccupied, but to be seized on and Christianized, like the rest.

With this precaution, there is every reason to be pleased with the new impulse given to theological studies. In themselves, apart from all higher considerations, they will give men greater depth and solidity of mind; and accustom them, in all their speculations, to the same careful and serious habit of inquiry, which they are obliged to practise when treading on holy ground. They hold out a hope, also, of restoring a deep philosophy, without which a deep theology can scarcely be maintained, and a nation must soon sink down into a general meanness of thought and action. The more, also, men are brought into contact with past ages, and especially with the treasures of mind accumulated in the ancient theology, the more they will become modest and active and firm: modest, from a reverential feeling towards their ancestors; active, from emulation; and firm, from being supported by authority. It was a wise remark of Niebuhr, that the French would scarcely become a great nation until their studies were closely connected with the history of past ages, and they had learned 'to consider themselves more as but one link in the great chain of nations.' And how much of our own national greatness has been lost, both morally and politically, by losing sight of our relation to the past, we know from the experience of the present. As to the position of the Church, its whole safety necessarily depends (humanly speaking) upon its learning; and its chief danger lies in the individual ingenuity of its teachers. And if, politically (that we may take this low ground also,) the Church is to be maintained as the very ark of the constitution, its learning must be maintained likewise; and men must acquiesce patiently, though with the learning there rises up a somewhat more stubborn and untractable adherence to principles than is always convenient for political partisanship.

In addition to the learning of the Oxford publications, there is something very pleasing and striking in their general tone. Not that they are, for the most part, remarkable as compositions: for the style, particularly of Dr. Pusey, is at times harsh and perplexed, as if formed by an early acquaintance with German writings; and in some, mostly of the early tracts, the attempt to be clear and familiar, when the thoughts are deep, has produced a stiffness and primness, singularly contrasted with the ease and vigor with which the language flows when a natural warmth of feeling is readmitted to it.

But there is—what is so rare in the present day—an absence of self; a straight-forward, earnest-minded endeavor to communicate information and suggest thoughts, which are evidently felt to be of vital importance—which are not to conciliate favor to the teachers or to excite admiration, but to do good; and this, not upon a principle of expediency and calculation, as if the duty was to be measured by its results, but as a message which the messenger is bound to deliver, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear—a message which has its own destiny to speed it—which sooner or later will find its own way—which will work its own way, defend its own cause, fulfil its own end, by a living instinct of truth, whether other minds embrace it or not. Probably much of the influence of these writings has been derived from this right—but, unhappily, in the present day, this novel—mode of addressing readers on religious subjects.

There is, indeed, a result, very common when men of retired and contemplative habits thus resolutely follow out their own views, without reference to the world around them: they must often see what men in the world do not see, and state what is startling; and then they are called imprudent and incautious. Now, that we are startled by opinions is no test either of truth itself, or of the prudence with which it is exhibited. There may exist a deep disease, requiring a strong medicine; and a strong medicine in a weak body must cause a great shock. Thus, if an age has waded far into disorder, insubordination, low materialistic views, rationalism, neglect of forms, indolence, and self-indulgence, they must be roused by setting before them principles of order and discipline; high theories, which will be called mysticism; the law of faith; the value of externals; self-denial, energy, and patience. And this cannot be done without a shock; and the violence of the shock proves, not the incautiousness of the process, but the necessity of its application. Incautious it will be, if these new principles are put forth alone, without reminding men that they are not to absorb them in turn—without balancing them by their counteracting tendencies; but with this, it must be confessed, after candid examination, the writers of the tracts are rarely, if ever, to be charged. If they have attacked ultra-Protestantism, on the one hand, they have struck Romanism with the other. If they have recalled man's thoughts to works, they have not trenched on justification by faith. If they have insisted upon forms, they have endeavored to spiritualize them all. If they have elevated the office of the clergy, they have laid on them an increased weight of moral responsibility. If they have raised the Church before men's eyes, they have taught them to look through always, and

