

The Bazaar.

THEY RECEIVED THE WORD WITH ALL READINESS OF MIND, AND SEARCHED THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, WHETHER THOSE THINGS WERE SO.—Acts xvii. 11.

VOLUME III.—No. 18.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, JULY 30, 1846.

[WHOLE NUMBER 122.]

TIME AND ETERNITY.

Catch then, O! catch the transient hour
Improve each moment as it flies;
'Tis heaven itself that points out an hereafter,
And intimates eternity to man.
He dies! Alas! how soon he dies.—Johnson.

Why shrinks the soul
Back on herself and starts at destruction?
'Tis the divinity that starts within us,
'Tis heaven itself that points out an hereafter,
And intimates eternity to man.
Eternity! thou pleasing dreadful thought!
[ADDISON.]

CHRIST, THE EVANGELICAL ALTAR.

A Sermon,
preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, December 8th, 1814,

BY THE REV. FRANCIS JUNE, D. C. L.

Master of Pembroke College, Canon of Gloucester,
and late Dean of Jersey.

HEBR. XIII. 10.

We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle.

The word "altar," in the text, rendered "altar," is not classical, but was used to denote a Jewish, not a pagan, altar. It was applied at an early period in the Christian Church to the Lord's table; and this use of the term, though incautious and unfortunate, as the event has shown, was perhaps innocent, before the monstrous fiction of transubstantiation had been devised by superstition, and tricked out by the subtlety of the schools. When our reformers were raised by the Lord to cleanse his sanctuary, they found that altars, so-called, and the idolatrous service of the mass, were inseparably associated in the minds of men, and that the defenders of the existing system maintained in controversy, that altars implied, as their correlatives, a material and proper sacrifice, and sacrificing priesthood: it became their duty, therefore, to eject the word from our liturgy, and the thing from our churches. The language of the prophet Hosea had become but too applicable: "Because Ephraim hath made many altars to sin, altars shall be unto him to sin." There is no scriptural authority for the literal use of the word in connexion with the services of the Church of Christ. Two passages only have been adduced as warranting it—that in St. Matthew's Gospel: "If thou bring thy gift to the altar," which, however, cannot refer, as bishop Jeremy Taylor well observes, to oblations at the eucharist, an institution which did not yet exist, but contains a precept intended to regulate the conduct of our Lord's disciples, while they were still bound to the services of the Jewish temple. The second passage is our text: a text so worded that we cannot feel surprised that unscrupulous writers, like those of the Douai catechism and some Romanizing divines among ourselves, should have urged it as legitimating the use of the word in their sense, and as concluding in their favour some of the momentous questions which divide us. The wiser and more candid commentators, however, of the papal party have not been reduced into an abandonment of the sound interpretation of the best ancient writers, adopted by the greatest of the school divines.

"The altar is Christ himself," says Cyril of Alexandria. "Altare crux Christi, vel ipse Christus," writes Thomas Aquinas, as quoted in the "Biblia Maxima." However strongly honest disputants may be inclined to defend on other grounds the belief, that we have in our churches unfigurative altars, an atoning sacrifice, and a proper priesthood, they must feel that, to represent St. Paul as speaking here of a material altar, is to set at naught the whole tenor of his argument in the epistle to the Hebrews. His object in writing it was, to keep some of his brethren in Christ, who were also his brethren according to the flesh, from relapsing into the faith of their fathers. It would seem that, under the pressure of a persecution from which the unconverted Jews were free, they were fain to listen to seducing doctors, who urged, as we may infer from St. Paul's arguments, the glorious origin of the ancient law, its promulgation by angels through the mediation of Moses, its consoling sacrifices, the ready means of access to God, through a divinely-commissioned priesthood, which it offers, as so many reasons for abandoning the religion set forth by the crucified Jesus; a religion which has no sacrificial ritual, no mediators on earth, no visible sacrifices. To meet these considerations, St. Paul asserts, in his sublime epistle, that our great salvation has for its author the eternal God; for its dispenser the Lord of angels, the only begotten Son, the builder of the house; for its sacrifice, not the blood of bulls and goats, but Christ offered once for all; for its atonement, the blood sprinkled before the mercy-seat in heaven; access to God, not through men compassed with infirmity, ministering in a temple made with hands, but through a divine and sinless, yet tempted and sympathizing, High Priest, exercising his office on the right hand of the Majesty on high. In short, his object is to show that every blessing, which made the Jew proud of the old covenant, is supplied by a corresponding blessing in the new; with this essential difference, that every thing in the old is itself shadowy, ineffectual, unreal, though material and tangible; while, in the new, all is unseen and spiritual, yet alone true and operative. It is impossible, therefore, to conceive that, at the close of his argument, he should intend to speak of a material object; to contrast with the Jewish altar some analogous piece of furniture found in the places of Christian assemblies. No: it is of a spiritual blessing that he boasts. He uses the term as an ordinary and compendious mode of expressing the sacrifice wrought upon an altar, or the benefits which are thence derived to the worshipper.

