

there needs no explanation but what our fallen estate supplies, but for the phenomenon of a conscience in which horror for the crimes of treason and murder have become extinct, and extinct in natures not habituated to crime—for a baneful phenomenon like this, we must seek explanation, not in the tendencies of our fallen nature, but in the principles of those into whose keeping that abused faculty has been implicitly confided. If you would protect England from the perils with which she is menaced, and would raise Ireland from the degradation to which she has been reduced, you will not rest satisfied with protesting against the arrogance of the Papal invasion of our country, but will be zealous also to counteract the more dangerous, because more insidious, scheme for familiarising the consciences of Englishmen with the doctrines and principles of the Roman canon law. In urging this duty upon you, we ask you to do no great thing. We do not ask you to accept our testimony as truths, or to regard our suspicions as proofs presumptive. The Roman canon law is recorded in her own knowledge and authoritative documents. To them, and not to our statements, attention should be directed, and by their testimony the case for or against the Church of Rome should be determined."

It is stated that the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin has conferred upon him for some time the "Cardinal's hat," but that for certain reasons his Grace kept the conferred honour a profound secret.

From our English Files.

The *Daily News* states that Lord Beaumont has been excommunicated for the publication of his letter to Lord Zeitland.

The *Atlas* correspondent, according to the following paragraph, would lead us to believe Lola Montes was about to turn nun:

"The great event of the religious world, and which has become the favoured subject of religious gossip, is the approaching conversion of Lola Montes, by the Abbe Deguerre. It appears that the worthy Abbe, in his zeal for the good of the Church, had called upon the fair Lola for aid in establishing the new chapel of Angustin; and with the tact for which he is so remarkable, had succeeded in engaging her attention upon religious subjects, and the conversation thus begun was found to be so interesting that the Abbe remained the whole afternoon, and far, indeed, into the middle of the night, by the side of the new convert, and never left her till her heart was softened and she had owned with bitter tears, that all the idols she had worshipped with such fervour in this life had brought her nought but disappointment and despair. Before he departed the Abbe took from his neck the cross and scapulary he wore, and the little reliquary containing a thorn from the Saviour's Crown, and placed it round the neck of the repentant Magdalene, and bade her pass the night in prayer for help in the great work she had begun. The next day he returned again—and the next—and the next—until he now seldom leaves the house but for the accomplishment of his religious duties; and they say he is determined to have attained his great degree of claiming her as his own before the festivals of Christmas."

The last will and statement of the late King of the French, disposing of his property in Sicily, England, and America, was proved at Doctors' Commons on Wednesday. The personal property is sworn under £100,000. The will is dated at Claremont, October 16, 1848, and is very concise. The signature is in a bold, clear handwriting:

"He bequeaths his house and garden at Palermo to Queen Marie Amelie for ever. Next, he gives all his funded property in England and America, his books, plate, china, and furniture, to the ex-Queen, for her life, with reversion to her children, subject to such provisions as her Majesty may make in her life-time." In the absence of such provisions, it is to be divided into nine shares—

"Two to go to the Duc de Nemours, and one to the Comte de Paris and the Duc de Chartres—to be held by them as joint tenants—that is to say, to be divided between them. The remaining shares are divided, one each to Louise, Queen of the Belgians, the Prince de Joinville, the Duc d'Angoulême, the Duchess de Saxe Coburg Gotha, the Duc de Montpensier, and Philip Alexandre (a grandson), Duc de Wurtemberg."

The property in France is not proved in England; but an extract from an old will is given, remarkable for a provision in case the testator should leave France, or go to reside in England; then the Castle and property at Eu, and house and property at Treport, are devoted to the Duc de Nemours and his heirs for ever.

The *Athenæum* states that the Chapter of St. Paul's are willing to enter into terms with the city authorities for a general reform of abuses in relation to our great national cathedral. They propose, it is said, to abolish the unbecoming charge for entrance at the door, and to remove the iron palisades, and throw open the entire space up to the doors, as in the case of Notre Dame in Paris, on condition that the Corporation undertakes to widen and improve the approaches. We confess we should greatly like to see such a compromise carried out.

The evidence at length received of Sir John Franklin having actually penetrated into a region of "thickened ice" seems to have acted as an incentive to renewed vigour. The *North Star*, which recently returned from Wolstenholme Sound, in excellent repair, is, to be re-commissioned forthwith, and sent out to Behring's Straits to relieve the *Plover*.

