

The Dominion Weekly

Published under the direction of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of Eastern North America

Volume XI. No. 43.

HALIFAX, N. S., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1859.

Whole No. 537.

Religious Miscellany.

The Daylight is Breaking.

REVIVAL HYMN.

BY W. WOODS OF BELFAST, IRELAND.

The night is far spent;

The daylight is breaking;

The bride, and the bees,

And the flowers are awake;

Awake thou, my soul,

And bring an oblation

Of praise and of prayer

To the God of creation!

Hallelujah to the Lamb;

The day spring to cheer us!

All round us is calm,

When Jesus is near us.

On mountains and plains

The showers now are falling;

"Awake, my beloved ones,"

The Spirit is calling.

He calls loud to some

In the voice of his thunder;

His will and small voice

To others is heard.

Hallelujah, &c.

Like doves to their windows

The new born are flying,

And upwards and onwards

Their strength they are trying.

My Beloved is mine,

And His I am ever;

We'll never be parted—

O, never!—no, never!

Hallelujah, &c.

Rule of Faith.

WHAT IS TRADITION?

MR. EDITOR.—The next time we met

for discussion the Reader says to Andy,

"I'm going to be at the second part of your

note to-night—we'll take a shot at tradition."

"Fire away," says Andy, "and do your best."

"Before we begin," says the Reader, "I must

remind you that you often take advantage of the

man by using the word 'tradition' in two different

senses. You sometimes use it to mean the

doctrine handed down, and sometimes the

way of handing down the doctrine. But you

might just as well call a horse and the

sack of corn which he carries by the one

name. 'That would do at all,' says Andy.

"For the horse that carries the corn is one

thing and the corn that he carries is another."

"Just so," says the Reader, "and, in like

manner the doctrine that is handed down is

one thing, and the means by which it is

handed down is another." "Well," says Andy,

"I don't know what you mean by that. I

know that the word 'tradition' is used in two

different ways; but we can examine each

meaning separately. First and foremost,

says he, "I'll defend unwritten tradition

as a means of handing down doctrine."

"Tell me," says the Reader, "what do you

mean by unwritten tradition?" "I mean,"

says Andy, "one man telling a doctrine to

another, and he telling it to a third, and he

to a fourth, and so on for hundreds of years."

"Well," says the Reader, "I can't think that

is a very good way of handing down doctrine."

"Why not?" says Andy, "I can't think that

is a very good way of handing down doctrine."

"Why not?" says Andy, "I can't think that

is a very good way of handing down doctrine."

"Why not?" says Andy, "I can't think that

is a very good way of handing down doctrine."

"Why not?" says Andy, "I can't think that

is a very good way of handing down doctrine."

"Why not?" says Andy, "I can't think that

is a very good way of handing down doctrine."

"Why not?" says Andy, "I can't think that

is a very good way of handing down doctrine."

down correctly the doctrine of religion?

"Sure," says Mick, "we all know it to be a

fact that no two persons tell a story exactly

the same, and it's a pity story 'twould be after

passing through forty or fifty years, for 1800

years. I'm thinking, says Jerry, "that in the

end 'twould be like the story of the three

black crows. Once upon a time a decent

man was going the road, and he was surprised

to see the neighbours looking after him

as if he had seven heads and in a quiet way

at all what was the matter. At last he

heard one of them saying to another,

"There's the man that eat the three black

crows for his dinner." So you may be

sure the honest man was greatly vexed

at having his character taken away in that

manner, and says he, 'if you don't tell me at

once who said that story going, may I never

but I'll swear again you for defamiation.' So

with that they told him, and he went straight

to the man, and says he, 'Wan't it a shame

to you to go tell the neighbours that I eat

three black crows, when you know well that

I wouldn't take a pound note and eat one of

the dirty beasts.' 'I never said so,' said the

man; 'I only said that you eat two black

crows, and them biggars exaggerated and

made it three.' But who told you such a

story at all, at all? says the man. 'Such

a one in the next parish,' says he. So the

decent man went to the other fellow, and

says he, 'I can't think that you should

say a report through the country that I eat

two black crows, and to have man

and mother's son laughing at me wherever

I show my nose.' 'I never said such a thing,'

says he; 'I only said that you eat one black

crow; and if you want any satisfaction you

may go to my father's brother's son for

'twas he that told me.' So the poor man

went to him, and says he, 'What did I ever

do to you that you should make a hare of

me through the parish, by saying that I eat

an filthy black crow for my dinner?' 'I never

said it all,' says he; 'I only said that you

had a fine turkey-cock, as black as a crow,

that I suppose you'd be eating at Carist.

'But I don't eat that, there's the story of the

three black crows.' 'And a very good

idea of it, says the Reader, 'of the danger

of trusting to unwritten tradition. Not one

of you, says he, 'I would trust to it in the

common affairs of life, and lastly, it is a

question of trust to the most important mat-

ter of all, the salvation of your souls.' But,

says Andy, 'you're speaking of stories hand-

ed down by sinful laymen, that are liable to

mistakes and errors; but the handing down

of a doctrine, as Dr. Milner tells you, that

is handed down by the clergy, and that they

are bound to do so, that's a different matter

entirely. I don't know what you mean by

that. I don't know what you mean by that.