The same figure is found in another passage of his writings: "Behold Israel eat the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?"—partakers, that is, of the sacrifice offered on the altar, and of the blessings which the sacrifice is intended to draw down from heaven. "In our text, the altar" is rather Christ himself, Christ sacrificed. This interpretation is placed beyond all doubt by the verses which follow: "For the bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the sanc-

tuary by the high-priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp." The things contrasted are, the altar which we have, and the bodies of the beasts which are burned without the camp. The equivalent words in the 12th verse to the "altar" of the 10th verse, are, "Jesus who suffered that he might sanctify the people with his blood." The altar, then, and Jesus who suffered, are synonymous terms; and the lesson conveyed to the Hebrews by the apostle is, that none who do not forsake Judaism and its tabernacle within the city, to come to Christ without the gate, can have a share in sin-offerings, in the sacrifices which alone atone, can have perfect remission, and the assurance thereof which eating of the victim gives.

We, too, can draw some important lessons from our text. "Behold Israel after the flesh," writes St. Paul to the Corinthians. "Behold Israel after the flesh," must every Christian teacher say to all who would know the real nature of the sacrifice of Christ, its perpetual efficacy, and the character of that feast in which its benefits are especially communicated to the believing soul. St. Paul has enabled the Church to understand the spiritual and typical meaning of the institutions of Moses; but Moses enables us conclusively to determine the sense of St. Paul, against the cavils of heresy. No system of theology can be according to the mind of the Spirit of God, which does not recognize the patrimony of the Christian privileges corresponding to those of the ancient Church. Moses copied from a heavenly exemplar, exhibited to him for a while in the mount; this exemplar was brought down to earth, and bequeathed as an eternal inheritance to his church by its divine Author. That cannot, therefore, be the divine original which does not bear the lineaments, which Moses thence transferred to his dispensation. But, of all the blessings of the older covenant, what could be more precious to a soul, in which the religious sense had been awakened, than the provision there made for the first and most lasting and most imperious of its cravings; I mean the need of reconciliation with God, and of the assurance of pardon, by some standing means of undoubted efficacy, applicable to the soul whenever its want is felt? This was found in the institution of sacrifice. Whether this rite took its origin in the spiritual instincts of mankind and a secret inspiration, and was subsequently incorporated into revealed religion, as some men have thought, or whether, as is more probably the case (since we read that Abel offered by faith; and subjective faith implies divine truth for its object), which, I think, is the case, it was bestowed by a gracious God, as the only way, by which man, till the effectual atonement should be wrought, certain it is, from the experience of mankind, that it is essentially allied to religion, and well adapted to satisfy the spiritual wants of him who is convinced of sin. How rich was the Mosaic system in this great instrument of pardon and grace! Morn and even, the blood of a lamb was sprinkled before the mercy-seat, to make atonement for the people of God; and every Israelite associating himself by an act of faith, to the solemn worship of the temple, might go forth to his labour, and return to his rest, with the confidence that he was under the favour of God. Time would fail me if I spoke of the passover, or of the sin-offering, slain twenty times and more each year, or of the service of the great day of atonement. Nor need I dwell on the power granted to ruler and priest, and the humblest layman alike, to offer for sin when their consciences were alarmed. And, if reason led men at times to doubt the real efficacy of the blood of bulls and of goats; if the fearfulness of the law, with regard to the pardon of presumptuous sins, ever raised misgivings, yet the reflection that what God has ordained cannot be in vain, and the intimations of mercies beyond those of the law, which are found in the prophets, probably sufficed to silence those doubts and misgivings. Such a faith was well calculated to attach pious hearts before the scheme of salvation was fully revealed; nor would it have been easy to win nobler spirits among the Jews to the obedience of faith, or to retain them in allegiance, unless access equally free to the throne of grace, and efficacious atonement for sins, and mercies new every morning, had been offered in the new covenant.