IRELAND.—On Monday the twenty-third of November, the election of the new corporation for the Irish capital resulted in an effectual Conservative change. In the late corporation there were forty-six Roman Catholics, all Repealers; fourteen Protestants, all Conservatives; and no Whigs. The new body, consisting of sixty members, including aldermen, is divided between the Roman Catholics and Protestants nearly equally divided—thirty-two to twenty-eight. Political Conservatives are now more variously represented. The twenty-four Conservatives, twenty-two Repealers, four Whigs. The result has had the effect of causing Mr. Reynolds, M.P., to refrain from offering himself for re-election as Lord Mayor, and fifty-six out of the sixty members signed a requisition to Alderman Guinness, the eminent Conservative brewer, to occupy the Civic throne for 1851.

A report has been in the mouths of all men of Dublin during the last few days, which has at length assumed a consistency and shape that prevent the possibility of its being passed by unnoticed. It is said that the proprietors of a weekly newspaper called the *World* published in this city, performed certain services for Lord

Clarendon, for which his Excellency did not show himself so grateful as was expected, although a large sum of money—we have heard £1,400—was paid on foot of the account. An action for "work and labour done" was accordingly had recourse to, and accompanied by an intimation that the noble lord's autograph letters would be put in evidence. The result (we still speak according to public—very public rumour) has been a compromise, and the withdrawal of the action by mutual consent of the parties.—*Dublin Evening Mail*.

The Bishop of Meath has been appointed an Ecclesiastical Commissioner for Ireland by the Crown. There is still a vacancy at the board unfilled since the death of the Lord Bishop of Kildare.

The Bishop of Limerick having been appointed a Commissioner of the Board of Education, took his seat on Friday last. His lordship purposes holding an ordination at the cathedral church of Limerick, on Sunday, the twenty-second December.

Darrynane Abbey, the seat of the late Daniel O'Connell, is about to be sold by auction.

The Marquis of Waterford has announced his intention to make reductions from ten to twenty per cent., and in some cases even more in his rents. The *Derry Standard*, one of the leading organs of the tenant-right league, admits that these reductions amount to upwards of £2000 a year.

It is said that on a scientific examination of the lead-mine discovered lately near the town of Galway, it has been found not only to be of a very valuable and rich quality, but to be far more extensive than was at first imagined.

Father Ignatius collected at Lurgan, last week, after one service, a sum of £143 towards the conversion of England.

Communications.

[We deem it necessary to follow the example of the London Church periodicals, and to apprise our readers that we are not responsible for the opinions of our Correspondents.—Ed. Ch.]

A LETTER TO A FRIEND, OCCASIONED BY THE PRESENT STATE OF RELIGIOUS PARTIES IN ENGLAND.

(Concluded from our last.)

You will not, I am sure, my dear —, suspect me, from what I have said respecting the idolatry of *human reason*, of subscribing to a dogma so insulting to the infinite mind and so degrading to man, as that "ignorance is the mother of devotion." All I wish to show is that Reason is not to usurp the place of God; but that her place is, as I am sure you will admit, to be the handmaid of religion, yea, and to a certain extent the guide of our piety; thus regarded, the office of reason, especially when corrected by the regenerating influences of Divine grace, is invaluable. Yea, so valuable do I esteem Christian reason, that I think it is sufficient to prove, when once we have revelation in our hands, the necessity of the visible Church to guide us, and of its ordinances to sanctify us, and to convince us of the purity and integrity of our own branch thereof.

For instance, your friends despise the Church and its ordinances, because they despise the flesh and think the grace of God is perfectly pure and spiritual. Being to us its senses unworthy of being the medium of conveying But is this not as unreasonable as it is unscriptural? First, the body is as much the creation of God as the soul. Secondly, it was through the flesh, that Satan succeeded in destroying the work of God, and in introducing sin into the world. Now, does not the dignity of the Creator seem to require that the flesh shall also be made in every individual offender the vehicle of his regeneration? Thirdly, the bodily senses are now constant inlets to sin, or, at least, occasions of temptation thereto. Now, seeing that the most Blessed has so indissolubly united our souls to them, that even eternal felicity cannot be fully secured until soul and body are re-united, does not even reason itself. Suggest that it is most consistent with both the Divine dignity and goodness to make the body, at least, as readily the medium of grace? Fourthly, we see that, in the person of the Divine Redeemer, the flesh has been raised to the most intimate union with Deity himself, and made even to share the empire of eternity. Can it be rationally supposed that any office connected with the redemption or sanctification of individual man, is too dignified or too holy for a body, the nature of which is thus identified with Omnipotence?