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

"I don't know what you mean by that."

could read them, and even if one

was able to read them, they're so long that one

could hardly get through them in a lifetime;

and, lastly, they're not to be had in any

of our churches. Andy, 'The priests are taught

and they teach them to us.' 'But,' says

the Reader, 'I won't receive those stories

as the Word of God, unless I'm given some

proof of it.' 'Sure,' says Andy, 'what

Christ or His Apostles spoke is as much the

Word of God as what the Lord said.' 'Yes,'

says the Reader, 'and what we want is, for

you to prove that they really did speak your

traditions. If you prove that we'll believe

them as firmly as if they were written in

the Bible.' 'Sure,' says Andy, 'St. John

says, 'Many signs and wonders were done

in the sight of His disciples which are not

written in this book.' Now, doesn't that

show that we must have recourse to tradition

to make up for what the Bible has omitted

?' 'No,' says the Reader; 'for the

very next verse says, 'But these are written

that you may believe that Jesus is the

Christ, and that, believing, you may have

life in His name.' So that, instead of that

verse proving the necessity of tradition, it

proves that we don't want anything more

than is in the word of God.' 'I see by that,'

says Mick, 'that if traditions were in

swarms forewent us they wouldn't be wanted,

for the Bible has enough in it for salvation.'

'That's just it,' says the Reader. 'We

know that Christ did and said many things

that aren't put down in the Bible; but when

God has put down as much as is needed to

instruct us unto salvation, 'till and to give

eternal life; 'what more do we want?'

'But,' says Andy, 'Dr. Milner tells us that

St. Paul bid the people 'stand fast in the

tradition.' 'That's true,' says the Reader,

'but does Dr. Milner tell us what those

traditions were?' 'No,' says Andy, 'he

doesn't.' 'And can you tell us what they

were?' 'No,' says the Reader. 'No, indeed,'

says Andy, 'then isn't it a hard thing, says

the Reader, 'to stand to believe things that

you don't know anything about?' 'But,'

says Andy, 'I'm sure they're some- where

among the traditions; and if you re- ceived

them all you'd have those amongst the

lot.' 'That wouldn't do at all,' says the

Reader; 'for even Dr. Milner admits

that you have no way of knowing what

traditions are. So I won't swallow

them all at a mouthful in that way.' 'But,'

says Jerry, 'does Dr. Milner really say

that some of our traditions are fabulous?'

'Indeed he does,' says the Reader. 'There,

you can look at it for yourself. He says,

'The traditions of the kings of the earth

have issued a decree that all the world shall

pay tribute to them. Sydney Smith's ludicrous

account of the taxation of England car-

ried the account no further than to the marble

under which the heaviest stones are piled,

and which every article of luxury and

convenience has paid its percentage to the

Government. But the case of the unhappy

Romanist is worse than this from his birth

to his burial, and for an indefinite period

of his life he is subjected to the exactions of his

capricious step-mother, the church. Coming

into the world under the baleful star of what

Archbishop Whately calls a "vicarious

redemption" in which the priest is his sponsor

and the father who paid tribute for him,

and substitute, and he himself has no com-

fort, but is subjected to the exactions of his

capricious step-mother, the church. Coming

into the world under the baleful star of what

Archbishop Whately calls a "vicarious

are staunch worshippers of the "Lady

of Guadalupe." But their social and civil

condition is debased and wretched, their

poverty being the result of their idolatry,

and their intelligence in religion is in-

dicated by the remark of one of them, that

appears to have expressed a common senti-

ment: "True," said he to an English gen-

tle, "we have three very good Spanish

gods, but we might have had more, had we

kept a few of those of our ancestors." A

letter from a distinguished officer to one of

the departments at Washington, was pub-

lished some years ago, in which he says,

"This country is a nation of Indians—

Some foreigners and Spanish Indians (of

mixed race) have the wealth and control;

But the great mass of the people are Indians.

Their spirits have been broken and cowed

by harsh treatment, and they now labour

and die for their masters. There is no

slavery flint I have seen, equal to that

of the Indians. The most cruel and un-

just treatment is meted out to the con-

querors of Mexico. 'Avarice stimulated zeal

and zeal consecrated avarice; and proselytes

and gold mines were sought with equal ardor.

And what good has been done to the peo-

ple by all this engineering of a false and op-

pressive religion? In the most that has been

done, towards helping the poor Mexican to

heaven, consists in having placed beyond his

reach the common objects of strong earthly

attachment—wealth, liberty, and social com-

fort. The impulse referred to by Macaulay

is a transient and accidental one, and it

is not the result of any principle of the

Reformation. Let them first receive the truth in its power,

and attain to a high degree of spirituality

of mind, and then they will be fitted for

the details of organization devised of the

