

THE REFORMATION,
ITS NATURE, ITS NECESSITY, AND ITS BENEFITS,
A SERMON
PREACHED IN THE CATHEDRAL
OF
CHRIST CHURCH, FREDERICTON,

ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1847,

BY

JOHN, BISHOP OF FREDERICTON,

AND

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

“ We desired the reformation of an old Religion—not the formation of a new.”—*Bishop Hall.*

FREDERICTON:

JAMES P. A. PHILLIPS, PRINTER.

1847.

TO THE HONORABLE

THE CHIEF JUSTICE,

His Honor the MASTER OF THE ROLLS,

The Honorable Mr. JUSTICE STREET,

The Honorable the PRESIDENT and other MEMBERS of the
Legislative Council,

The Hon. The SPEAKER and other MEMBERS of the House of
Assembly,

Who, having been present at the delivery of this Discourse,
in the Cathedral of Christ Church, Fredericton,
requested its Publication,

It is now respectfully dedicated

by their obliged servant and Bishop,

JOHN FREDERICTON.

Fredericton, Feb. 18, 1847.

PREFACE.

It is impossible for an English Churchman to write on a controversial fact, like the Reformation, without seeming to reflect upon others. I desire, however, to be considered, in this Sermon, as acting solely on the defensive, and as only wishing to give information to those under my charge, on important principles of action ; but if there be any expression which may seem uncourteous or unkind to any of my fellow-christians, I regret it, and as far as the objection is sound, I retract it.

I have only now to commend all who may read this discourse to the divine blessing, and to intreat their prayers for God's guidance and direction, in times when it seems equally dangerous to speak when we ought to be silent, or to be silent when we ought to speak.

J. FREDERICTON.

A SERMON.

“Hearken unto me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord: look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged.”—*Isaiah*, xl, 1.

THE advice which the Prophet here gives to the Jews, in reference to their expectations of the coming Saviour, resembles much which we find elsewhere in the Holy Scriptures.

It is an earnest recommendation to consider the marvellous mercies of God in former times, and our own unworthiness of them, and from such meditations to derive comfort in perplexity, confidence in the wisdom and goodness of God, humility and repentance for our neglect and abuse of his goodness, and motives to diligence, uprightness, and perseverance in the path of duty. Now, if such a course of meditation were useful to the Jew, it must be of still greater use to the Christian, who has not only before him the whole course of God's providential dealing with his elder brother, with his fearful and continued fall—continued to this very hour: but the still more wonderful blessings vouchsafed to himself.

Every Christian is, or should be, a kind of wonder to himself: the whole history of Christ's love to us from his birth to his ascension into Glory, is so stupendous, that it would fill us with wonder and admiration all the year round, if we had a proper sense of the Divine goodness. And our incorporation into the Church of Christ, so far from diminishing, does in fact add to the value of the gift, by shewing that God did not leave his plan (so to speak,) to take care of itself, but provided in the most ample manner for its being sustained, continued, and completed. Now, to view the whole of this plan oneself, or to endeavor to display it to others, as a whole, at any one time, is impossible. Its very magnitude and the number of its parts completely overwhelm the mind; and a great many persons fail of understanding the real blessings of the Gospel, because they will not take the pains to number them one by one, and try to count them up, though they “pass man's understanding.”

Now, the blessings which God has vouchsafed us, in connexion with the Church, may be said to be these: Its original foundation by Christ himself: the means which our blessed Lord took for its continuance: the assurance which he gave of his own perpetual

presence in it ; and the fulfilment of these promises in its remarkable increase, in the face of opposition and persecution—in its spreading out into all parts of the world, and in its revival and reformation at various periods of its history, when corrupted by the devices of Satan, or apparently in a state of declension and decay.

The mention of the revival and reformation of particular branches of the Church from heresy of doctrine or corruption of manners, brings me at once to the subject of my present discourse, which is to endeavour to set before you in as full and yet as concise a manner as the subject will admit of, some of the blessings which we enjoy from the great event which is called *the English Reformation*.

In every question the first point to be ascertained is, what we mean by the words we make use of, or what we understand by the Reformation ; and, perhaps, we shall better perceive what the Reformation was, when we have learned what it was not.

1st. It was not the laying the foundation of the English Church. For in that case, the Church would have been *formed*, not *reformed*. We cannot cleanse, purify and renew what has no previous existence. To use a homely illustration, a bell may be cracked and recast, but the bell was there. “Be it known to all the world,” says that excellent and amiable Divine, Bishop Hall, “that our Church is only reformed or repaired, not made new. There is not one stone of a new foundation laid by us.” Again, “we profess this Church of ours by God’s grace reformed : reformed I say, not new made, as some envious spirits allege. For my part I am ready to sink into the earth with shame, when I hear that hacknied reproach, where was your Church before Luther ? Where was your Church ? Here ye cavillers ! we desired the reformation of an old religion, not the formation of a new. The Church was reformed, not new wrought. It is the same Church that it was before, only purged from some superfluous and pernicious additaments. Is it a new face that was lately washed ? a new garment that is mended ? a new house that is repaired ? Blush, if ye have any shame, who thus fondly cast this in our teeth.”* So that nothing can be more incorrect than to talk of the English Church being three centuries old, or being founded in the time of Edward the sixth. The Church is not an institution made by man. Christ was its founder : and all perfectly constituted Churches must trace their origin to him, and to his Apostles. Nor

* Bishop Hall’s Works, vol. v, p. 177, and ix, p. 233. So also, Bishop Taylor’s Works, vol. x, p. 132. “That which we rely upon is the same that the primitive Church did acknowledge to be the adequate foundation of their hopes in matter of belief: the way which they thought sufficient to go to Heaven in, is the way in which we walk: what they did not teach, we do not publish and impose: into this faith entirely, and into no other, as they did theirs, so we baptise our catechumens: the discriminations of heresy from catholic doctrine which they used, we use also, and we use no other ; and in short, we believe all that doctrine which the Church of Rome believes, except those things which they have superinduced upon the old religion, and in which they have innovated.”

did the Reformers ever set up so preposterous a claim as the power to make or found the Church of God. All that they professed to do was to purify it from its corruptions. Indeed, if there were no Church before the time of the Reformers, from what source did they obtain it? Whence had they the Scriptures to which they appealed? Did they invent or discover them for themselves? Whence did they obtain the three Creeds † or the form of Church government? But this notion is as contrary to fact, as to reason. In the year 596, A. D., we know that Saint Augustine was sent by Gregory, Bishop of Rome, to convert the English nation, a large part of which was heathen, to the Christian faith, and that when he came, he found several British Bishops (who resided chiefly in Wales) already in possession of the field. ‡ We know also, that to his pious labor a large portion of England is indebted for the Gospel, and for the Scriptures which he brought with him. § The corruptions afterwards introduced (many of which in his time were unknown) did not make the English Church to be no Church: they only rendered it necessary that it should be reformed and purified.