All this St. Paul holds forth, as in many passages of his epistle to the Hebrews, so in this text, "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." This was in effect to say, in accordance with all received ideas on the subject, "We have a sacrifice for sin: lay your hand on the victim provided by God: transfer your guilt to Jesus, who suffered without the gate; and know, that he has brought his blood into the true sanctuary, and there makes atonement for sin. And, what is more, the blood of bulls and of goats had no real power to propitiate God, or to compensate for sin: many things too, there were, of which you could not be justified by the law of Moses, and, accordingly, none—not the priests themselves—were permitted to eat of the sin-offering; though it is by eating that men become partakers of the altar. But of this we have a right to eat, and to have full assurance and palpable pledges of entire pardon." Thus it was that St. Paul exposed the weakness of the old covenant and the power of the new, by appeals to reason and scripture, which the candid could not resist, however satisfied they might have been with their spiritual privileges before their eyes were opened to behold these wondrous things. Thus did he keep his converts from drawing back into perdition. They once thought that in the scriptures they had eternal life, and they thought rightly; but this life was not in the sacrifices and atonements prescribed in the scriptures, but in Christ, of whom they testified.

This cardinal truth flows from our text, and many other such passages of the epistle; namely, that the death of Christ was a sin-offering, a vicarious sacrifice, a satisfaction to God's justice, the substitution of the innocent for the guilty. St. Paul's argument is imbecile, if this be not the case; nor does the gospel correspond to its ritual antitype. The Socinian error on this point can be embraced only by him who has blinded himself to the plain sense of Scripture, and to every rule of sound interpretation. By God's mercy, however, no church

has yet formally denied that the sacrifice of the cross is the meritorious cause of man's acceptance with God, however grievously the doctrine has been superseded and suppressed. In the first instance, at least, justification, or the acquittal of the sinner by the remission of his sins, is ascribed to faith in the blood of Christ directly and alone, even by those in communion with Rome. The Jesuit missionary would even now, we hope, reply to the inquiring pagan: "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." "Being justified through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood." But, to the Christian convinced of sin, the mercies of God would not by many be preached with the same freedom. Yet it is not the Gentile only—he who hears the glad tidings of salvation for the first time—that has need of evangelical mercies. In a Christian country, vast hosts of men are virtually pagans. When such men are awakened to the horror of their state, and cry in anguish, "What shall I do to be saved?" are they to be told that "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a fearful looking-for of judgment?" or must they be taught to seek for remission by the scourge, or the shirt of hair, or the bare-footed pilgrimage, and even then have no better thing to anticipate, for an indefinite time after death, than purgatorial flames? And the child of God, who is tempted, and falls through the frailty of his nature, is he never to have the comfort of spiritual health again? Must he be left to the horrible fears which take hold of the soul, under the belief that God's mercies are perchance clean gone for ever? Shall not the minister of reconciliation say to his penitent: "We have an altar?" Of this, we of the Israel of God have a right to eat, though we have rebelled against him who has brought up and nourished us; and, by virtue thereof, our sins, "though they be as scarlet, shall be white as snow." A sin-offering belongs to us. We have a Priest, who ever liveth to make intercession for us; one who can "save to the uttermost all that come unto God through him." "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous;" and he is now as ever, the propitiator for our sins—for our's as for those of the whole world.

To be continued.

THE SCOTCH EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

From the Churchman's Monthly Review.

