

# The Church

VOLUME VII.—No. 19.]

COBOURG, CANADA, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1843.

[WHOLE NUMBER, CCCXXXI.]

## Poetry.

### THE POOR MAN AND HIS PARISH CHURCH.

THE POOR MAN AND HIS PARISH CHURCH.  
By the Vicar of North-west, Cornwall.

The Poor have Heads, and Feet, and Eyes,  
And a Feeling Mind,  
They breathe the Breath of Moral Sense—  
They are of Human Kind!  
They weep such Tears as others shed,  
And now and then they smile,  
For sweet to them is that poor Bread  
They win with honest Toil!

The Poor Men have their Wedding Day,  
And Children climb their Knees—  
They have not many Friends, for they  
Are in such Numbers!

They sell their Youth, their Skill, their Pains,  
For Hire, in Hill and Glen,  
The very Blood within their Veins  
It flows for other Men!

They should have Roofs to call their own  
When they grow Old and Bent,  
Mock Hoarse with cold, and many Sore,  
When Labour's Moniment!

There should they dwell beneath the Thatch  
With Threshold calm and free—  
No Stranger's Hand should lift the Latch  
To mark their Poverty.

Fast by the Church those Walls should stand,  
Her Aides in all their need,  
They have no Home in all the Land  
Like that Old House of God!

There! there! the Sacrament was shed  
That gave them Heavenly Birth,  
And lifted up the Poor-Man's Head  
With Princes of the Earth!

There in the Chancel's Voice of Praise  
Their simple Yaws were heard,  
And Angels look'd, with equal Gaze,  
On Lazarus and his Lord!

There too, at last, they calmly sleep  
Where hallowed Blossoms bloom—  
And Eyes as fond and faithful weep,  
As over the Rich Man's Tomb!

They told me of an Ancient Home  
Beside a Churchyard Wall,  
Where Roses round the Porch would roam,  
And gentle Jasmies fall!

There dwelt an Old Man, worn and blind,  
Poor, and of lowly Birth,  
He seem'd the Last of all his Kind,  
He had no Friend on Earth!

Men saw him, till his eyes grew dim,  
At Noon and Evening-Tide,  
Past mid the Graves with tottering Limb,  
To the Grey Chancel's Side!

There knelt he down, and meekly pray'd  
The Prayers his Youth had known—  
Words by the Old Apostle said,  
In Tongues of ancient Tone!

At Noon-Time, at Evening-Hour,  
He bent with reverent Knees,  
The Dial carved upon the Tower  
Was not more true than he!

This lasted till the Blindness fell  
In Shadows round his Bed,  
And on the Wall of his Cell  
He look'd—and they were dead!

Then would he watch and fondly turn,  
If Feet of Men were there,  
To tell them how his Soul would yearn  
For the Old Place of Prayer!

And some would lead him on, to stand  
While faint their Tears would fall,  
Until he touch'd the Holy Wall,  
The long-accustom'd Wall!

Then joy in those dim Eyes would melt,  
Faith found the former Tone—  
His Heart, within his Bosom, felt  
The Touch of every Stone!

He died—He slept beneath the Dew,  
In his own grave of Coffin-knew  
The Corpse within the Coffin-knew  
That consecrated Ground!

I know not why—but when they tell  
Of His grave side-by-side,  
Where Troops of Poor Men go to dwell  
In Chambers side by side—

I dream of that Old Cottage Door  
With Carvings on the Wall,  
And with the Children of the Poor  
Had Flowers to call their own!

And when they taunt, that in those Walls  
They have their Worship-Day,  
Where the Stern Signal loudly calls  
The Prisoner Poor to pray—

I think upon that Ancient Home  
Beside the Churchyard Wall,  
Where Roses round the Porch would roam  
And gentle Jasmies fall!

I see the Old Man of my Lay,  
His Gray Head bow'd and bare,  
He kneels by One Dear Wall to pray—  
The Sunlight in his Hair!

Will they not strive as Wise Men will,  
To work with Wit and Gold,  
I think my own dear Cornwall still  
Was happier of Old!

O! for the Poor Man's Church again!  
With one Roof over all,  
Where the True Hearts of Cornish Men  
Might Rest beside the Wall!

The Altar, where in holier Days  
Our Fathers were forgiven;  
Who went with meek and faithful ways  
Through the Old Aides to Heaven!

Festival of St. John the Baptist, 1843.

### THE REFORMATION.

(By the Rev. W. Grealey.)