2. It is to be remembered that the Reformation was not the work of a few pious individuals only, but the act of the whole British Church in conjunction with the State. || To bring our present Ecclesiastical constitution to what we find it in the Prayer Book, it was considered necessary first, that it should be submitted to the Convocation of the Clergy; secondly, that it should be ratified by Parliament, or by the Laity and representatives of the Clergy together; and finally, that it should be approved by the Crown. And having these three sanctions it became the Law of the land, and remains such to this day. So that the works of the Reformers do not bind us as authority, any more than the writings of other pious and able Divines of the Church of England. The authority is the Book of Common Prayer, which expresses the mind of the Church, and is binding on the Bishop as well as the Priest, on the Crown and the ordinary Layman alike.

* The Scriptures were preserved by the Church, though it was corrupted; but until the art of printing was discovered, few persons were able to read.

† Of the Apostles Creed, (or the Creed which bears their name,) we have evidence that a great part of it was used as early as 160, after Christ. The Nicene Creed was drawn up from the general confessions of all Churches, A. D. 325, and the Creed which bears the name of Athanasius, in the 5th century.

‡ The names of three British Bishops occur in the Council held at Arles, A. D. 314, nearly three centuries before St. Augustine came over into Britain; and St. Athanasius seems to allude to some having been present, or who sent in their adhesion to the great Council of Nice, A. D. 325.

§ The whole section of the Southern, Western, Midland, and some portion of the Northern part of England, Cornwall and Wales only excepted, are indebted for the Gospel to Saint Augustine. Some portions of the North and North-East were evangelized by Bishops, who did not at first submit themselves to the Roman See, nor keep the Feast of Easter at the same time.

|| For in those days the Nation was the Church, and the Church the Nation.

*It is the law of the Church of England, to all who continue in her Communion.**

3. Again, it has been supposed, that the Reformation was little else than the universal permission to exercise the unlimited right of private judgment. Now, if by this expression be meant, the liberty to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, without persecution or molestation, there cannot be a greater mistake than to suppose that this very reasonable and christian liberty was granted at the time of the Reformation. For, by whom was it then granted? Not by Henry the Eighth, who with equal satisfaction to himself, is said to have "burned some of his subjects for being Protestants, and hanged others for being Catholics. Not by the famous Reformer Calvin, whose burning of Servetus is sufficiently notorious. Not by Queen Mary, the unenviable notoriety of whose name forbids the supposition. Not by her sister, Queen Elizabeth, who threatened members of the House of Commons with being sent to the Tower for liberty of speech, tortured and cruelly entreated numbers of her Roman Catholic subjects for their religion, and finally put the Queen of Scots to death, chiefly for the same cause. Not by James The First, if we may trust his significant hints as to what he could do to the Puritans if they did not conform. † Not by King Charles and Archbishop Laud, if we may trust the records of the Star Chamber. Not by Oliver Cromwell, who first preached against persecution and then practised it himself, making it penal even to read the Liturgy of the Church of England in a private house. ‡ Not in the days of Charles the Second, if we draw our inferences from the stringent severity of enactments against Roman Catholics and Dissenters.§ Not by James the Second, who sent the seven Bishops to the Tower for presuming to exercise their private judgment, and awoke to his reason, when he had lost his Crown. Here is a century and a half after the Reformation, and very little trace of this liberty either in the writings of the Reformers, or in the authorities of the Realm, civil or ecclesiastical. And even our brethren of the laity were quite as ex-

* That which all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, at their Ordination declare their willingness to obey, having previously subscribed the same, must be the law of the Church, or there is no meaning in words, nor faith in subscriptions.

† "I will make them conform themselves, or I will carry them out of this land, or else do worse."—King James at Hampton Court Conference, 1604.

‡ "This year, 1655, Cromwell, finding himself strong, published a declaration, by virtue of which, those of the loyal Clergy who either managed private schools, or officiated in noble-men's families, were ordered to be imprisoned; and on an application by Archbishop Usher to grant permission to use the Liturgy, he replied, that having advised with his Council, he and the rest were of opinion that it was not safe to grant liberty of conscience to those men who were declared enemies to his government."—Collier's History of Great Britain, volume viii., page 398.

§ The King, in his declaration at Breda, had said, "that no man shall be disturbed or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the Kingdom." Under favor, however, of this latter clause, men's exasperated minds soon put a stop to liberty of conscience.

pert in the use of these carnal weapons as the clergy, if we may judge from the lives of Lord Chancellors Audley, Rich and Wriothesley, and Mr. Attorney Coke, one of whom lent the use even of his physical powers to aid the weakness of the secular arm. But, perhaps, it was wisely permitted by providence, that the Reformation should be a struggle not for toleration, but for truth. In more tolerant times, though men might be more christianly disposed towards each other, their minds would not have been so determined "earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints," and toleration would probably have produced indifference. Whereas by a century and a half of fierce struggles and bitter contests, through the infirmity and corruption of our nature, it was at last discovered, that persecution for religion is a religious crime and a political blunder: a crime in religion, because it is not the weapon by which the truth should be defended; and a blunder in politics, because it increases the number of bad subjects, who do not scruple publicly to profess what in private they disdain to believe: and diminishes the number of good subjects, who are too honest to affirm with their lips what in their hearts they deny.* We, however, who have lived to see universal toleration, or at least professed toleration, must beware lest we confound toleration with scepticism: or lest we imagine that unfettered *private* judgment is the unlimited power of *public* abuse: for it is no very uncommon case to find those who are very eager for their own right clamouring down all exercise of it in others, and denying them the power of seeing, hearing, thinking, and judging for themselves.

4. Further, we must not confound the Reformation with the abuses of the times in which it was brought about. In all revolutions the evil will probably outnumber the good; and it was one of the greatest misfortunes of the kingdom, that the steps which lead to the Reformation were full of the most heartless perfidy and grossest duplicity that ever disgraced a Monarch on the Throne: and that in the first separation from Rome, as well in the dissolution of the Monasteries, some of the principal agents seem to have had no other motives but the lust of concupiscence, and the blinding love of mammon.† These acts were not, however, the Reformation, though they are often charged on it by Roman Catholic writers. The separation from Rome

* It is a curious and humiliating fact, that the only man who propounded this liberty at the time of the Reformation, was Sir Thomas More, in a book then very little heeded, and which I never knew any one who had read, called *Utopia*. The singularity of his opinions may be judged of by the word having passed into a Proverb to signify any thing visionary, and impracticable. See Lord Campbell's *Lives of the Chancellors*, vol. i., p. 593. Yet even More did not practice what he recommended.