We have a most conscientious regard for the Episcopal order, independently of the earthly baronial dignity associated with it in our land. Nay, we are not prepared to admit that the prelate overseas and examples of the flock gain anything of piety with this world's conventional arrangements; they bind the baronial balls around the mitre. And we are certain that when, in compliance with the gracious politeness of a sovereign, our colonial bishops admitted the unsubstantiated and anomalous title of "My Lord," they did injury to the cause of Episcopacy and truth. We are prepared, therefore, to admit with reverence the claims of the Scottish prelate to all due honour; more especially as there is no question that their orders are derived directly from the English Church. Only let them abide honestly by the sound reformation teaching of that communion to which they owe the episcopate, and we will give them equal honours for the mitre, though utterly disconnected from the ermine and the coronet. We acknowledge their Episcopal authority, though without a legally-defined diocese.

But serious charge stands recorded against the present occupiers of the Scotch episcopal bench, that they have suddenly and unexpectedly, after a solemn act of concordat, altered the fixed terms of communion in their Church. While the Stuart family in the direct line was not extinct, and the Cardinal York could yet be looked to by the expiring embers of the party, as a claimant to the British throne, there were necessarily in Scotland two bodies of Episcopal clergy—the remnant of the Scotch Episcopacy, who were on principle disaffected to the Hanover family, and had been considerably compromised in the successive rebellions of 1715 and 1745—and the English ordained clergy, whom, with a view to pastoral care, the loyal part of the Scottish nation were compelled to bring over the border. Towards the close of the last century, the Scotch Episcopal nonjuring clergy and their congregations were at a very low ebb. But they had the mitre exclusively with them; while the congregations under English ordained clergy had the substance and wealth of the Episcopal body of worshippers. These, however, were, to a certain extent, in an anomalous position; because they could not possibly join with Episcopals who would not pray for the reigning sovereign; nor could they recognize the chief characteristic ordinance of the Scotch Episcopal Church—the communion office—which had been recently modified, so as to be essentially identified with the Romish mass. They remained, therefore, conscientiously episcopalian in sentiment, without the advantage of direct episcopalian government; because to them, the indigenous Episcopate was palpably heretical; and because they had not been diligent and earnest in seeking, in those times in which it would have been readily given, the consecration of some of their own pastors, so as to complete the platform of their government.

So matters stood at the death of Cardinal York; when the Jacobites could, consistently with their former scruples, acknowledge the Brunswick as the legitimate line; and then, as the great barrier to union was removed, proposals for approximation readily appeared. On the one side was the Episcopate, and on the other the great proportion of pastors and people. Union was desirable; and the true basis of that union would have been the precise features of the English Church and its formularies; and if a resolute stand had been made, the bench would have given way; a stable union would have been effected on Anglican terms, and a flourishing Episcopal Church established beyond the Tweed. But the Scotch bishops found Mr. Sandford, an English clergyman then recently settled in Edinburgh, a man of small means and eager expectations, who was but too ready to accept the mitre; consequently, the terms of union ultimately agreed upon were not so Anglican, as they might and ought to have been. The ground taken by the

English clergy, and allowed by the Scotch, was this: "Set us free from all accessory and actual participation in your communion-office, and take our Prayer-book and Thirty-nine Articles, and we will join you." These terms were in a certain sense agreed to. The Scotch clergy signed the Thirty-nine Articles with explanation and reservation as to their meaning, and adopted a canon, by which the consciences of the English clergy were entirely freed from any approval or use of the Scotch communion-office. The Scotch clergy adhered to their office: the English held their own opinion of it, and repudiated its use. And this arrangement the terms of the concordat, as embodied in the canons of the Church, directly sanctioned. The English clergy relied on the honourable dealing of their brethren of the north, and gradually entered, with their congregations, the Scotch Episcopal communion.