At the distance of three hundred years, we ought to be able to look back on the events of the Reformation with calmness, and to discern more justly than those who lived amongst them, the springs and tendencies of that great revolution. If we are not able to do so, it is but one amongst many proofs of the vitality of traditional feelings, and the tenacity with which antipathies and prepossessions engrain themselves in the hearts of men from generation to generation.

Let us endeavour, with as much absence of prejudice as we may, to take a brief survey of the Reformation in its various bearings.

In the first place, it must be looked on as a removal of abuses, and a restoration of the Church to her ancient purity. This is the true view of it. This is what the English Reformers themselves aimed at, and in the main accomplished. They compared the existing doctrines and practices of the Church with Scripture; and if anything was plainly contrary to the word of God, they abolished it. But the instances of positive repugnance to the plain letter of Scripture, though sufficiently numerous, were few in comparison with the mass of corruption which had grown up by the misinterpretation of Scripture, or the overlaying of primitive usages. For the purification of these abuses, Cranmer and the other reformers had recourse to the writings of the ancient fathers and the historical reminiscences of the early Church. "I protest," says Cranmer, "that it never was in my mind to write, speak, or understand anything contrary to the most holy word of God, or else against the holy Catholic Church of Christ; but purely and simply to initiate and teach those things only which I had learned of sacred Scripture, and of the Catholic Church of Christ from the beginning, and also according to the exposition of the most holy and learned fathers and martyrs of the Church." Ridley speaks to the same effect: "When I perceive the greatest part of Christianity to be infected with the poison of the see of Rome, I repair to the usage of the primitive Church." Laitner declared that he had taught and preached nothing but according to holy Scripture, holy fathers, and ancient interpreters of the same.

Farrar,

Hooper, Philpot, Bradford, and Coverdale, add their testimony to that of Cranmer and Ridley: "We doubt not, by God's grace, but we shall be able to prove all our confessions here to be most true, by the verity of God's word and consent of the Catholic Church." Philpot speaks still more plainly. At his fourth examination, the Bishop of Gloucester asked him, "I pray you, by whom will you be judged in matters of controversy which happen daily?" Philpot answered, "By the word of God; for Christ saith in St. John, the word that He spake shall be judge in the latter day." The bishop then asked him, "What if you take the word one way, and I another way? who shall judge then?" Philpot answered, "The primitive Church." The Homilies abound with appeals to the ancient fathers collectively and individually. The Canons also contain similar recognition of their value, as in particular the one respecting preachers: "In the first place, they (the preachers) shall see that they never teach anything for a discourse which they wish to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and what the Catholic fathers and teachers and ancient bishops have collected out of the same doctrine."

It is most important to observe what entirely different ground the reformed Church of England occupies from the Romanist on the one hand, and the continental Protestants on the other. The Romanist considers each existing Pope as infallible, and what-soever he pronounces from time to time, either from Scripture or elsewhere, is to be received as truth.—The ultra-Protestant considers each man to be a pope himself, and at liberty to take the Scriptures and interpret them according to his own fancy; hence the variety of sects into which they are divided. The Anglican Churchman believes that the truth was settled by Christ and His Apostles, once for all at the beginning, and that Scripture containeth all things necessary for salvation. Where Scripture speaks plainly, he considers its decision as final; where difference of opinions exists as to the sense of Scripture, then he appeals—not to the pope, who is but a fallible man; not to his own equally fallible judgment—but to the concurrent testimony of the ancient Church.—In some cases where usages, innocent in themselves and sanctioned by antiquity, had become connected with superstition, the English reformers thought it the safer course to discourage or abolish them—as the Levitical brake in pieces the brazen serpent made by Moses, which had become an object of superstitious worship. Such was the principle of the English reformation; as may be collected from an infinite variety of passages, besides those which I have already quoted. On this principle image-worship was condemned, as it had been by the ancient Church, as contrary to the plain word of God. Perhaps there was no greater practical change effected than the removal of idols from churches. Nothing but their absolute removal could root out the degraded superstition which thousands of poor ignorant people every where throughout the country regarded them, and direct their worship from the lifeless block to the one eternal invisible Jehovah. And when we see the strange infatuation of the ignorant, and the tenacity with which even educated Romanists, unconsciously from a spirit of party-zeal, still defend their use, we are led the more to admire the wisdom and goodness of Almighty God when with His own finger He wrote His preceptory command against them. Again: transubstantiation, though pretended to be founded on Scripture, was found to be contrary to the doctrines of the ancient Church. And the pope's authority over other bishops, and the notion of an universal prelacy, was discovered to have no sanction in Scripture, and to be contrary to primitive practice. Thus were these and other corruptions removed, and the Church stood forth in her ancient simplicity.