† At the dissolution of Monasteries, King Henry divided part of the spoils among two hundred and sixty gentlemen of families, in one part of England, and (like the dust flung up by Moses,) they became curses both on the families and estates of the owners.—Fuller's *Church History*, book vi., 371.

(as far as regards the usurped supremacy of the Pope) was promoted, argued, and carried by Roman Catholics themselves: by those who most of them continued in communion with the Roman Church to the end of their days, and were some of them (as Gardiner and Bonner) the fiercest persecutors of those who held a different faith. For it was Gardiner who wrote the most strongly in his book *De Verâ Obedientiâ* against the Pope's supremacy. Tunstal, Heath, and other Prelates, all Roman Catholics, stated the same opinions; and the bill was carried through Parliament, with almost perfect unanimity, only Bishop Fisher having the courage to say a word against it. And in both houses of Convocation (both of Canterbury and York) there was an almost unanimous vote, (only four voting against it,) that "by the word of God the Bishop of Rome has no more jurisdiction in England than any other Bishop."

Again, the plunder of the Church was not the work, in the first instance, of the Reformers, but of Cardinal Wolsey, who persuaded his master to the act, and he having once tasted of blood, could not afterwards be restrained. But the persons to whom he sold, or gave or gambled away these estates, would not have dared to profess a faith different from that of Henry himself, for fear of losing their lives. These facts do not seem to me to be sufficiently insisted on in general, or we should not hear so much of the spoliation of the Reformers. And there can be no doubt that Ridley and Latimer, especially the latter, publicly preached and protested against the spoliation.*

However, it must be confessed that Queen Mary, whose name is held in such detestation, was the only one of her family who seems to have had a conscience towards Church property, or to have had any notion that it was wrong to rob God of what was once given to him: for she restored the estates of the Bishopric of Durham after they had been all alienated to the Crown, at a time when the revenues were so impoverished that she scarcely knew where to find money for her ordinary wants.† Having shown, then, what the Reformation was not, let us proceed to show that the Reformation was an act justifiable in itself. Two things rendered the

* To Latimer's honest protests and plain dealing with all sorts of men, we owe the foundation of two Hospitals, (St. Thomas and Bethlehem,) and the noble foundation of Christ's Hospital School, London.

† After the Commissioners, appointed by Protector Somerset, had plundered every Parish Church of all the Plate they could find, conceiving, as Fuller observes, "one cup enough for a small Parish, and that the richer were able to purchase more for themselves," he pleasantly adds, "All this income rather stayed the stomach than satisfied the hunger of the King's Exchequer, for the allying whereof, the Parliament, now sitting, conferred on the Crown the Bishopric of Durham. Rich and entire the revenues of this See, such as alone would make a considerable addition to the Crown; remote the situation thereof, out of Southern sight, and therefore the sooner out of men's minds! Within two years after, Queen Mary restored this Bishopric to itself, re-settling all the lands on the same."—Fuller's Church History, vol. vii., p. 419.

Reformation necessary: First, the enormity of the evils to be reformed, and Secondly, the impossibility of obtaining redress in any other way. The evils to be redressed were *corruptions of doctrine and corruptions of manners*.

It is impossible, I think, to conceive that the system which the Roman Catholic Church retains to this day could have been the system recognized by St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John, without any allusion to the principal parts of it in the New Testament. To suppose, for example, that St. Paul or St. Peter knew that all Apostles and Bishops were to be subject to St. Peter as the Bishop of Rome, and all Churches to the Church of Rome, or that prayers were to be offered to the Blessed Virgin as our great mediatrix and intercessor with Christ, and yet that they should pass over in entire silence doctrines so unspeakably important (if true) for the faith of all Christians, and for the government of all Churches, is to suppose either that the Gospel was by them most imperfectly known, or if perfectly known, most imperfectly delivered. And this absolute silence of the Church in respect of these two leading features of the Papal system, was confirmed by an appeal to the practice of the Church itself, which the nearer we draw to the times in which Christianity flourished most, seems to have known the least either of the supremacy of the Pope, or the intercession of the Virgin. Now, it was found at the Reformation, that these two doctrines were so deeply rooted in the Papal system, that no appeals to reason, or Scripture, short of an absolute breach with the Papacy, could be of any avail. There were indeed other corruptions, if not so prominent, yet not less injurious in their tendency, which were gradually and successively renounced. These are, the definition of the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper to be the conversion of the whole substance of bread and wine into the whole substance of Christ's body and blood, thus overthrowing the nature of the Sacrament, which consists not only of invisible grace, (that is, as our Church Catechism teaches us,) the body and blood of Christ, but of a visible sign, that is, the bread and wine, which must remain in their nature bread and wine, in order that there may be a visible sign.* Further, the denial

*Archbishop Usher, a name deservedly dear to all men of wisdom and piety, thus strikingly explains the view of the Church of England in this matter, in his sermon preached before the Common House of Parliament, in the year 1620. "The bread and wine are not changed in their substance from being the same with that which is found at ordinary table; but in respect of the sacred use whereunto they are consecrated, such a change is made that they differ as much from common bread and wine, as Heaven from earth. Neither are they to be accounted barely *significative*, but truly *exhibitive*, also of those Heavenly things whereto they have relation, as being appointed by God to be a means of conveying the same unto us, and putting us in actual possession thereof. So that in the use of this holy ordinance, as verily as a man, with his bodily hand and mouth, receiveth the earthly creatures, so verily doth he with his spiritual hand and mouth, if any such he have, receive the body and blood of Christ, and this is that *real* and *substantial* presence which are affirmed to be in the inward part of this sacred action. The truth which must be held, is this, that we do not here receive only the benefits

of the cup to the laity, in direct defiance of Christ's own institution, and of the acknowledged practice of the Church for 1400 years, the addition of several books of undoubted antiquity, (and always held in reverence by the Church,) to the universally received and limited Hebrew Canon of Scripture; the compulsory celibacy of the Clergy, in opposition to the express words of St. Paul, in 1st Epistle to Timothy and Titus, the practice of St. Peter, "who was himself a married man," and the permission of our Saviour to remain unmarried, with an express limitation, "that all men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given;" the insisting on the Liturgy being performed in a tongue unknown to the people, contrary to the words of St. Paul, 1st Cor., v. 14, and the common practice of the Church; the assertion of a state after death, distinct from Heaven, Paradise, or Hell, in which souls are tried by fire, and extricated by the prayers and alms of the Church; the abuse of our Lord's words, "whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them," by selling indulgences openly for money; the supposing that the Saints, by their performance of works not included in the Commandments, but done out of love of God, can do more than obtain their own salvation, and that their merits are capable of being imputed to us; and finally, the assigning justification from sin to our own inherent righteousness, wrought in us by the Spirit of God, and not to the merits of Christ imputed to us when we believe and obey him.