see in it Him who is its Head. Self-examination is enforced, but self-consciousness deprecated. Respect for tradition revived, but veneration for the Scriptures revived too. While men are carried back to the study and imitation of antiquity, they are reminded, also, of their allegiance to the Church into which they were born. Rationalism is condemned, but reason not stigmatized. The study of the Fathers is urged, but the extent of their testimony restricted. Mortification of self is imposed, but superstitious asceticism checked. The privileges of baptism are magnified, yet so as to enhance the necessity of practical holiness. The defects of the Reformation are pointed out, but this is coupled with a grateful acknowledgment of the blessings of which God made it the source. And many other instances might be added. If they are not insensible to departures in our own liturgy from the primitive models, they state broadly that we must cherish what we possess, and that there cannot be real alterations without a schism. If the principle of the Apostolic Succession compels them to draw a broad distinction between the Church and sectarians, they speak of them, particularly of Presbyterians, with kindness, and most distinctly, in numberless passages, disclaim all uncharitable conclusions, inconsistent with the just sense of individual worth and piety, and the untoward circumstances of former times, under which existing arrangements took place. If obedience to the king is revived, it is not stated nakedly, as in Filmer's and other treatises, but is coupled with its own preservative against extravagance—the principle of faith in God and obedience to His appointment, 'whose authority he hath.' And if the system of mystical interpretation is applied to the Bible, there is no sacrifice of the letter, but rather a more strict adherence to it.

These instances may be sufficient: and if these writers are to be fairly criticized, and especially if the panic-fear which prevails of rash innovation is to be allayed, attention must be given to this their ordinary mode of stating truth. Nothing can be more unlike than this to rashness or party-spirit, or is a fairer test of their intentions and good judgment.

One more remark must be made on the general tone of these writers. Their discussions are polemical, and directed against errors, grievous in themselves, and which evidently shock their feelings as well as their belief. But even their opponents acknowledge that they have written throughout as Christians should write, abstaining from bitterness and invective, and from censures on individuals, and with a deep humility and reverence—becoming men who feel that, even in disputing with men, they are disputing about holy things, and in the presence of holy beings.

This is the more remarkable, because they have for a long time been made the object of violent attacks. Even in the University of Oxford, where, personally, they are deeply respected, they are, we believe, sometimes regarded with a certain degree of suspicion and alarm, peculiarly painful to earnest-minded men. We do not quarrel with this hesitation to adopt seemingly new views, in a place like Oxford, or, indeed, anywhere—quite the contrary; and yet, it naturally would provoke irritation. But out of Oxford there has been a violence of opposition far more easy to bear with patience, but far more distressing and offensive to mere spectators. The most idle tales have been circulated, publicly and privately: in journals of all classes; in Scotland, where it was found impossible to give a public dinner without denouncing Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman as enemies of the Church of England; and in Ireland, where it is understood that the clergy with a national vehemence are anxious to rise, *en masse*, against them; though it is acknowledged that scarcely a single tract has ever found its way into the country.

Within the Church of England the greatest opposition has arisen from a class of religionists who avowedly take their views from garbled extracts in a party paper, and even venture to confess, in the midst of their censures, that they have never read the works themselves, and do not intend to read them for fear of contamination. Even bodies of clergy have been found to join in the same clamor, with the same ignorance. Not very long since, the clergy of a whole district in the west of England met—and resolved unhesitatingly to enter a protest against the Oxford Tracts. The protest was on the point of being made, when some one suggested that it might be better to read them first; and, as it was found that this preliminary step had been universally omitted, the society resolved itself into sections to read what they had determined to condemn, and the protest was postponed till the following meeting. We give this as a fact, and as a specimen how little we can trust the real temper of even an age which boasts so much of its gentle, tolerant, equitable, and enlightened dealings, especially with theological opponents.

These calumnies, also, have been reiterated and believed in the face of the most positive denials from the parties accused, from disinterested bystanders, and even from the bishop of the diocese. Men are called Papists who are writing against Popery, with infinitely more of learning and of zeal than perhaps any of their contemporaries; traitors to the Church of England, when their time, talents, and money, are devoted to support it; violators of the rubric, when they are enforcing its authority; theorists and inventors of novelties, in the same page which stigmatizes them as bigots to antiquity and authority; upholders of human tradition, while they are blessing God that the Church rests on no human names, but on the inspiration of the apostles; and founders of a party, when their avowed object is to merge all parties in the Catholic Church. And, after all, there is no party in existence; since, with the exception of three or four friends, other writers in the same cause are evidently independent asserters of their own personal views.

Certainly, to lookers on, there is something very suspicious in these ambidexter attacks. Either the Oxford writers are little short of lunatics, or such charges are not far from libels. And in this dilemma, we should be inclined to take refuge with another class of critics, composed both

of Papists and ultra-Protestants, who have condescended to read what they condemn, and finding the works contain neither Popery nor ultra-Protestantism, but protests against each, and protests urged with a learning and a piety which it is impossible not to respect, have fallen in their perplexity upon the hypothesis, that so much goodness, coupled, as they each suppose, with so much error, can be nothing else but the prophesied appearance of "the Mystery of Iniquity." All this idle violence is very sad.