If the Reformers had kept strictly to this principle, and carried it out with moderation, it had been well. But unfortunately, human passions mixed themselves up with the proceedings of the times, and greatly marred the boon which the providence of God had bestowed. On the Continent the evil exhibited itself far more perniciously than in England. Here in England there were many wild spirits which were with difficulty controlled; yet the Reformation was conducted mainly by the sovereign and the bishops. On the Continent it was effected generally in opposition to the ruling powers of the Church, and partook more of the nature of a democratic movement; hence its violence and imperfections. From intercourse with foreigners, the English imbibed much of their sectarian views, and a spirit of resistance to authority—a temper of most unhappy tendency, even though it may be sometimes necessary to act apparently as if influenced by it. If, for instance, we are commanded by our ecclesiastical rulers to worship images, or deny our Lord, there seems to be no alternative but to refuse even to death, and endure patiently whatsoever trials God may be pleased to lay upon us. But when the same spirit, abused as it is almost sure to be, to excess, leads men to resist their lawful rulers in lawful matters—as, for instance, to refuse to wear a cope or surplice, or to kneel at the holy communion; when the conscience, we may almost say, degrades itself by resistance to such things as these: when men proceed to greater lengths, set up conventicles, separate from a Church, the general doctrine of which they acknowledge to be true; when they refuse to worship with the Church of their fathers, on the futile plea that it is joined with the State;—in these cases, it is clear that a wicked spirit of sectarianism is the true principle of action; and unfortunately such a spirit was generated at the time of the Reformation, and is rife among us even to the present day.

Again, the Reformation was the occasion of a most unhappy schism. We, of course, believe that the Romanist is responsible before God for this schism. We believe that the English bishops were perfectly justified in rejecting the authority of the pope, and were constrained in conscience to abolish the corrupt practices which had overspread the Church; and that the Roman Church, instead of excommunicating us, ought to have followed our example. Still, there can be no doubt that the schism then caused in the Western Church was deeply to be deplored.—Cranmer strongly felt the inconvenience of the isolated position in which the English Church was placed. Even the continental reformers were aware of the advantage which the Church of Rome had over them in being (outwardly at least) one united body, whereas they themselves were divided into a multitude of sects; and at one time a scheme was set on foot for drawing up a series of articles which should embrace all the various denominations of Protestants. Had the foreign Protestants acted in the same spirit of moderation, which, for the most part, characterized the English Reformers—had they been content to remove what was plainly contrary to Scripture and ancient usage, and to preserve what possessed the venerable sanction of antiquity—especially, had they retained the apostolical or episcopal succession of the ministry, whereby the Churches of Christ are linked together with the Apostles as their common ancestors, and are, in fact, by common descent one great family,—the schism; but yet I would not have men to be sworn to them; or so add as to take hand over head whatever they say; it were a great inconvenience so to do." Vol. i. p. 197. He is confessing at Oxford, 1534.

These passages are quoted from a letter by the Hon. and Rev. A. Percival, recently published.

union might profitably have been effected, and great strength have accrued to the reformed Church. But as it was,—the continental Protestants, running into wild excesses, and some of them rejecting fundamental articles of faith or discipline, some denying the doctrine of the atonement, some corrupting the ancient doctrines of the sacraments, and falling into a variety of heresies,—it was a most blessed and providential circumstance that no formal union was effected between them and the Church of England.

Other incidental evils resulted from the schism. It was not to be expected that men, when influenced by strong feeling, should discern the just line between the necessary assertion of independence and the sin of schism. The pope had for several ages occupied a great place in the eyes of Christendom; and if the bishops thought it right, as indeed it was, to remove their dioceses from his usurped dominion, individual Christians deemed that they had equal right to withdraw from the communion of their bishops. Hence by a natural, but not a legitimate deduction, men arrived at the false notion of religion being based on liberty of opinion and the right of private judgment,—principles which, carried to extreme lengths, have generated the host of sects and schisms that disgrace the Christian name, and impede the progress of the kingdom of God. But it was no vain notion of this sort which influenced the best amongst our English reformers. It was no liberty, but rather a stern restraint of conscience, which moved them to obey the word of God, and follow in the footsteps of the Apostles, instead of maintaining the abuses which man's corrupt will has superinduced. It was no liberty of conscience, but a dominant necessity, which led the martyrs to the stake. The spirit of martyrdom dwells not in the arrogant feeling of the right of private judgment, but in the strong duty of obedience. Most vainly, therefore, does the schismatic assert, that in wantonly separating from the Church, and following the imagination of his own heart, he is treading in the steps of the English Church. The best reformers were men of very different mould from the modern dissenter.