All these corruptions of doctrine the English Church protested against and renounced at the Reformation, and this on two grounds: 1st, That the entire silence of Scripture as to many of them, and the direct declaration of Scripture against most of them, was sufficient to condemn them, inasmuch as nothing which cannot be proved or concluded from Scripture should be received as an article of faith, or held to be necessary to salvation. And 2dly, That every one of such doctrines could be traced to a period later than the three Creeds, and the four first General Councils, and consequently, being unknown and unacknowledged in the earliest ages of the Church, could not have been part of the holy treasury of Christ's truth, which St. Jude speaks of as "the faith once," *once for all*, "delivered to the Saints."

So that our Church, in making these declarations had not only no intention of separating herself from the ancient Catholic Church of

that flow from Christ, but the very body and blood of Christ, that is Christ himself crucified." Again, "Where if any man shall demand, 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' he must not think that we cannot truly feed on Christ, unless we receive him within our mouths, but must consider that the eating and drinking which our Saviour speaketh of must be answerable to the hungering and thirsting, for the guiding whereof his Heavenly banquet is provided. It is not therefore such an eating that every man who bringeth a bodily mouth may attain unto; but it is of a far higher nature, viz: a spiritual uniting of us into Christ, whereby he dwelleth in us, and we live by him." These are the words of Archbishop Usher, a man who had as great an aversion to the Papacy as most.

Christ, but united herself the more strongly to it by throwing off those later inventions, for which there is no warrant in antiquity, and, in point of fact, the ultimate act of separation came from the Roman Church, not from our own, the greater part of the Roman Catholic laity having attended the services of the English Church during the first twelve years of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, and never having been excommunicated by us. And she is thus both *Protestant* and *Catholic*, and not in any respect inconsistent in claiming to be both one and the other. A Protestant Church is nothing less or more than a true Church *protesting* against the introduction of error. Thus when Arius arose and taught a new doctrine, the great Council at Nice, in 325, *protested*, in the words of the Nicene Creed. When other errors crept into the Church, she again protested in the words of the Athanasian Creed. These are the protests of the universal Church against particular errors respecting the true doctrine of the unity of God, and the truth of our Lord's incarnation; as our articles are the protests of our own branch of the Church against other errors of a different kind, affecting vitally the doctrines of Christianity. There is no difference in principle between the two protests. The difference lies in the degree of authority possessed by the Creeds, and the thirty-nine Articles. The Creeds are of higher authority, because they are the decrees of the Church universal before its unhappy division. The Articles have no authority in any Church but our own; nor do we seek to impose them on others. And even in our own Church they are not regarded as necessary to salvation. They are *protests*, necessary by reason of the abundance of error, but only necessary as long as the error lasts. And that a particular branch of the Church does not lose its title to Catholicity, when, in a lawful manner, consistently with its divine institution, it protests against the errors of another branch of the vine, is implied in St. Paul's "withstanding St. Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed," and is proved historically by ample evidence of antiquity.*

Because, then, our Church is *Protestant*, does she therefore cease to claim the title of *Catholic*? I confess, I never could understand the real meaning of this language. As often as there is any morning or evening prayer amongst us, we are all bid to stand up and say aloud, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." But what belief we can have in it, unless we are members of it, that is, unless we profess to be Catholics? *not of course Roman Catholics*, but *Catholics*, that is, members of a true branch

* As in St. Cyprian and the African Church protesting against the Decrees of Stephen, Bishop of Rome, even though Cyprian has been ruled to be mistaken in the point for which he contended.

of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, founded by Christ on himself? That any person should say this, and be always saying it without any difficulty, and yet forget or deny that they are Catholics, and allow those who are in some points less Catholic than themselves to appropriate the name, and seem themselves to be heartily ashamed of it, is to me incomprehensible. But it may be said, what, are we not Protestants? *Most assuredly we are*, though that word does not occur in any one of our services, (as far as I know) still *protest* we must, and we shall only cease to be Protestants when there is no error left to protest against; **BUT THE REAL CATHOLIC IS IN FACT THE TRUE PROTESTANT.** He who believes what the universal Church teaches and the Scripture proves, no less and no more, must (to be consistent) *protest*, and that publicly, against the adding to, or the taking away from that body of divine truth.

We have noticed, then, the corruptions in doctrine against which the Reformation was a protest; but there were also manifold corruptions in practice. It would detain us too long to enlarge on this point, and though many persons seem to take a morbid pleasure in rehearsing the long list of wickednesses of profligate Popes, licentious Cardinals, ambitious Prelates, corrupt and blinded Clergy, yet surely the recital must be painful to a really Christian mind. What pious believer in Christianity can wish to know the secret mysteries of successful crime? That the great wealth and power of the Clergy, with a forced celibacy, led to great wickedness, no man who knows human nature will deny. But that all the crimes laid to the account of the Clergy in the times previous to the Reformation are true, let him believe who can. I do not. God never utterly forsakes his Church, and the darkest ages must have had many lights unknown to history, whose names and whose deeds are not forgotten.

Still it must be confessed, that the light shines out too dimly from the fearful darkness around. When one remembers that in times immediately preceding the Reformation, to one Ecclesiastic, who was the instrument of Henry's guilty pleasures, and the subservient tool of his will, were committed the Archbishopric of York, the Bishoprics of Lincoln, Durham, Winchester, and even Tournay, in France, and the Abbey of St. Alban's; that this same man farmed out the revenues of three other Bishoprics to Italian Priests, who never saw their flocks nor resided in their dioceses one hour of their lives, and that this was sanctioned by the Pope and by successive Popes; when we remember that to all this wealth he added the legative power of the Pope, and the Chancellorship of the Realm, and spared neither promises nor bribes to attain the Triple Crown, one may well believe that there was need of Reformation.

