

LIST OF BURSARIES.

Mr. Robert Burns—(the Knox Bursary, founded by Isaac Buchanan, Esq.) for Essay on Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures	£	s.	d.
A critical exercise on MATTHEW xvi.—18, by the same author, was declared worthy of a bursary.	10	0	0
Mr. Lachlan McPherson, the Bursary of the Colonial Committee of the Free Church of Scotland, for general proficiency in Gaelic	10	0	0
Mr. Archd. Currie was declared by the adjudicators to be the most accurate writer of Gaelic.			
Mr. John Black, for critical exercise on 1 Peter iii. 18	10	0	0
Mr. Robert Ure, Essay on Bacon's method of Induction	10	0	0
Mr. George Jamieson, Essay on same subject	10	0	0
Mr. W. Ross Sutherland, two critical exercises	7	10	0
Mr. John Scott, Essay on Faith	7	10	0
Mr. Thomas Dickson, Essay on Study of Theology	7	10	0
Mr. Robert Swinton, Sketch of Church History	7	10	0
Mr. A. Hudson, Essay on Inspiration.	7	10	0
Mr. Archibald Currie, Essay on Faith, and for general proficiency	7	10	0
Mr. William Ball, Essay on Inspiration	5	0	0
Mr. Wm. Jas. McKenzie, on Study of Theology	7	10	0
Mr. James Nesbit, Outline of Ancient History	7	10	0
Mr. Peter Gray, for General Proficiency	7	10	0
Mr. John Ross ditto	7	10	0
Mr. Duncan McCruick, on being examined in Greek Testament	5	0	0
Mr. William Troup ditto	5	0	0
Messrs. John Smith, William A. Johnston, and Alexander McLachlan, for equal proficiency in Grammar, repetition of Catechism, &c., &c.	4	0	0
Mr. James Boyd, Essay, &c.	5	0	0

LIST OF PRIZES IN THE HEBREW CLASS.

- 1st. (Mr. Rintoul's prize) to Mr. Robert Burns.
- The second—to Mr. John Black.
- The third—to Mr. Lachlan McPherson.

IN THE SENIOR GREEK CLASS.

- The first—to Mr. John Black.
- The second—to Mr. Andrew Hudson.

IN THE JUNIOR GREEK CLASS.

- The first—to Mr. William Troup.
- The second—to Mr. James Nesbit.

IN THE LATIN.

- The first—to Mr. John Scott.
- The second—to Mr. Robert Ure.

IN THE PHILOSOPHY CLASS.

- 1st. (Mr. Eason's prize) to Mr. Robert Ure.
- 2nd. (Mr. Gale's) to Mr. John Scott.
- 3rd. To Mr. George Jamieson and Mr. James Boyd—the votes being equal.

IN THE DIVINITY CLASS—FOR ESSAYS.

- 1st. (Dr. Willis' prize) to Mr. Robert Burns, for Discourse on Election.
- 2nd. (Dr. Burns' prize) to Mr. Geo. Jamieson, for Discourse on the same subject.
- Dr. Willis' prize, for best outline of Lectures, delivered in Divinity Hall, to Mr. James Nesbit.

DOES THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH ACKNOWLEDGE CHRIST AS ITS HEAD? By the Rev. James McCosh, A. M., East Free Church, Brechin.

The object of Mr. McCosh's unpretending but really able tract, as its title imports, is to prove, "First, that the judges and statesmen of the land do hold that the Established Church is bound to obey them in spiritual matters. Second, That the Established Church has, in its deeds (whatever may be its profession in words), taken orders from the civil courts in the most sacred and spiritual matters;" and, therefore, that practically it does not acknowledge Christ as its Head.

It is not difficult (he says) to comprehend how, in consequence of the repeated assertions of the ministers, made on all occasions, in sermons and in prayers, there are not a few of the people who

believe, with a sincerity for which we give them credit, that because the Established Church proclaims Christ to be its Head, it really and truly does so honour and acknowledge him. But the intelligent and inquiring mind will go deeper, and demand better authority than the mere professions, so easy to make by one party, or the sincere, though it may be unenlightened convictions of another party. I can conceive a person determined to be at the bottom of this subject, resorting to two quarters for information. He might go to the statements of the judges and legislators of the land, who made the law what it is; or he might look to the Acts of the Church itself, with the view of determining whether it was honouring Christ by obedience to his commands, as well as by professions of regard. . . . These tests, (he truly remarks) are decisive of the whole controversy.

We cannot, within our limited space, pretend to do anything like justice to Mr. McCosh's argument, which is ably conducted throughout, and, to our mind, completely incontrovertible. We can do no more than present to our readers a small portion of the evidence by which he makes out his case. And, first, in regard to the deliberate statements of the legal and legislative authorities, Mr. John Hope, now Lord Justice-Clerk, and acknowledged, on all hands, to be one of those who had most to do in making the ecclesiastical law of the land what it now is, says,

"When a particular religious persuasion or association is to be made a national Church, it depends wholly on the will of the State what authority it shall possess in any matter whatever (be it civil or be it ecclesiastical—be it doctrinal or spiritual) on which the State chooses to give directions, or for which to make provisions. The civil court being the tribunal of the Legislature specially for enforcing its statutes, is supreme. Whether the body is ecclesiastical or not, the performance to the State of the duty imposed by a statute is a civil obligation, no matter to what the duty relates; and hence the obligation being civil, may be enforced by the civil courts equally, whether the body which owes the duty to the State is ecclesiastical or not."