The notion of liberty of conscience arises partly from a confusion between human and divine law. God has given a revelation of His will, and established a Church upon earth: and each man is bound, at his own personal risk, to believe the revelation, and become a member of the Church: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 16.) There is no liberty of conscience here as regards God's command. We are not to believe what we choose, but what God has revealed; and as there is one faith, so there is one baptism;—as one Spirit, so one body, the Church, to which, and to no other body, we are bound to belong. We are responsible to God,—and vast indeed is the responsibility,—but no human power can justly coerce us. No authority of man can or ought to force us to our salvation; nor can any human power save us from condemnation. To God and His holy Church, which He has instituted, we are bound at our peril; and in that very absence of all religious liberty consists our freedom from human control.

It is the mixing up of these two authorities which is the main source of modern dissent: men falsely arguing, that because the State has no right to control their will, therefore the Church has no claim to their obedience and communion. And this notion, though very different from that of our best reformers, was no doubt promoted by a false application of their example.

### THE JEWS AS SOLDIERS.

(From the Jewish Intelligence.)

Every feature in the history of the Jews deserves attention. We have long been privileged in deriving instruction and consolation from those inspired triumphal songs in which they celebrated the overthrow of their foes; and we have mourned over their helplessness and defenceless condition as given over into the hands of their enemies. We know, indeed, that Israel can never "dwell safely,"—the inhabitants of Jerusalem cannot be defended except by the power and grace of Him whom, as a nation, they have rejected; but in the meantime, we feel a lively interest in the history of those whom the Almighty hath declared to be his battle-axe and weapons of war.

The writer of the following remarks clings with affection to the remembrance of the deeds of war for which his ancestors were celebrated. We regret that he thinks so little of the peculiar glory and blessing which pertain unto Israel. While we listen to the details which he gives concerning the outward circumstances connected with the history of his nation,—while we remember their national wrongs and sufferings, we pray that they may be sanctified to their correction and improvement in the ways of righteousness. May the author of this work, and every one of his people, learn to mourn over those sins which have caused their glory and defence to depart from them, that the world may again rejoice in Israel, "in Judah is God known: his name is great in Israel." The rage of the enemy that hath subdued and despised them shall no more prevail to hurt them, "for he that is feeble among them shall be as David, and the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the Lord before them."

There was no want of prowess and courage among them in ancient times, and it was not through cowardice that they became a prey to their adversaries. They were smitten before their enemies because they would not hearken to the voice of the Lord their God. We trust that they will soon learn, not only to think with delight of the deeds of arms for which their mighty men of old were famous, but also to understand the source from whence they derived their strength and help, that thus repenting and believing, like David and Joshua, they may also wage successful warfare against the world, the flesh, and the devil, and thus shall they again rejoice in the presence and help of the Lord of Hosts.

Throughout the existence of the Jewish people as a nation, their history shows a warlike spirit, and tells of some of the most splendid deeds that have ever been recorded. Their journey through the wilderness, in constant combat with hostile nations, proves that even at that early period they were not wanting in courage and perseverance. In those wars of conquest which they carried on under Moses, Joshua, David, Jehoshaphat, and, in aftertimes, under Hircanus and Herod, victory was on their side, and they resisted valiantly the mightiest nations, the Assyrians, the Persians, the Syrians, yea, even the Romans in the zenith of their power. They conquered their country, arms in hand, and they fell fighting, too, at last. To this very day they celebrate the feast of Chanuka, which Borne very truly calls their 18th October (the anniversary of the battle of Lepis), in commemoration of that glorious period when the celebrated Jewish leaders expelled the far more powerful Syrians from their country and sanctuary, and consecrated the latter anew. Was not the Patriarch Jacob ennobled by receiving from God himself the important surname Israel, on account of his courage in wrestling with God and man? And thus the whole of the people Israel may claim the most ancient military nobility in the same way as single families among them are distinguished by the nobility of the priesthood on account of their descent from the tribe of Levi, or even from the family of Aaron. A noble, valiant spirit did not only pervade men like Gideon, called the Sword of the Lord, Jephthah, Samson, David, Asa, Jehoshaphat, the renowned Maccabees, and the great King Hircanus, whom De Wette calls the second King David; even

the tender women in Israel were inspired by this spirit, as the triumphant warriors of Miriam, Deborah, the virgins in the days of Saul and David, testify, as well as the bold deeds of Deborah, Jack, Judith, and Esther. And that this spirit also pervaded the mass of the people, is proved by the general arming of the nation, the organization of the troops, and the education of the youth. Every inhabitant was armed, every considerable town had its arsenal.