Under these circumstances, honour and honesty required that the covenant terms of the union should have remained fixed and irrevocable. There was no more liberty to alter those terms, than there is civil power in an individual to alter statute law. Nay more, those terms ought to have been preserved with a tender and punctilious regard to the consciences of men, who had thus, in a measure for peace sake, committed themselves to their brethren. Yet it appears, that just when the union, except in one or two instances, was complete,—when the net of the Scotch Episcopate was just closing round the whole body, an unexpected violation of the covenant was perpetrated. A synod was assembled in the year 1833, composed of the bishops, the deans, and six delegates from the six dioceses, in which the canons, which were the basis of the concordat, were hastily altered, in respect to the essential points previously in *lite*; and the approbation of the objectionable office was forced, as a term of communion, upon all the English clergy; who had united upon distinct, safe, and satisfactory ground before. In that synod there were only two Anglican ordained clergy, who, had they adhered rigidly to their own previous engagements at ordination, to use no other but the English sacramental office, might have protested, though perhaps vainly and ineffectually, against so unjust a procedure. But the synod had been well chosen; and these English clergy silently sacrificed the previously-secured privileges of their brethren. They were prepared to affirm the superiority of the Scotch office to that in their own Prayer-book. They were prepared to use it. The canons, as altered, received the sanction of the synod; and they now place every English ordained clergyman in the Scotch Episcopal Church in the strange and anomalous position of avouching his approbation of, and his adherence to, an office which he virtually separates himself, by his signature of the Scotch canon, from doctrinal communion and identity with the Church in which he was ordained; and never can be in entire accordance again with the formularies to which at ordination he solemnly put his hand, till he has openly withdrawn from any connexion with that which differs from them. The two offices can never be held and approved by the same person, while he values truth, straightforwardness, and consistency. The views of one condemn and exclude the views of the other. The English office provides a distinct intentional condemnation of that which constitutes the prominent and characteristic feature of the other. And no man who has a clear comprehension of the meaning of words in colloquial sentences, can ever, with full approbation and with an approving conscience, make use of both. And to use them in any other way, and under whatever process of mystification, is to obscure the distinguishing line between right and wrong, and to sanction an inferior system of morals in respect to the professed tenets of religious faith.

It is on these grounds that the Bishop of Cashel, who thoroughly understands the subject, has said publicly and deliberately:—"That the doctrines of the two churches are not the same, is an undeniable fact; and I cannot understand how persons who have subscribed to certain doctrines in England, can be expected to give their assent to other doctrines in Scotland." Let the difference to which the bishop refers, be distinctly shown in the language of the Scotch Episcopal theologians. It will be found very fully argued in the well-known work on the communion-office, by the Rev. William Skinner of Forfar; in which he shows most elaborately that the difference between the English and the Scotch notion of the Eucharist is, that the Scotch Episcopals regard it as "a material sacrifice," while the English Church regards it as a commemorative feast, subsequent to the one great sacrifice, with an offering of praise and thanksgiving. This is the language of the Scotch divines and of their party in England: "As the legal sacrifices prefigured the sacrifice of Christ, so does the eucharist commemorate that sacrifice; but as the legal sacrifices were not less sacrifices, because they were figures of the grand sacrifice, so neither can the eucharist be less a sacrifice, because it is a figure and representation of the grand sacrifice." And again: "The holy eucharist is a commemorative sacrifice offered up to God, by way of memorial or bringing to remembrance the grand sacrifice once offered on the cross; and for the purpose of applying the merits of it to the parties who in faith offer it up." And with this view, they pray over the elements, without any qualifying expression whatever "that they may become the body and blood of the Lord."

This is no coloured misrepresentation of the Scotch theology. It is the point on which they stand in all their writings, and in their catechisms; and we cannot but feel assured, from their known sentiments, that if the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of London and Exeter, could give full attention to this subject, they would see sound theological reasons for withdrawing their expressions of assent, which they have recently volunteered against the seceding Episcopal party in the north. Truth and conscientiousness are sacred things, and it will not do, merely from a wish to stand by the cause of the mitre, to drive men to a sanction of views which in their hearts they believe to be contrary to their previous engagements. If they value a cordial and ex-*anim*o subscription to the English

Articles and Liturgy, they must not be expected to treat as a matter of indifference, a conscientious objection to averments which are believed, and can, on good argumentative grounds, be shown to be opposed to them. Nay, further, we cannot altogether acquit the reverend prelates, who have thus incautiously slurred over the doctrinal difference between the two communions, of a certain measure of virtual contrariety to their own subscription; a matter which, considering the solemnity of their responsibilities, and the unspeakable importance of maintaining a clear and definite view of revealed truth, calls, on their own part, for serious investigation. The trumpet must not give an uncertain sound; nor must an English prelate lightly appear to sanction, across the Tweed, a doctrine, which his mitred brethren there know, and have ever maintained, to be at variance with the testimony of his own subscribed formulary.—*Episcopal Recorder*.