I suggest these hints, my dear sir, not as an elaborate argument, but to direct the attention of your own acute mind to further reflection on the fact that, when used as the handmaid of religion, and based on the teaching of the Bible, and the Church of God, reason most unequivocally supports the Church, and her ordinances, as the greatest blessings to redeemed man; though, when usurping the place of God, reason sits in uncontrolled and haughty judgment upon holy things. Satan is often permitted so to darken the understanding that our greatest blessings are counted vain and unholy. The above thoughts may perhaps also serve to strengthen your conviction of the unreasonableness of that opposition, which those who are guided by "private judgment," or, to use scriptural language, who "leave to their own understandings," so generally offer to the doctrine of the saving efficacy, to the faithful elect, of the Sacraments and ordinances of the Church.

As, however, my third sheet is not full, permit me to test your patience a little further by pointing out one or two other inconsistencies which, the reason that sits at the feet of Christ and His Church, seems to belong to the unhappy worshippers of their own intellects. They profess to believe that ever since His ascension Christ has had, at least, an *invisible* Church on earth. They will also further admit that this invisible Church has, for the most part, been found within the visible or Catholic Church. Yet, for 1500 years, that is, while yet, as I suppose, the Plymouth Brethren themselves would allow, the visible and invisible Church were united—a distinct priesthood, sacraments, ordinances, and union with the visible or Catholic Church were thought generally necessary to salvation; as one proof of which, I may remind you that the Infidel Gibbon himself admits that by the end of the first century Episcopacy was universal. Christian reason asks, therefore, is it to be credited that Christ left His Church, and that not merely the outward and corrupt Church as these persons would call it, but His chosen, pure, and invisible Church,—during so long a period in such serious and fundamental errors, as the doctrines just stated would be, if, as your friends in common with most Dissenters, suppose none of these things are of God? Had He done so, where would have been the truth of His promise to "be ever with His Church" and to "guide it into all truth"? For, remember, we are speaking now of what

the Plymouth Brethren, Quakers, &c., call the Church; hence, themselves being judges, these unhappy sectaries, in denying the blessed character and scriptural truth of the doctrines in question, are convicted of "charging God foolishly" with having left His Church for fifteen ages a prey to very deep corruption!

Again holy reason can very clearly see that the opinions held by these Plymouth sectaries, lay the axe at the root of all true humility. Few things tend so much to humble us as to have to submit, and the deeper and the more real the subjection, if rendered as unto God, the more genuine is the humility. Now since the Divine Head of the Church has been pleased to establish His Church as the fold, His ordinances as the channels, and a human, though Divinely appointed priesthood as the dispensers of His grace and salvation, there is little room left for the display of self-will or of haughtiness of spirit in those who are really seeking present grace and final salvation. The means are contemptible to human pride—a little water, a little bread and wine, a few words of forgiveness or of blessing, all administered it is true, in the name of an infinite Saviour, but by mortal men, perhaps in everything, but their office, inferior to ourselves, and yet all stringent by necessity in this and no other way, in order to our being certainly accepted of the Father. Surely it cannot be reasonably denied that to be obliged all through the journey of life to seek the Divine mercy and favour by the use of means and ordinances such as these, is deeply humiliating to our natural pride of head and heart: as however, this humiliation is exactly the end desired, pride in some shape or other, being the damning sin of our race, the Church and its economy which tends to produce it must evidently be of God.

And now, my dear —, I put it to you who are daily witnessing dissent in its most rampant, and yet in some ways under its most captivating forms; is it calculated thus to produce humility? On the contrary is not its natural effect to nourish in a high degree that most dangerous of all inflations—spiritual pride? How could it possibly be otherwise? In some of these bodies of dissent, as amongst your own friends, every man is his own priest; he approaches the Eternal therefore only at those times and in such a way and manner, and amongst such people, and in those places that may happen to please his various fancies, or his excited imagination, or his indifferent and lukewarm feelings, and finally, he administers the most solemn ordinances to himself and others, without the intervention of any spiritual superior. Other sects make and unmake here, and dismiss their ministers and teachers as their whims, interest, or their pride may dictate. In all, or most of them, the public prayers, the exhortations, the experiences, the pecuniary or the executive importance of the individual members must sorely tend to feed their vanity of soul; and this danger is so much the greater, as very many of the members of these sects are poor and illiterate, filling in secular life very inferior stations, and therefore the more easily puffed up. Surely nothing but miracle can save mortal man, under such circumstances, from "falling into the snare of the devil," and with Diotrephes "seeking the pre-eminence." Is it possible that "the wisdom which cometh from above" can have had any part in forming such churches as these?