We may here mention the very remarkable fact, that we find among the Jews the most ancient traces of a military hollow square. Moses invariably placed the ark with the tablets of the law in the centre of his warriors; his headquarters were fixed before the ark, as if to teach his people also to stand up for their laws. In times of peace, also, the Jewish youth practised warlike exercises. Military games with bow and arrow were of frequent occurrence, and the inhabitants of Guatiba, not less skilled than the natives of the Balaeric Isles, hit the mark by a hair's breadth. While the law lasted, the ritual laws were suspended, so far as necessity required it. And powerful must have been the spirit which impelled them to take up arms, when the law of Moses made provision for exemption, in certain cases, from military duties. Thus no one could be claimed for military service who had bought a house but not yet inhabited it, or possessed a vineyard where he had not yet pressed any wine, or who had not yet lived a year with his wife. And yet their armies were always complete, and the call, "To arms!" was never issued in vain in Israel, but was answered by too many rather than too few.

It would lead us too far were we to point out all the warlike deeds and achievements recorded on the page of Jewish history. While the Jews existed as a separate nation, their warlike spirit and abilities were acknowledged and duly estimated by the Romans, who were competent judges of the military art. History tells us, that no less a person than Julius Caesar was so much pleased with the bold spirit of Ariabaudus, that he intrusted two legions to him, to reconquer Judea and guard the interests of Rome in Syria and Arabia. Antipater likewise was the ally of Julius Caesar, and saved him out of great peril in Egypt, by joining him with a Jewish army, and taking Pelusium from the Egyptian troops, who disputed with Caesar the land-side, himself being the first to scale the walls. But let us dwell on but one single point, namely, their last struggle for liberty, which is not to be equalled by any other event recorded in history. For seven years did this inconsiderable people withstand that Rome which had already conquered the world then known, and neither the Roman commanders, nor the numbers of their legions accustomed to war and victory, could change their courageous determination to resist to the last. It is proved that their leaders, Antigonus, John of Giccala, and Simon, evinced greater talent in their tactics than the Roman commanders, and even Tacitus cannot but bear honourable testimony to their heroism. We cannot but marvel at the number and strength of their fortified places. What a stronghold must Jotapat have been, which could for eight months defy the united forces of the Romans. What valour and perseverance to prefer the torture of the most dreadful famine and sure death to captivity. At the siege of Jotapat, 40,000 Jews lost their lives; only 1,200 their liberty. At that of Jerusalem, certain death awaited those who dared to speak of surrender. Without cessation they repaired and counteracted the work of destruction committed by the powerful implements of war used by the Romans, and sallied forth against the besiegers. And when, at last, the enemy forced his way, foot by foot, and the Roman eagle was already planted on the castle temple, the Jews still continued to defend the temple; nor did they yield when, at last, the flames burst out on all sides. In the midst of the fire and smoke some still continued to oppose the further progress of the enemies, until they also fell beneath the dense array of Roman lances. They were the last priests of the Jewish nation who were buried beneath the ruins of their temple.

Thus fell the Jewish nation; like no other, truly; and of no other campaign has Rome made so great a merit as this, against a nation so inconsiderable as to extent and population. But the triumphal arch of Titus, which, significantly enough, has been preserved in better condition than any other, is, indeed, rather a monument in honour of the conquered than of the conquerors.

Again they arose before they wrapped themselves in their shroud for that long slumber out of which they were only to be startled by painful dreams. We will only mention the rising under Hadrian, and which, from its extent and obstinacy, became one of the most bloody wars in which the Romans were engaged. Dio Cassius informs us, that they were compelled to summon their best cohorts and leaders, and even to call their most celebrated commander, Julius Severus, from distant Britain to the scene of action. This war lasted five years, and was scarcely less formidable than the former, under Vespasian and Titus. The last feat of arms of the Romans was the taking of Bethar, where the besieged defended themselves for three years and a half as valiantly, and surrounded by the same horrors, as their ancestors at Jerusalem. Their leader, Bar Kokchab, was killed; and the famous Rabbi Akiba, with his sons, fell into the hands of the victors, to proclaim dying, under the most cruel tortures, the unity of God. The Roman historians estimate the number of those who fell by the sword during this conflict, at 580,000; during the former war, 1,600,000 had perished; that in these two wars, above two million Jews fell with their arms in their hands, fighting for religion, fatherland, and liberty.