But when we add to this the subsequent history of that frightful age, that the Monarch who broke the heart of an amiable and high

minded woman, with whom he had lived for nearly twenty years without any of those pretended pangs of conscience, that he might gratify his passion for another, was upheld in that iniquitous course by servile Clergy, and degenerate Barons, and above all, by Cranmer;* that this man who beheaded his second wife, that he might marry the day after her death marry a third, and was only prevented by God's providence and woman's wit from a like cruelty to his sixth; who put to death one of the *most accomplished* men† in his dominions for a slight offence in heraldry; one of the *wisest* men‡ in his dominions for refusing to assert to the King's having the power of the Pope; and one of the *honestest* Bishops§ in his dominions for a like reason, after he had plighted his royal word for his personal safety; that this man, going down to his dishonorable grave, laden with the weight of a thousand acts of injustice, and stained with the blood of legal murders, should wring the hand of the Archbishop as he died, and without one act of penitence, one expression of sorrow, or of shame, should give sign of his dying in the faith of Christ, and that his crimes and his follies should be met by the general adulation of his subjects, and that in all that long protracted contest between himself and the Popes, in which the principal men of the kingdom were engaged, religion, justice, and morality, should seem to have so little to do with it on either side, reveals an absence of all manly and high minded policy, and a base and universal degeneracy, that makes us thrill with horror as we turn the page that convinces us of the need of Reformation, and may well teach the most thoughtless to bless God that he lives not in 1537, under King Henry The Eighth, but in 1847, under the mild and peaceful sceptre, equitable laws, and domestic virtues of Queen Victoria,—whom, God preserve. Still, whoever steadfastly considers all these facts, will cease to wonder why Roman Catholics, who have been taught to call this the begin-

* Of the Archbishop's private virtues, his gentleness, his meekness, and his forgiving spirit, there seems to be no difference of opinion. That we are all indebted to him for many blessings, I should be the last to deny; but I see no reason for identifying the Reformation with all which his timidity induced him to do or to yield, nor for justifying his private opinions, some of which are in direct contradiction to the Prayer Book. "It seems highly probable," says Dr. Cardwell, "that, had Edward The Sixth lived, the Archbishop would have yielded to the growing influence of the Foreign Reformers, and that our Church would have been entirely deficient in some of her leading principles." Indeed, so rapid and frequent were the changes in men's opinions, that if we were to identify any single person's sentiments with the Reformation, to the exclusion of the Prayer Book, we could hardly discover what are the real principles of the Reformation. The idolizing of persons, to the neglect of principles, still, however, continues to be a favorite occupation of the human mind. Sir J. Mackintosh, in his History of England, thus sums up Cranmer's character, "Cranmer wanted the courage to resist crimes, but never desired to do evil."

† The Earl of Surrey.

‡ Sir Thomas More.

§ Bishop Fisher, the account of whose death, by Fuller, the Church Historian, is one of the most affecting pieces of History ever composed.

ning of the Reformation, regard our religion with prejudice, distrust, and aversion.*

Thank God, however, these crimes are not the Reformation. Its benefits are to be looked for, *politically*, in the exemption from a foreign and usurped dominion; from acts of legal violence and tyrannical power; in the fair, open, and equitable administration of the laws; in the universal diffusion of useful knowledge; in the general increase and comfort among all classes of society, and in a far greater amount of public principle, and real efforts to benefit mankind.

The real practical result of the Reformation, *theologically*, is to be looked for in the English Prayer Book—a book which has been more tried in the furnace of adversity than any book in the world, not professing to be inspired.

Once it was all but interpolated by the influence of Foreign Reformers. Once it was cast out by fire and sword under the influence of Bishops Gardiner and Bonner. Again it was restored and revised by Convocation in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Once more it suffered shipwreck in the disastrous times of Cromwell. Again it re-appeared with monarchy and order in its train. Once more did Puritan presumption endeavor entirely to break it up, and substitute a composition of about ten days' thought in its stead. And again it withstood the power of King James The Second, and proved stronger than the Monarch on his Throne.† It has lasted unimpaired for three centuries of unexampled conflict of force, passion, and opinion; and it is now the only stay (under God) that keeps the members of the Church of England together, scattered as they are, and increasing throughout the world. Dynasties have arisen and have ceased; revolutions have come and passed away upon the wings of time; the

* "In a word, it may be truly said that Henry, as if he had intended to levy war against every various sort of natural virtue, proclaimed by the executions of More and Anne, that he henceforward bade defiance to compassion, affection, and veneration.—A man without a good quality would perhaps be in the condition of a monster in the physical world, where distortion and deformity in every organ seemed to be incompatible with life.—But, in these two direful deeds, Henry, perhaps, approached as nearly to the ideal standard of perfect wickedness as the infirmities of human nature will allow."—Mackintosh's History of England, vol. 2, p. 204.

† The compilation of the Reformed Office-Book was entrusted to a Committee of seven Bishops, of whom Cranmer and Ridley were two, and other learned men, in 1548. The whole Prayer Book was first put forth in the year 1549. The second Book in 1552. It was cast out in 1553. It was restored after revision, more nearly as we have it now, in 1557. Once more revised in 1604. It was removed to make way for the Directory in 1645. It was restored and again revised in 1662, after which period we find no alteration. But it is a great mistake to suppose that the Prayer Book was *made* even at the earliest of these dates. It is almost entirely a compilation from earlier times, judiciously framed. This will appear by the following brief summary of evidence (from Palmer,) respecting some portions of it. The verses and responses after the Absolution, are found in the sixth century. Reading of Psalms and Lessons alternately, was appointed by the Council of Laodicea, in the fourth century. The Te Deum and Athanasian Creed were composed in the same century. The Prayers following the Responses are found in offices of the sixth century. The Collects for *Grace*, for *Peace*, and for the *Clergy and People*, have been used by the English Church for above twelve hundred years. The prayer of St. Chrysostom is also very ancient. Litanies similar to our own were certainly used in the Church sixteen centuries ago; and we have

whole Constitution of England, and still more of North America, has undergone an entire and surprising change; yet the English Prayer Book remains unaltered.

And is this the book that Churchmen tamper with, as if it were an antiquated jest-book, or a dull forgotten tale? Let them know, that, when their own names lie buried in the dust, this book will still furnish instruction to the young, meditation to the old, and comfort to the dying, and will be the stay and anchorage-ground of ten thousand rising hearts.

