

SERMONS FOR THE TIMES.

As the *Tracts for the times* have ceased to be published, we are now favored with sermons for the *Times*, from the same able writers. In the second series, one is entitled—“*The pollution of the Temple*,” from which we take the following extracts furnished by the Episcopal Recorder:

“Alas! alas! the penitent is no longer to be found kneeling in the porch, conscious of his unworthiness to make a nearer approach to the place where God’s name is recorded, and where His honor dwelleth; nor the publican to be seen standing afar off, smiting upon his breast, and crying—‘God be merciful to me a sinner.’ ‘How is the gold become dim, and the most fine gold changed?’ The wall of the holy place has been trodden down, and without a sacrifice, and without a washing, and without a change of vestment, the Gentiles were their proper appointed court. Instead of a saintly Ambrose closing the door against the penitent Theodosius, we have men going about from house to house, who think they are doing God service by holding out to the sinner even the inducement of temporal advantage to attend a place of worship. Who may not come and take a seat in the presence of the King of Kings? and what is more fearful still, who is not invited to take part in a form of worship, which cannot be used without blasphemy by other than a pious soul, and hallowed lips! The very purpose of God’s house is perverted, and its proper work can hardly be said to be done in it. Instead of the fire upon the altar, and the lights of the sanctuary continually burning, and the ministers waiting upon their ministry in the courses, and watching unto prayers, as God’s elect, crying day and night unto Him, we have a deserted and shut up house, as if it were an honor little to be desired to wait upon the Lord. The service of worship, when it is performed, what is it? the reading of a beautiful composition, the uttering of words by a congregation of sinners which they do not understand, or, with an occasional exception) a lifeless form irreverently gone through.”

“Adoration is gone; veneration and reverence are gone; humility is gone; obedience is gone; mortification, self-denial, and the cross are gone. Priestly rule, priestly blessing, and ministerial responsibility are gone; the Word of God is corrupted; the sacraments have been converted into empty signs, and the daily sacrifice has ceased. We have abundance of preaching it is true; it has become a profitable trading in toys; the interesting nature of exhibition being the grand attraction. Like children amusing themselves with a box of fanciful and variegated alphabets, it is, this is A, and this is A, and this is A too, conversion, conversion, conversion, without an attempt to form a syllable, and having an idea that the use of the alphabet is the construction of words. There is no spirituality; no teaching to godly edification; and piety is nothing more than a prostituted name. Zion is become a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation, and our holy and beautiful

house, where our fathers praised Thee, is burned up with unholy and antichristian fire, and all our pleasant things are laid waste.’ Even the outward structure of God’s house has become antichristian, and every thing calculated to induce holy association has either been carefully removed, or studiously perverted. The time was when the distorted visages on the outer walls spoke of the misery of those who were excluded from saintly privileges; and the unclean beasts raging without, shewed their fruitless attempt to find a place within. The ancient churches were built up from the foundation in the form of a cross, to teach the important lesson, that it was by the way of sorrow and suffering that he could come to that joy which was lasting and divine. The arched door said, I am the way, pointing upwards to Him. The arched window said, I am the Light of Life, pointing also to Him, while the painted glass, giving representations of the saints, subdued, but did not obstruct the light, and taught the spiritualists to see Him in His variously manifested likenesses, and to follow them as they followed Christ, as lights in the way to glory. The baptismal font in the porch, or at the entrance, reminded the presumptuous sinner that even the child of days must be washed before he could be received into the sacred courts; and the prominent, yet half-concealed altar, spoke of mercy and of holiness; of majesty and of a condescension; of a crucified Saviour, and of a risen and reigning Lord; inviting approach, but saying at the same time, how sacred is the banqueting place of His love, and how fearful in holiness is even the mercy seat of God. The body of the church was called the Nave, (from *navis* a ship), as the antitype of the ark, tossed about on the sea of this world, and exposed to many a storm and blast, but still the only place of safety. The upper part was called the choir, and shadowed forth the heavenly mansions, where the praises of God are sung without ceasing; and the carved work in stall and canopy, loft and shrine, window and door, within and without, represented the workmanship of the Holy Ghost in the new creation, whose hand-fashions into varied forms of surpassing beauty the rude material of nature. Every ornament was wrought into the form of a cross; while the crocketed spire, pinnacle, and point, great and little, stood like so many fingers silently pointing out the path to the heavenlies, whither Jesus our fore-runner has gone before. Such was the house of God in former times, when worshippers prostrated themselves when they adored; knelt when they prayed; and stood with reverence when they praised God or listened to His word, and the exhortation of His minister. But the wicked have impudently carried their seats in the holy place, and erected their pews there, insulting God to His face, and telling Him by their every act, that the house has become their own.”

From the *Edinburgh Review*, Article VIII., titled “*Toleration of the Reformers*,” No. 53.