INTERMARRIAGES BETWEEN PROTESTANTS AND PAPISTS.

The following correspondence relating to the intermarriage of Protestants with Roman Catholics should be extensively circulated, as we apprehend that the law in reference to that matter is not generally known:—

"TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE LORD LIEUTENANT.
I wish to call your Excellency's notice to a peculiar result from the late marriage law, 7 & 8 Vic., cap. 81, which is proving a sad infliction upon the Protestant Reformed Faith in Ireland. Your Excellency knows that by the provisions of that Act, a complete stop has been put to the baneful and pestilent system of clandestine marriages, heretofore performed by degraded ministers of the Presbyterian faith, or other Protestant denominations. So far, much good has resulted from this enactment. The act, however, made no alteration in regard to marriages by Roman Catholic Priests, which were permitted to be celebrated in the same manner as before it was passed. The result of leaving the Church of Rome and her ministers untouched by the enactment, while the Established Church and her ministers, and all Protestant sects and their ministers were brought under the control of the act—the result has been this, that immense numbers of inconsiderate young Protestant persons of both sexes, especially females, having made ill-advised and ill-assorted connexions with persons disapproved of by their parents or guardians—dreading the publicity of a union by a Church minister, or other Protestant minister, now by law recognised; and having not the alternative of repairing, as heretofore, to the residence of a degraded minister, betake themselves to the lawless expedient of clandestine marriages; which had been the law to him previous to this enactment continued so. He might marry two of his own flock when and where he pleased, and register it as of old. If he marries two Protestants, or a Protestant and Roman Catholic, he is liable to punishment, as was lately incurred by the Rev. Mr. Taggart, county Down.

"In this part of the country, however, the custom by which the penalty is evaded I shall state for your Excellency's information. The Protestant party (or parties where it so occurs) is informed that adhesion to the Roman tenets must be a preliminary step, and that baptism into the Romish Church must precede the marriage ceremony. When inconsiderate young people have plunged so far, this will not often prove an obstacle; they conform, are baptized, and then the nuptial ceremonies are ratified, so enabling the priest to evade the penalties which otherwise he should incur.

"It is quite frightful to think of the number of young people in my district, and all through this country, that have been thus sacrificed since the passing into law of that enactment; and that are daily dragged off in this way, the prey of that over-watchful confederacy.

"I have been frequently asked by broken hearted parents and relatives how the priest who acted so could be punished, and whether the legislature interposed no check to such a disreputable way of gaining converts from the churches of the Saints. It is in the hope of directing your Excellency's attention to the subject, I venture to address you; and should feel it a great favour were your Excellency to put me in a train of receiving instruction from the Law Officers of the Crown on this matter; whether—

"I. Any laws exist which render it criminal in a Roman Catholic Priest to solemnize marriage between one of his own flock and a Protestant—only just immediately before the solemnization in question, and by the process mentioned—induced to conform to Romanism?

"And II. If the laws of the land are defective in some provision for this very gross case—would it not be well to have an enactment grafted on the 7 & 8 Vic., cap. 81—that no Roman Catholic priest can solemnize any marriage between two converts from another faith, or between one of his own flock and a convert from another faith, unless such converts, or convert, shall be in prior communion with the Church of Rome at least three months?—I have the honour to be, your Excellency's very obedient humble servant,

A. T. GILLMOR, L.L.D.

Incumbent of Calry, and Surrogate of Elphin.

His Excellency's answer—
"Dublin Castle, 19th May, 1846.

"Sir—I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th inst., which, by his Excellency's desire, has been laid before the law adviser of the Crown, who has given the following opinion on the subject referred to in your communication:—

"A marriage by a Roman Catholic Clergyman of a Roman Catholic, and one who has been a Protestant at any time within 12 months before the marriage, is void by 19 Geo. II. c. 18; and consequently I apprehend that a Roman Catholic clergyman, marrying persons under such circumstances as this letter refers to, would be liable to the provisions of the 7 & 8 Vic., c. 81.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

RICHARD PENNEFATHER.

Rev. A. T. Gillmor, L.L.D.,
Calry, Sligo.?"
Achill Herald.