I shall make but one more remark, at this time, on the subject of the Reformation, and that is, to enquire why it is that a change so imperatively called for by corruption of doctrine and corruption of manners—a change so happily made in one respect by the adoption, ratification, and continuance of so holy and pious a guide as the Prayer Book, embodying a large part of what was really good in the ancient service, and rejecting all that was unscriptural, should not have produced effects equal to what might have been expected; but that there exists, I fear, more unity of purpose among bodies who (we are apt to think) enjoy fewer advantages than ourselves. Many causes might, no doubt, be assigned, political or religious, for this weakness, and different causes by different persons. I shall content myself with assigning one, which seems to me to be, at all events, not unimportant.* It is this: *the words of the Prayer Book are not taken in their natural sense, and the principles of the Prayer Book are not honestly, humbly, systematically, and straightforwardly practised.* A great deal has been heard of late about the natural and non-natural sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, in consequence of an attempt to prove that it was possible for persons holding all Roman doctrine to sign the Articles in their own sense, that is, in fact, to strain them into a sense their compilers never intended. As soon as this doctrine was broached, it was, I think, generally felt by most sound-minded members of the Church of England, to be inadmissible. For the question immediately occurs, if such be the looseness of subscription, of what use is it to subscribe?—nay, of

positive evidence that the words of our own Liturgy were used in the eighth century. The occasional Prayers for Rain, against Pestilence, War, &c., are all twelve centuries old. The Prayers for the Parliament, for all conditions of men, and for the General Thanksgiving, were added in 1662. Almost all the Collects are as old as Gregory, Bishop of Rome, in the sixth century, and some are found in the fifth. In the Communion Service, Cyprian, in the third century, quotes the words, "Lift up your hearts," &c.; and St. Augustine says they were used in all Churches. The different prefaces for Christmas Day, Whit Sunday, Trinity Sunday, &c., are all found in offices of the fifth century; and the Hymn, "Glory be to God on High," &c., has been used in the Eastern Church for 1500, and by our own for 1200 years. Here is evidence enough for any reasonable man, that the Church was "not formed, but re-formed." But whosoever wishes more may consult Palmer's *Original Liturgies*, Cardwell's *Conferences*, and *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church*.

* See Note at the end of the Sermon.

what use are the Articles themselves? This scheme, then, which was not altogether new in its principle, having been broached by no less a person than Archdeacon Paley, but somewhat novel in its application, was soon felt to be untenable, and the learned and ingenious author of it must have perceived, that he had only cut the ground from under his own feet, without doing any of the good he intended. It seems, however, not to have occurred to many, who have been loudest in reprobation of this suggestion, that there is another thing to be condemned besides a non-natural sense of the Articles, and that is *a non-natural sense of the whole Prayer Book, and of all its services.*

Are we at liberty to take the Articles in a real sense, and the Baptismal service in a fictitious sense? or to take only those Articles which make against Rome, and pass by those which make against Geneva? Is the Article against Purgatory a truth, and the sentences of the Offertory a fiction? Is the protest against indulgences a reality, and the visitation for the sick a dead letter?—and all these, you will observe, drawn up, revised, ratified, and enforced by the same authority, and included in the same book. But, in fact, there is something more to be said in palliation of a non-natural sense of the Articles, than of the services. The Articles are most of them controversial, some of them so worded as to include men of different minds—as the 17th. The services are uncontroversial, devotional, and generally very plain and unambiguous. What reason can be assigned for not taking such words in their natural sense? Certainly none that would not apply with greater force to the Articles. Here, then, seems to me to lie one source of the practical weakness of the Church of England, that so many of her professed members, or attendants,—for members without Communion I can scarcely call them,—either use the services of the Prayer Book only to explain them away, or submit to them to save themselves the trouble of thinking, but do not really believe them. A Roman Catholic believes with all his heart and soul in the authority of his Priest, and the unity of his Church. A Wesleyan believes heartily in the efficiency and unity of Wesleyanism, and the truth of Wesley's Hymns. A Baptist is a thorough believer in the necessity of adult Baptism. They all support and help each other; but how many are there of our own people, who can give no rational account why they are not Roman Catholics, Wesleyans, Baptists, or Presbyterians. All they know is what they are not; but what they are, it would puzzle them sorely to tell. All they are agreed on, is the desirableness of coming to no fixed conclusion on matters of religion. This kind of disposition, which I consider to be an extensive application of the doctrine of the non-natural sense, or in other words, the doctrine of no sense at all, is a perpetual source of weakness, suspicion,

and distrust, in the Church of England. It blunts our kindest sympathies ; it fetters our most successful energies ; it retards our noblest exertions ; it makes us seem in the eyes of dissenters a large body of respectable people who have not real religion enough to belong to their party, and who are doing their work by our want of sympathy with our own system. This, no doubt, on their part, is an exaggerated view ; but is it not the view they take, and is there not some foundation for it ? Let a dissenter be attacked—are they not all up in arms ? Let a dissenter do wrong, (and they are not infallible,) is it not kept as quiet as possible ? Let there be any secret troubles and jars within their assemblies—and are they not all hushed up ? Whereas in our Communion, if there be an error, every one proclaims it. If a single jarring note is heard, it is published with every conceivable aggravation, as if the only use of being a Churchman was to make those who are not such believe that our Church was worse managed, worse officered, worse attended to, and worse dealt with than any other body besides. Does not this betoken a vital want of sympathy with our system, and with each other ? and expose us to the contempt and ridicule of all other bodies of Christians ?

It may be asked what is the remedy ? Many might be thought of, but I shall mention one. If men, born and brought up in our Church, would only candidly and thoroughly study the history of their own Prayer Book from original sources, or if they have not time, inclination, or means to do this, would believe that the whole Church of England, collectively, is wiser than themselves, and would agree to act on the principles of the Reformation, as they find them in that book which they all bring to Church, then, I think, though we might differ in some smaller matters, we should agree on general principles of action, and those principles could not be the principles of a party, because when they became such, they would cease to be found in the Prayer Book. But we must not sit down in despair. Still there are good and honest hearts, far more in number than man can see, with fixed enduring principles of action, with a real earnestness about their own souls, and a sound and enlightened attachment to the Church of which they are members. As for them, their die is cast, their arrow hastens to the mark, their eye is single and their aim is true ; the rock on which they have set their feet still bears them up, and their God is the strength of their confidence. They know (and blessed be God they do know it) that they have but a little while longer to linger in this dark and cheerless valley, and even now they can discover at the end of it a path that leads them out into the full sunshine of God's Eternal Day.

NOTE TO PAGE 19.