“Protestant writers, in general, are apt to describe the Reformation as a struggle for religious freedom. . . . Now, we humbly apprehend, that the free exercise of private judgment was most heartily abhorred by the first Reformers, except only where the persons who assumed it had the good fortune to be exactly of their opinion. . . . The martyrdoms of Servetus, in Geneva, and of Joan Bocher, in England, are notable instances of the religious freedom which prevailed in the pure and primitive state of the Protestant Churches. It is obvious, also, that the freedom for which our first Reformers so strenuously contended, did not, by any means, include a freedom to think as the Catholics thought, that is to say, to think as all Europe had thought for many ages, and as the greatest part of Europe thought at the very time, and continue to think to this very day. *The contemplated extirpation of the Catholic Church, not merely as a public establishment, but as a tolerated sect, was the avowed object of our first Reformers.* In 1560, by an Act of the Parliament, which established the Reformation, in Scotland, both the sayers and hearers of mass, whether in public or private, were, for the first offence, to suffer confiscation of all their goods, together with corporal punishment, at the discretion of the magistrate; they were to be punished by banishment for the second offence; and by death for the third! . . . It was not possible for the most bigoted Catholic to inculcate more distinctly the complete extirpation of the opinions and worship of the protestants, than John Knox inculcated as a most sacred duty, incumbent on the civil government, in the first instance, and if the civil government is remiss, incumbent on the people, to extirpate completely the opinions and worship of the Catholics, and even to massacre the Catholics, man, woman, and child. . . . If the government had followed the directions of the clergy, the Catholics would have been extirpated by the sword. . . . In the reigns of Charles the Second, and of his brother, a Protestant administration out-stripped the wishes of those arbitrary monarchs in the persecution of their Protestant countrymen. It is needless to weary ourselves or our readers with disgusting details, which the curious in martyrology may find in various publications. Everybody knows that the martyrdoms were both numerous and cruel, but perhaps the comparative mildness of the Catholic Church of Scotland, is not so generally known. Knox has invested the matter with commendable diligence, but has not been able to muster more than eighteen martyrs who perished by the hand of the executioner, from the year 1500, when heresy first began, till 1559, when the Catholics had no longer the power to persecute. . . . It is, indeed a horrid list; but far short of the numbers, who, during the twenty-two years immediately previous to the Revolution, were capitally executed in Scotland for the ‘wicked error’ of separation from the worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church.”

THE “GLORIOUS REVOLUTION” OF 1688.

From an article by a young and talented Irishman, Mr. Torrens M’Cullagh, in the *North of England Magazine* for November, we make the following extract upon the nonsensical stories circulated by Hume and other romancers, concerning the Revolution of 1688. Mr. M’Cullagh, it may be well to mention, is not a Catholic.

False Pretences of the Successful Rebellion of 1688.—Judging from the language of terror used in public by the friends of the revolution, while it was preparing, and during its progress, one would suppose that if James did not really possess some vast and irresponsible resources of political or military power, they at least were under the delusion that he did, and that he was gradually undermining the civil and religious liberties of the land. It was said that he had organized a Catholic army, or at all events, had removed most of the Protestant officers, and supplied their places with those of his own persuasion. Some light is thrown on this matter by a letter of Colonel A. Norton, giving an account of the state of the regiments stationed at Hounslow, in the summer of 1688. “In our regiment,” he says, “the number of Catholics was very inconsiderable, being but one lieutenant, a quartermaster, and thirteen troopers.” (Macpherson; Orig. Papers. i. 285.) So much for the Popish army in the fourth year of this dangerous reign. But James relied, it was said, on the Catholic population, who on a signal being given were ready to rise en masse, burn the city, and exterminate the defenceless Protestant population. William affected to enter fully into all these apprehensions. Indeed from the stress laid thereupon in his memorable declaration, it would seem that but for the duty imposed upon him by Providence, of delivering the trembling and defenceless British nation, he would have been rather at a loss for a decent excuse for invading his father-in-law’s realm. An indecent pretence he had to be sure respecting the Prince of Wales—of which a word or two by and by. But being rather an indifferent husband, a worse than indifferent nephew, it behoved him to talk the more loudly in public about his regard for religion. His allies among the nobility likewise, having a wondrous repugnance to resting the quarrel upon any distinct or tangible ground of political rights, sagaciously strove to rivet attention upon vague and invisible dangers; and when the deposition of James was effected, without the burning of London by the Jesuits, or the massacre of the entire peasantry of the southern counties by the Irish troops, both of which had been prognosticated during several weeks—both houses of parliament voted a day of solemn thanksgiving for the merciful escape vouchsafed to the nation from Popery and slavery. And now let us see what these honest men meant by their danger! In King William’s box an unpublished census was found, taken immediately after his accession, at his express desire, of the comparative number of churchmen, dissenters, and Catholics in England, and the following is the result:—Conformists, 477,254; Non-conformists, 108,676; Pa-