We find Jews afterwards serving with distinction in the armies of the Romans and Goths; a Jewish commander is even mentioned as having been in the service of the Emperor Honorius. In the beginning of the sixth century they formed under the Goths separate divisions, which were frequently employed on a distinct service, and with success. They held out against two sieges, by Chlodwig, of Arles, and the celebrated Belisar, of Naples, with such valour, that they obtained an honourable place in history, notwithstanding the obscurity to which they had been consigned. A century later, we see 20,000 Jews marching with the Persians against the Romans for the purpose of reconquering Jerusalem; while, at the same time, we behold them defending the fortress Abaranus, in Arabia, with persevering valour, against Mahomet and his followers. According to Dabnag, and several Jewish historians, an Israelite, Dou Solomou Ben Jehaja, was general of the Portuguese Jews in the year 1190, and commanded them with great renown. The Turkish emperor, Belim I., had many Jewish officers in his army, especially in the ordnance department. In the East Indies, also, a great many Jews serve as soldiers, being scattered through the different regiments. Many of them have risen by their talent to the rank of superior officers.

In Napoleon's army, several Israelites rose to the rank of colonel, and even of general; General Wolf, Knight of the Legion of Honour, deserves especially to be mentioned, he having been generally held in high estimation on account of his military knowledge and excellent qualities. We cannot, also, omit naming, among many others, the distinguished Colonel Simoon, the valiant Beer, captain of horse, Barak, &c., &c.—During the restoration, in the last Spanish war, it was the Jewish lieutenant, Corfbeer, who, at the storming of the Trocadero, ventured a surprise; several Jewish captives, also, on that occasion obtained the cross of the Legion of Honour. The solemn and touching

funeral of the Municipal-Sergeant Jonas, who, at the outbreak in Paris, in the year 1839, fell fighting for the maintenance of law and order, will, no doubt, still be in the recollection of many.

It is a matter of fact, that during the last great war the sons of the most respectable and wealthy Jews in Prussia, and the whole of Germany, set others an example by spontaneously taking up arms, and fighting with the same perseverance, faithfulness, and courage, as other citizens. It was only very lately that a Jewish captain in the Prussian army received, through the gracious favour of his present Majesty, the order of the Red Eagle.

In Austria, the Jews have already in ancient times given proofs of great valour. In Bohemia, they assisted the Christian under Boleslaus II., in repelling the Heathen hordes who devastated the country; as a reward for which, they obtained leave to build a synagogue in Prague. They distinguished themselves greatly at the siege of Prague by the Swedes, in 1648. Among the fortifications erected by them, a redoubt on the White Mountain, near Prague, bears still the name of "die Judenchanze" (the Jews' fort). As a reward for their conduct in this war, they were permitted to have a small bell in their Council-house for summoning the congregation; and the old synagogue at Prague is still decorated with banners which fell to the share of the Jews on this occasion.

Ever since the year 1788, the Jews have been called upon to perform military service as strictly as all other Austrian subjects; and if it is considered in how many and bloody wars Austria has been engaged since that period, it may be supposed that immense numbers have fallen for their country. In the year 1803, Dr. Jeckel stated ("Volen's Staatsveränderung," Wien 1803, vol. iv. p. 38):—"In the wars of the French Revolution, more than 15,000 Israelites have served under Austria's banner." But although several attained the rank of subordinate officers, and received gold and silver medals as rewards for good conduct, there have been but very few instances in which any of the higher distinctions have been accorded to them. At present, there is not only not a single officer of the Jewish nation in the Austrian army, but the Jewish soldier who has become an invalid, and a cripple, has not even the bare consolation of being able as a citizen to begin a small trade, or to obtain a subordinate office in the state. And yet the number of Jews serving in the Austrian army increases continually; they are very often to be met with in the Hungarian regiments. The Jews appear, however, to be most particularly numerous in the Russian army; Kosciusko formed a whole body of volunteers consisting of none but Jews.

### THE ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES.

(From the German of Professor Huber.)

There is scarcely a spot in the world, which bears a historical stamp so deep and varied as Oxford; where so many noble memorials of moral and material power, co-operating to an honourable end, meet the eye all at once. He who can be proof against the strong emotions which the whole aspect and genius of the place tend to inspire, must be dull, thoughtless, uneducated, or of very perverted views. Others will bear us witness, that, even side by side with the eternal Rome, the Alma Mater of Oxford may be fitly named as producing a deep, lasting, and peculiar impression.