IN assigning this cause, I do not overlook the various causes which, without any positive blame to ourselves, as members of the Church of England, will readily account for some portion of the greater unity and vigor of action which we see pervading other bodies of Christians. In the Roman Catholic Communion, their absolute dependance on a spiritual monarchy, and that monarchy uncontrolled in its decrees, with their perfect realization of the necessity of unity in order to combined and energetic action, and that unity pervading all classes without exception, gives them a distinctness and singleness of view, which, perhaps, we find no where else. They look at their system not as a truth, but as ~~THE~~ truth; they cling to it as a whole, because if they were to give it up, it seems to them as if they must fall into Infidelity at once. With them the highly educated and intelligent live above their system, and reject the gross conceptions of the mass; the uneducated and ignorant, who are many, accept the simple doctrine of the unity of the Church, and requiring something to lean upon out of themselves, lean upon that, and ask no further questions. They see that those who are out of the pale of their Church, disagree among themselves, and for them this is enough. Few ordinary men can take in more than one idea at once. This, of course, does not prove their doctrinal system to be true; but it shows their wisdom, and accounts for their strength.

Again, other religious bodies are, some of them, (except the Presbyterians,) placed in a relation of antagonism to the Church, and its connexion with the State; and are therefore driven to the realization of the principle of dependance on their own energies. Had they been as indifferent to the extension of their own body, and to a temporal provision for their own officers, as the members of the Church of England have been, they must long ago have become extinct. But as with the Roman Catholics, unity is every thing; with the Protestant Dissenters, organization is every thing. This principle is acted on by them all; but is brought to perfection more among the Wesleyan body, (as far as I can judge,) than any other. Their founder was the greatest general that modern spiritual warfare has seen. And while they have departed from his theory, his genius penetrates and leavens the mass. As therefore the strength of the Roman Catholics lie in *monarchical rule*, the strength of the Wesleyans (and in some degree, of other bodies,) lies in *democratic organization*. The jealousy felt by mankind of any power, independent of themselves, being neutralized by the multitudes who possess local offices, and by the invariable practice of giving every man something to do. Another principle, peculiarly favorable to the growth and strength of such religious bodies, is the absence of individual control, along with the exercise of a general discipline. Every man feels himself at his ease, it is a free and easy religion; there are no canons to check, no articles to bind, no Liturgical form to restrain unpremeditated zeal, sometimes (to a fastidious ear,) pouring itself forth in strange, fanciful, or irreverent expressions; the feelings of the heart are left to find their own vent, and take their own course.

Of the fascination of this kind of religion to imperfectly educated minds there can be no doubt, and I confess, for myself, I deeply regret that some means were not devised of a safety-valve for men's strong and pious zeal, while Wesley's dying

words were yet ringing in men's ears, "Whatever you do, leave not the Church," before estrangement became certain, and separation unavoidable. Why should men be driven from the Church because they cannot express themselves genteelly? because their hands are rough and their voice is over loud? Is no man to get to Heaven who cannot speak in a whisper? To sum up, then, this part of the subject:—The Papal strength lies in devoted obedience to one ruling will. The strength of religious bodies at the other extremity of the horn, lies in their sway over the affections of the multitude; the strength of the Church of England lies in her reason, her moderation, and the hold which a body constituted as she happily is must ever possess over the judgment of the better educated of mankind. Here are, as it were, the power of the will, the power of the understanding, and the power of the affections disunited. But in the Apostolic Church these elements were in union, for there was "the spirit of *power*, and the spirit of *love*, and the spirit of a *sound mind*." There was rule vested in the Apostles, but limited by the pastoral and loving nature of their commission—limited by the office of Presbyters being advanced close to their own, (the administering of the two great ordinances of the Christian religion being placed in the hands of all priests,) limited by the will, advice, and co-operation of the laity, which was always taken in great public assemblies of the Church. Why, then, should it be a dream to suppose that these elements may be again re-composed? that borrowing from the Papacy and the Greek Church, whatever their system has of strength of obedience; from the Church of England, whatever she has of wise and Scriptural moderation; and from the other religious communities, whatever lies in them of burning zeal and true affection, purified from its disorder and excess, the will, the understanding, and the affections of the whole Church may form one "perfect man," and without sacrificing one point of essential faith, necessary discipline, or Apostolic order, may return to its original constitution at Jerusalem on a scale commensurate with the necessities of the world? Then might the Church write once more on the margin of her decrees, "*It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.*" This may be only a dream. It may be too good for fallen earth to see. But whether the words of Prophets and Apostles are to be taken in this sense or not, at all events it is not a delusive dream. For it will not lead us out of the path in which God has placed us as members of the Church of England, but will rather shew us that *we have our own duty to fulfil in our own body, and that our part is patiently to do that duty, and stand fast in it to the end. O that God would hasten it in his time.*—AMEN.

There is another cause of the strength of these bodies, which has been often entirely overlooked. Their members are much more nearly on a level in point of education, intelligence, and station, than the members of the Church of England. Their natural affinities and sympathies are therefore all linked together. There are very few class distinctions, feelings, and prerogatives. They who attain to a more than ordinary degree of learning or wealth, often leave the Body, or by way of compromise, send their sons into the Church of England. Those who remain behind are not much elevated one above another. There is therefore no natural difficulty in exciting and moving the mass. It is easily leavened and indoctrinated. There are no prejudices of caste, no hereditary traditions to be got over. There is therefore no condescension on the one part, nor obligation on the other. Each man makes or fancies himself to be the hero of the piece, and acts as if he thought that the standing or falling of dissent depended on his own personal exertions. *To the zeal of such bodies too much praise cannot be given. It is the great lesson for us to copy.* They do everything for themselves; and we want to have everything done for us, and then, looking on with magnanimous approbation, we say, "Well done!"