You mention a melancholy instance of a gentleman and a scholar who resigned an influential employment, sacrificed a liberal income, distributed the remainder of his property, married an illiterate wife, and is now leading an obscure life as the teacher of a small school, and all this in the name of religion! Why my dear friend, what account will this man be able to give at the last dread day of the "talents" entrusted to his care? Truly we read of one man, of whom Christ, in His right as the Sovereign of the universe, required the surrender at once of his station and his property; the Saviour's motive for this we need not enquire, for He was God and King, and had a right to require what He chose; but we may safely conjecture that the young ruler's worldliness of mind required such a surrender in order to his salvation, but at all events as no mere mortal has a right to require such a sacrifice from another, so to make it voluntarily, without some Providential necessity, appears to me to be a species of *moral suicide*, an effort to escape from those responsibilities of life which form a part of our probation.—Thus we find but one such command given: from the rest, the perhaps, more arduous task seems to be required—"Occupy till I come."

It is true that for a short period under the very peculiar circumstances of the infant Christian Church, there appears to have been something like a community of goods, yet it evidently was not designed, for perpetuity, as it is contrary to the very genius of Christianity which requires a *regular continuance* in well doing, rather than by any violent spasmodic effort to put it out of our power to sin. The gentleman you mention acted in submission I suppose to the common principles of the Plymouth Brethren, much more in the spirit of Origen, who sought to end the conflict with temptation by destroying the powers of nature, than in that of St. Paul who, by the *continual* use of lawful means, kept his body under.

And that I am right in these views is evident not only from the general principles of Christianity, but from this also, that in the latter part of the New Testament there is no trace of this community of goods, and many distinct proofs to the contrary. All the numerous exhortations contained in the Epistles, to alms-giving would have been commencing if property had been in common; all the directions contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the Christian like the ancient priesthood should live of the altar, would be equally irrelevant. What do the Plymouth Brethren say to this strong incidental proof—the more strong because it is *incidental*, that a distinctive ministry forms part of the Christian polity; nor should we be able to comprehend how it was that St. Paul should have supported himself even while occupied in his ministerial duties by the labour of his own hands, for surely he could not have been the only member of the Church in Corinth who was excluded from the common funds if there had indeed been any such? Yes Scripture, reason, and fact, all prove that like everything else over which the Christian has control, the right use of his property is, in all ordinary cases to be throughout his whole life, one of the tests of his love and obedience at least a title to the priesthood, with liberal free-will offerings to the Church and her poor, and not forgetting even the necessities spiritual and temporal of those who are without.

But because this Christian use of property has been in the later history of the Church shamefully neglected, let not the sincere of heart be deluded into seeking unscriptural and unlawful remedies, lest they share in the condemnation of those who, from a similar spirit of self-willed judging, and fleshly zeal, have permitted the puritanism of the last age to make the Romanizers of this! Much I fear, therefore, that the gentleman

whose unscriptural procedure has called forth these remarks, will be found an unwise, at least, if not an unfaithful steward.

In conclusion to this long epistle, permit me to suggest what I consider the great course of modern heresy and schism. It is this, that Christians now, look upon themselves as being the ultimate end and principal object which the Most High has in view in the vast scheme of redemption. The Primitive Church, I imagine, with more truth and humanity, thought otherwise. They thought that redemption, like all the rest of the Divine doings, was chiefly designed to bring glory to God, and that in this case it was to be accomplished by the victory which the incarnate son of God should gain over the malice of Satan; and, that consequently every step in man's salvation is planned with reference to the increase of the glory of God, through the exultation of the mediatorial character of His Son.