In one of the most fertile districts of that Queen of the Seas, whom Nature has so richly blessed, whom for centuries past no footsteps of foreign armies has desecrated, whose trident bears away over a wider circle than ever did the sword of the ancient Mistress of the World, lies a broad green vale, where the Cherwell and the Isis mingle their full clear waters. Here and there primeval elms and oaks overshadow them; while in their various windings they encircle gardens, meadows, and fields, villages, cottages, farmhouses, and country seats, in molley mixture. In the midst rises a mass of mighty buildings, the general character of which varies between convent, palace, and castle. Some few Gothic church towers and Romanesque domes, it is true, break through the horizontal lines, yet the general impression, at a distance and at first sight, is essentially different from that of any of the towns of the Middle Ages. The outlines are far from being so sharp, so angular, so irregular, so fantastical; a certain softness, a peculiar repose, reigns in these broader terraced-like rising masses. Not that the Gothic pinnacles that point up into the sky are in themselves inconsiderable; the tower of St. Mary's is inferior to but faint of the third order; but they all appear less prominent than either the horizontal lines or the cupola form, which here and there rears its head; whether it be from its greater variety, or its more perfect harmony with the style of the whole, that the latter arrests the eye more than the former. Only in the creations of Claude Lorraine or Poussin could we expect to find any spot to compare with the prevailing character of this picture, especially when lit up by a favourable light; in reality, probably, there is none anywhere. The principle masses consist of the colleges, the university-buildings, and the city churches; and by the side of these the city itself is lost on distant view: so that on entering the streets, we find around us all the signs of an active and prosperous trade. Rich and elegant shops in profusion, afford a sight to be found nowhere but in England; although side by side, it must be owned, with the darkest contrasts of misery and depravity. But the houses of merchants, retailers, craftsmen, and innkeepers, with all their glitter and show, sink into a modest and, as it were, menial attitude by the side of the grandly severe memorials of the higher intellectual life—memorials which have been growing out of that life from almost the beginning of christian civilization. They are as it were the domestic offices of those palaces of learning, which ever rivet the eyes and mind of the observer, all beside seeming, perform, to be subservient to them. Oxford, indeed, has no manufactures of consequence; the creating, sooty, giant-industry of the day offers to the Museum nothing but his previously-finished produce, without forcing on the sense the thousand offensive consequences of its creation. The population, moreover, has a tranquil character, making it seem to be far less dense than in other flourishing English towns; and, in fact, the noisy, whirling streams of human creatures that hurry along the streets of London, Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham, would be ill-adapted to the architectural and historical character of the place. Yet there is nothing herein to suggest the idea of poverty or decay. What strikes the eye as most peculiar, is the contrast between the fashionable and varied dress of the more active and busy townspeople, and the ancient, severe, and ample ecclesiastical costume of the "gownmen," who may plainly enough be seen to be the ruling spirit of the place. Everywhere, indeed, wealth and rank are sure to meet with outward signs of respect; nowhere more surely than in England, and from tradespeople of the middle classes; but, perhaps, in all the world it might be difficult to find so many forms, evidently the stately representatives of the genius of the place, as are the Fellows and Masters of the colleges of an English University. It is a peculiar type, propagated from generation to generation. The university towns have happily escaped the lot of modern beautification, and in this respect harmonize with the colleges. Each of the larger and more ancient colleges looks like a separate whole; an entire town, whose walls and monuments proclaim the vigorous growth of many centuries; in fact, every college is in itself a sort of chronicle of the history of art in England, and more especially of architecture.

## THE CHURCH.

COBOURG, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1843.

CONTENTS OF THE OUTSIDE.

First Page.—The English Universities.  
Second Page.—The Poor Man and his Parish Church.  
Third Page.—The Jews as Soldiers.  
Fourth Page.—Letters from the Editor.

"It happened," says Mosheim, speaking of the third century, "through the pernicious influence of human passions, which too often induce themselves with the execution of the best purposes and the most upright intentions, that they who were desirous of surpassing all others in piety, looked upon it as lawful, and even laudable, to advance the cause of piety by artifice and fraud."—If such conduct be utterly indefensible, and in the sight of God most sinful, even when directed to the triumph of true religion over heathen idolatry,—as was the case at the period referred to by Mosheim,—how much more unjustifiable and sinful must it be, to employ such arts for the strengthening of faction and the consolidation of schism against the voice and authority of the Church Catholic? We have already shown how Mr. Powell, in his attempt to overthrow the Church's doctrine of Episcopacy, has fallen into this wickedness; we go on now to prove still further from his recent work, how grievously the narrow spirit of party has made him blind to wander from the rules of honest criticism, as well as to mutilate the records of primitive truth.