The late Lord President of the Court of Session uses words of precisely the same import as those employed by his son:—

"That the Saviour is the Head of the Kirk of Scotland in any temporal, or legislative, or judicial sense, is a position, which I can dignify by no other name than absurdity. The Parliament is the temporal head of the Church, from whose Acts, and from whose Acts alone, it exists as the national Church—from which alone it derives all its powers."

Lord Gillies says, when speaking of the Church: "Thus its power is just that of making by-laws—a privilege, properly speaking, of corporations.—Every corporation has privileges. The power of making by-laws is one of its privileges. Its laws are good if ratified by Parliament, as are the by-laws of the town of Edinburgh, and other corporations."

Lord Meadowbank cordially subscribed to all the views which had been presented by the Lord President and Lord Gillies.

"The Established Church (he said) must be regarded as an institution, deriving its authority from statute alone; and it cannot be argued that it possesses any other inherent right to any power or privilege, except what the Legislature has conferred upon it. The Church courts are of statutory creation. The Church is the creature of the law, and every power which it possesses is derived from the law."

So much for the opinions of the exponents of the law; the views of the legislators are no less explicit. When Lord Aberdeen's Bill was under discussion, the Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst spoke as follows:—

"If the Church courts did not conform to the Act, and exceeded the powers given to them, the civil courts had a right to interfere. It was quite unnecessary to enact anything of the kind. By so doing they would seem to throw a doubt on the subject; and if they did not take care to enact it in very full and ample terms, they would narrow the jurisdiction of the civil courts, instead of maintaining it untouched."

This language was used, it will be observed, when Lord Aberdeen's Bill was under consideration. We are thus enabled to meet the objections

of those who hint rather than assert that this Bill has done away with the prostrating decisions of the judges. His Lordship's own language is: "He had not the slightest intention of impugning the judgment in the Auchterarder case. No such unwelcome had been entertained by any one—quite the reverse."

Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst again and again declared, that

"There was nothing in the Auchterarder case contrary to the Bill now before their Lordships."

It was subsequently to Lord Aberdeen's Bill being passed into law that Mr. Robert Peel said:—

"I do not see that you can establish a Church possessing all the emoluments of state endowments, without its submitting to stringent control on the part of the State. I think it of the greatest importance that the spiritual authority of the Church should be restrained, as it is restrained, and made subordinate to Parliament."

In regard to the second point which Mr. McCosh proposes to establish, viz., the practical aspect given by the Church to those views of her subordinate and enslaved condition: it is sufficient to ask, with him, how the General Assembly dealt, after the protesting party had left them, with the Acts which the Church had passed, in virtue of her supposed independent authority.

Did they say, These Acts are not very expeditious; but as they are the Acts of the Church, we will consider them as such, and obey them till we have time to repeal them? No, this was not their mode of procedure. The Assembly did not retain so much as the semblance of independent authority. It hastened to fling itself in subject prostration at the feet of its master. It declared that because the civil courts said so, the Veto was not a law, and never had been a law of the Church, and that the Strathbogie ministers had never been deposed. It made a kind of show of rescinding the Chapel Act, but all in implicit obedience to the civil authorities. In short, it was so anxious to hark in the smiles of the State, that it homologated and submitted to all that the State had chosen to lay upon it. "Isaiah is a strong ass, crouching between two burdens; & he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant, and bowed his shoulders to bear, and became a servant unto tribute."

Mr. McCosh states, in his preface, that this is his first appearance as a controversialist. We do not know whether it would be quite charitable to express a hope that it should not be his last, altho' in controversial times, there are few whom we would more readily trust on any question requiring a clear head, and good taste, and excellent temper. We hardly believe any one however strongly prejudiced could read his pamphlet without conviction. We think it might with great advantage be reprinted in a cheap form, for general circulation.

Miscellaneous RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

KNOX'S CHURCH, HAMILTON.—This church edifice was opened for public worship on Sabbath, the 12th ult., on which occasion the services were conducted by the Rev. Dr. Willis, of Glasgow, a deputy from the Free Church of Scotland, in the morning and afternoon—and by the Rev. Dr. Burns, of Toronto, in the evening. All these services were attended by large and attentive audiences; in the morning and evening particularly, the church was crowded in every corner. Having mentioned the names of those who ministered on the occasion we need only add, that there was an able, appropriate and faithful proclamation by them of the truths of the blessed gospel. Dr. Willis' preaching in the morning from Zeck. vii. 12, 13; in the afternoon from Luke vii. 47; and Dr. Burns in the evening, from 1. Kings viii. 13. The collection amounted, we understand, to nearly £70. On the preceding Friday evening, 10th ult., a meeting of the congregation was held for thanksgiving and prayer, when the services were conducted by the minister, assisted by Dr. Fernie. And on the evening of Monday the 12th, another large and interesting meeting, of a devotional kind, was held, at which eloquent and impressive addresses were delivered by Dr. Willis Dr. Burns, and the Rev. Mr. Rintoul, of Strontville, on topics of interest connected with the position and