Hence the difference of conduct in the two classes of Christians. The Primitive Disciple cleaved to the Church and her ordinances, seeking in the smallest matter to obey the Divine will, believing this the surest method of honouring the great Head of the Church; and even had they foolishly imagined that some other method of serving him would have been more profitable to themselves, they would not have been at liberty to follow it. On the contrary, the modern sectary looking upon his own spiritual advancement as everything, feels at perfect liberty to serve God in any way that his wayward fancy may suggest, as being most beneficial to himself, comparatively regardless of what may be the effect upon the honour and glory of his Incarnate God. Upon this vast subject however, I can only give a hint for your own deeper reflection to follow.

Believe me, my dear —

Very faithfully yours,

A. T.

To the Editor of the Church.

REV. SIR,—I observed in THE CHURCH of the week before last a question from "a constant reader" respecting the meaning of the words "O Sapientia" in the Calendar opposite the 16th Dec; in reply to which you very rightly refer him to the expositions of Wheatley and Marst, where it may be seen that "O Sapientia" day, and all the days in the Calendar marked with particular names, not being Red Letter Days, were retained merely for civil convenience, without any religious observances being designed or appointed for them; the names of those days having by long usage become connected with many popular customs in England both local and general.

But if a "constant reader" wishes to see the original Anthems from which "O Sapientia" day received its name, he will find them in the Romish Missal or Service Books, among the Offices for the season. And here I would beg leave to suggest that if the Editors of the "Parish Choir," whose article you gave at length, wish to extend its circulation among Churchmen, they would do well to employ its pages otherwise than in recommending Romish Anthems and sending us to Popish Service Books for our Advent Hymns.

All that was primitive and Scriptural and worth preserving in the Service Books at the time of the Reformation, the Church has preserved, and Churchmen are bound to observe the one of the distinctions which the Church has drawn, even though, as in this case, there may be nothing exceptionable in the words or doctrine of the anthems referred to: yet as the Church has thought right to leave them in the Romish Missal, they had better be allowed to remain there.

There is unquestionably a great deal too much leaning to Romish ideas and Romish names long obsolete in the Church of England, to be found in many self-styled Church devotional publications—a thing which ought to be strenuously discountenanced, now especially, when the relative positions of the Church of England and Rome imperatively forbids any tampering with Romish tenets or any morbid partiality for, or sunderance of, Romish practices.

With Mr. Jebb, whose opinion is quoted in the "Parish Choir," it may readily be admitted that "the principle of having Anthems fixed for the chief seasons of the Church's year is a beautiful one;" but it is not quite so beautiful an idea, to take them from the Romish missal. The Scriptures, or even the authorized compositions of our Divines, furnish every thing that can be required as appropriate and devotional. It has always been the practice of the Church, as far as my experience serves, to have the Anthems in the Service always in the words of Scripture. And when we find in our Book of Common Prayer, at a certain place in the Morning and Evening Service, the rubrical direction—"in Quires, and places where they sing, here followeth the Anthem,"—it may safely be taken for granted that it never was the mind or intention of the Church to permit the introduction of Anthems from the Romish Service Books, the use of which she had so decidedly rejected and forbidden.

January, 1851.

B. C. C.

To the Editor of the Church.

HAMILTON, January 1, 1851.

REV. SIR,—Some three or four weeks ago, a long editorial appeared in "The Church" commenting on the support rendered to the Church Society, and making it appear that "three pence three-farthings" was the whole average contribution of the members of the Church in this Diocese, towards her support.

This average you appear to have arrived at by dividing the income of the Church Society amongst the 200,000 belonging to her communion, in Upper Canada. This statement was reiterated in the ensuing week, and went forth to the world, on the authority of "The Church," as the measure of the liberality of Canadian Churchmen—for our friends to grieve over, and for our enemies to exult at, and taunt us with, as "The Globe" did, shortly after. That paper made use of the statement, of course presuming that from such a source it must be accurate, and sneered at Churchmen for seeking State support, and doing so little to help themselves.

A moment's reflection would have shewn you that the contributions of Churchmen to the Church Society, forms a very small part of the pecuniary assistance afforded by them for church purposes.

I will take this place (Hamilton) as an example. Our contributions to the Church Society, amounted last year, including the collections for Mission, Widows' and Students' Funds, to £125 13s. 6d., while our ordinary annual payments for the local support of the Church, amount to £700, and in addition to this, we have within the last two years paid £150 on account of a new Organ; and in 1850, have paid £90 towards the new Church in progress of erection. So that, in fact, our subscriptions to the Church Society, which,