Now, the secret of their strength has been, in some degree, the secret of our weakness. First, the polar star of the Reformed Anglican Church was truth. That being secured, (after a century or more of bitter struggle,) men seemed to think that truth would take care of itself. With such a body of theology, the Church of England must prosper. But the nation and the constitution began

imperceptibly to undergo a great change. A body of men arose, who were not content with being told to repose on truth, but also wanted "a living spirit to come into contact with their spirit." Dead books were nothing to them, for they had no book learning. "The letter killeth;"—so it was, or seemed to be, in their case. Their feelings found no response in the great heart of the Church of England, and they left it. I do not acquit them of blame; but there is much guilt on either side. Secondly, our position in the middle way between Rome and Geneva, though as regards truth, a strong intellectual and moral position, has its peculiar perils. It is a complex and therefore hazardous position. Men of business, men of hard and tedious labor, men of rough and stirring minds, either do not like the trouble of thinking, or do not love a middle way. It seems to them to be trimming and indecisive. The Egyptians are before, and the Philistines behind. If you advance, the cry is, why do you go to Rome? If you look back, why do you go to Geneva? This double line of defence is enjoined by the Articles; yet to those who dislike trouble, it is very irksome. The Roman Catholics boldly cut the knot with the sword. The Dissenter persuades the people to cut it themselves. The Church of England tells us that it can be solved, yet not without labor and difficulty; but is not this, after all, the true way? Does the Bible cut off all our difficulties at once? Is it not amidst doubt and perplexity, fears and fightings, that we reach the goal? "Death only binds us fast to the bright shore we love." But however this be, it accounts for one of our difficulties, that our members sometimes look unkindly on each other: "Is not this man more than half a Papist?" cries one, "Is not this man more than half a Dissenter?" says another. Another source of our difficulties lies in the different classes of society which constitute the Church of England. If we understood our duty, this ought to be a source of strength; the body should increase by "that which every joint supplieth;" it would be so in a perfect Church, but our imperfection turns it into an evil. The rich do not "rejoice that they are made low;" they complain of it. They look on it as a nuisance to sit near a poor man, or a man of color, or a person of low extraction. Alas! is not one grave good enough for us all? Must not a polluted soul appear much more loathsome to the eyes of God than an unclean body can appear to our own? Did the Lord of Glory mix with poor, mean, and dirty people—nay, sit down with publicans and sinners? and are we above doing what Christ did? The poor, on the other hand, often palm gross impositions on the rich, and deceive them in a thousand ways; and thus are we torn asunder from each other. We look strangely on each other, and have no true sympathy, and the union of the world has no power to bind hearts in mutual love. It is the union of the material body, not of the redeemed and purified soul.

We are further hampered by the anomalous connexion of our Church with the State. In England, this connexion is founded on three very palpable facts. First, it is requisite that the Sovereign should be a member of the Church of England, anointed by the Archbishop or Bishop, in full communion, and bound by the Coronation Oath to maintain the Protestant religion as established by Law. Secondly, the Sovereign convokes the Clergy, ratifies their decrees, and appoints their Bishops as their temporal head. And thirdly, all subjects of the Realm in England, pay rates to maintain the fabric of the Parochial Churches, and on that ground have a common law right to interment in the Parish Church Yard, the parson having the sole right to perform service therein. Tithes do not appear to me to form part of the establishment, having been originally voluntary offerings made by the piety of our ancestors, and secured by law to the Church of England, as to any other corporation.

But in this Province these facts are all modified, if not reversed. The representative of the Queen is not by the law required to be a member of any particular Church; his religious creed is not considered, and therefore that part of the Queen's prerogative which concerns the Church of England is not (constitutionally) represented. Again, the maintenance of the fabric of the Churches is thrown entirely on the members of the Church of England. The laws of the

Province recognize no compulsory rate, payable either by them or by any other bodies, for the erection or continuance of the building; and consequently the Church Yards are not, (except by special enactment,) property held in trust for the use of all. The principal features, therefore, of an establishment in England, viz: the acknowledgment of the Church as such by the Sovereign, and the submission of the Church to the Sovereign as her temporal head, and the taxation of the people, generally, for such end, are here in one important respect wanting. Again, the Canons which bind the Clergy in England, all proceed on the strictest regimen of an Establishment, but where there is no Establishment, or only the name, it is a question yet undecided, whether they bind the Clergy, as in England, or no.

I only mention these things to show how much the undefined, anomalous state of our Church hampers us. Men's minds have been used to State-notions and State-assistance, and they are suddenly thrown into a new position, (without being positively assured of any thing,) and left to their own unaided resources, except so far as the voluntary charity of our English brethren steps in to help us. But unfortunately, the ancient notion clings to the mind when the reality is gone, and therefore, instead of helping themselves, many of us are trying to linger on in the dreamy security of an Establishment. We may be quite certain, however, to be roughly shaken out of our slumbers. Help ourselves we must, if we mean to increase, or even to stand. We, (I mean the Clergy and the Laity,) must do more, work harder, give more largely, live better, and be more zealous and more consistent than we have been hitherto. For as every instance of an unfaithful, or even amiably indolent Clergyman, does far more injury where the number is small: so every Layman, immoral in his life, or manifestly wanting in zeal for the interests of the Communion to which he professedly belongs, not only occasions a blemish, but inflicts a wound. Even the very toleration of the Church of England has proved some hindrance to us. In our progress from Egypt to Zion we are accompanied by a "mixed multitude," who add nothing to our strength, and only encumber the order of our march—who continually fall a-lusting after the "cucumbers, and the melons, the leeks, the onions, and the garlick" of Egypt, and have no desire for the clustering grapes of the Heavenly Canaan. Yet ~~were~~ these unhappy men, who have no fixed religious principles, and who live only for a world whose brightest glories are short, and whose speedy ruin is certain, might, possibly, if we were to thrust them out from us, only sink down into more callous indifference—more hopeless infidelity.

I need only name other causes of our weakness, peculiar to the Province, or common to the other Provinces of British North America, because they lie on the surface of things. Such are the pains taken by the Government of England to send out emigrants without the benefits of art, of order, and religion, and to find or lose them "on the hills and in the valleys, and under every green tree:" the constant influx of settlers, some of one religion and some of another, and some of no religion at all; the unsettled state of our whole border-line, from our constant contact with the worst class of American citizens; the want of public spirit, hopeful enterprize, and useful literature, which is felt by every thinking mind among us; the scattered nature of the population, and the fearful number of persons who attend occasionally at one place of worship, occasionally at another, but are equally indifferent to any and to all.

I have now traced at some length what I conceive to be co-operating causes of that degree of weakness and want of vital sympathy which seems to me to retard the progress of the Church of England here and elsewhere. Some of them may be partial or temporary; some of them may be in course of remedy; but all are greatly aggravated by the heavy curse that lies up us all—the divided state of Christendom. These who requested me to publish the Sermon, are not pledged to take the same view of things, because they did not hear it. But I have thought it right to lay it before them, because the Sermon is hardly com-

plete, without it, and because, whether it be right or wrong, it is mainly the result of my observation for several years, as a Parish Priest. To some, what I have said may appear new and strange, but the only question worth asking, is, whether it be true? For the longer we shut our eyes to the truth, so much the worse for ourselves. To despair of any cause which we believe to be true, is to cast a slur on the sincerity of our own belief; and to refuse to help it forward with all the energies of living souls, is to show ourselves traitors to Him who planted the Church, who died for it, and will maintain it to the end.