We have extant an epistle of Polycarp, which Mr. Powell admits to be genuine,—because he thinks it is, that the general title Presbyter is applied to all the spiritual rulers of the Church at Philippi.—We have already sufficiently explained the consistency of this with the pre-eminence of the Episcopate; but what we have to notice is an instance of Mr. Powell's dissingenuousness in his appeal to the authorities by which the endeavours to overthrow the authority of the epistles of Ignatius, by contumaciously parading the testimony of the best Continental divines; but when, they give their votes against the epistle of Polycarp also, he accuses them of defaming ancient records, and that which there is no reasonable ground of objection to! That is to say, their reputation for integrity and talent is to be measured exactly by their coincidence with his own views, and by no other standard. When they agree with his own prejudices, they are worthy of all respect; when they oppose them, they are no better than dishonest traducers. This is the consistency of a man who professes to write down Episcopacy,—to impugn and demolish the recorded verdict of all the learning and piety of fifteen centuries!

The truth is, the epistle of Polycarp was written to the Philippians as an accompaniment to the epistles of Ignatius, which were sent at the same time, and commended by the bishop of Smyrna to the notice of the Philippians Church.—This writing, therefore, is a standing monument of their genuineness and authenticity; and if suffered to remain, must bear up the others also. "Diodesis" and "Dalle" were conscious of this; Mr. Powell, in his ignorance, did not observe this fact, or, in his impetuous vehemence, forgot it; and by this oversight has pronounced his own condemnation.

The notice of Justin Martyr embraces nothing of importance to the argument designed to be built up by Mr. Powell; because his Apologies being addressed to heathens and designed as a disavowal against their persecution of the Christians, they could not be expected to contain disquisitions upon Church government and subordination. We, therefore, proceed to Irenaeus, whose testimony, as Mr. Stopford shows, has also been tampered with by his writer under review.

"Our next witness is Irenaeus; he was a disciple of Polycarp and others who had been from his school; and we have more of his writings than of any other writer of so early a date; he wrote about the year 180. Mr. Powell commences thus with him (p. 101): 'He mentions both Bishop and Presbyter; but he uses them synonymously. Now this, if true, would make a general case for both orders, sometimes as applied particularly to one. But the word Bishop he never uses, except for a chief ruler established in every Church by the Apostles themselves, and kept up from their time by regular succession; so that he does not use them synonymously; as Mr. Powell says. It seems, indeed, to be aware that he is open to contradiction, for he says, some may doubt my assertion; and will indeed they say; however, he says, they shall judge for themselves. Now, let us see how he enables them to do so. He calls the successors of the Apostles Bishops, which, as it is agreed on both sides, we need not quote.' This is the way he enables his readers to judge for themselves, whether the words be used synonymously."

"The next chapter which Mr. Powell so innocently 'need not quote,' is as follows: 'Therefore, to all who are willing to bear the truth, it is at hand, in every Church, to behold the tradition of the Apostles; manifested to the whole world; and we have those to enumerate who were appointed Bishops in the Churches by the Apostles; and their successors down to ourselves, who neither taught nor knew any such thing as is raved about by these men (the Gnostic heretics); because if the Apostles had known any hidden mysteries, which they taught the perfect apart and secretly from the rest, they would deliver those things chiefly to those to whom they committed even the Churches themselves. For they desired that they should be very perfect and blameless in all things, whom they left as successors, delivering to them their own places or governments; from whom good and sound doctrine must arise, as from their evil conduct great calamity.'"

Irenaeus then goes on to give the actual succession of Bishops in the Church of Rome, from Linus to Eleutherius,—the latter the twelfth in place from the Apostles. And yet in the face of this very clear statement, Mr. Powell declares that Irenaeus, in speaking of the individuals who presided over the Churches, never uses any other name than that of Presbyter!

Tertullian has, in common with his predecessors, been subjected to a variety of liberties. We have not space to exhibit all the instances of dishonesty, apparent in dealing with his testimony; the subjoined quotation will establish the existence of what we pledged ourselves to expose,—direct and premeditated falsehood.—

"Here is Tertullian's challenge, as given by Mr. Powell (p. 103): 'But if any of the heretics dare to connect themselves with the Apostolic age, that they may seem to be derived from the Apostles, as existing under their names, they may say, let them therefore declare the origin of their Churches; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their first Bishop to have had some Apostle or Apostolic man as his predecessor; or, if they are unable to do this, let them declare the names of their Bishops; let them exhibit the series of their Bishops, so coming down by a continued succession from the beginning, so as to show their