PRAYER MORE IMPORTANT THAN PREACHING.

Many people stay away from their Church, pretending as a plea, that there is no sermon in the afternoon. We are not arguing the question, or, even giving an opinion, whether there ought, in all cases, or ought not, to be a sermon in the afternoon. But we give our decided opinion that where there is no sermon, that is no excuse whatsoever, for being absent from the prayers. Bingham, in the following passages, tells us plainly, what was the judgment of the early Church, as recorded by St. Chrysostom, upon this point.

"In such churches as had no evening sermon, there was still the common service of evening prayer; and men generally thought themselves obliged to attend this, as a necessary part of the public worship and solemnity of the Lord's day. Some, indeed, in these primitive ages, had their objections against this, which St. Chrysostom, in one of his Homilies mentions, and smartly answers, 'Why should we go to church, said they, if we cannot hear a preacher?' 'This one thing, says Chrysostom in reply, 'has ruined and destroyed all religion. For what need is there of a preacher, except when that necessity arises from our sloth and negligence? What need is there of an homily, when all things necessary are plainly revealed in Scripture? Such hearers as desire to have something new every day, only study to delight their ears and fancy. Tell me, what pompous train of words did St. Paul use? And yet he converted the world. What eloquent harangues did the illiterate Peter make? But the Scriptures are dark, and hard to be understood, without a sermon to explain them. How so? are they read in Hebrew, or Latin, or any other strange language? Are they not read in Greek to you that understand Greek? What difficulties do the histories contain? You may understand the plain places and take some pains about the rest. Oh but we have the same things read to us out of Scripture. And do you not hear the same things every day in the theatre? Have you not the same sight at the horse-race! Are not all things the same? Does not the same sun rise every morning? Do you not eat the same meat every day? Hence he concludes, that all these were but pretences for idleness, or mere indications of a sceptical temper. So again, when some would have excused themselves from these prayers of the Church, by this frivolous plea, that they could pray at home, but they could not hear a sermon in their own houses; and therefore, they would come to sermon, but not to prayers: he makes this handsome reply. 'You deceive yourself, O man; for though you may pray at home, yet you cannot pray there in the same manner that you may in the church, where there are so many fathers together, and where the cry of your prayers is sent up to God with one consent. You are not heard so well, when you pray to God by yourself alone, as when you pray with your brethren. For there is something more here, consent of mind, and consent of voice, and the bond of charity, and the prayers of the priests together. For the priests, for this very reason, preside in the church, that the people's prayers, which are weaker of themselves, laying hold on those that are stronger, may together with them, mount up to heaven.' In another place, answering the same vulgar plea, that men could pray at home, he tells them, 'you may pray at home indeed, but your prayers are not of that efficacy and power as when the whole body of the church, with one mind, and one voice, send up their prayer together; the priests assisting, and offering up the prayers of the whole multitude in common.' This was the sense, which that holy man had of public prayer on the Lord's day, though there was no sermon; and the method he took to show men their obligation to frequent the church for public prayer, which, when men had opportunity to frequent it, was always to be preferred before private devotion. They might both very well consist together, and both be performed as proper exercises for the Lord's day: but the one was not to jostle out the other, or to be pleaded as a rational excuse for absenting from the public service.'—*Penny Sunday Reader.*

THE DESTINIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

Let us carry our thoughts back for a moment to the period of our blessed Saviour's appearance upon earth, and consider what was then the situation of this country [England]. Sunk in the grossest ignorance and superstition, the worshipper of deities whom he hoped to propitiate by shedding the blood of human victims, the ancient Briton could boast no higher place in the scale of civilization than the islander of the Pacific Ocean in the present day. Had the eloquent writer, from whom we have received the earliest account of the state of our country, been told that a time would arrive when the descendants of the despised barbarians whom he beheld, would become a great and powerful nation; that their fleets would cover the seas, their enterprising industry leave no corner of the globe unexplored; and their dominion be extended over countries of which, when he wrote, the existence was not even suspected;—had the Roman conqueror, when he first set foot upon the shores of our island, been told that such would be its future fortunes, he might have been excused for receiving with an incredulous smile a prediction which appeared so far to transcend the utmost limits of probability. Yet the time has arrived when we see every part of the above description fully realised, and when our national greatness will bear a comparison with that of Rome in the plenitude of her power. But while we exult in the distinguished rank which