

full well the danger that lurked in this proposal, and conscious of the rights which he possessed as a Roman citizen, he refused to accede to it, and said boldly to Festus: "I stand before Cæsar's tribunal, and there ought my tribunal to be. To the Jews I have done no wrong, as thou knowest full well. If I am guilty, and have done anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die; but if the things whereof these men accuse me are nought, no man can give me up to them. I appeal unto Cæsar."

No longer under the Jewish law, by claiming his Roman citizenship, he transferred his cause from the lower tribunal to the highest court of Appeal. The judge was non-plussed: he addressed his assessors, but they gave as their opinion that the prisoner had only availed himself of his prerogative; and accordingly the decision was pronounced, "Thou hast appealed unto Cæsar; unto Cæsar thou shalt be sent." Little more remained to be done than to make the indictment for the Emperor, and append his own judgment, and then to forward him to Rome under safe custody. How to word the charges perplexed the pro-consul, for it appeared "a foolish thing to him to send a prisoner to Rome without at the same time specifying the charges against him." Fortunately for him, Herod Agrippa II., King of Chalcis, and his sister Beranice came to his aid, who was not so ignorant of Jewish theology as his entertainers. Upon a second interview with Festus, in company with his illustrious guests the Apostle was acquitted of his charges, with the remark by the King: "This man might have been set at liberty if he had not appealed to the Emperor." It was too late. The Apostle had sealed his own doom. Preparations were to be made as speedily as possible to transport him to Italy, by sea, along the Asiatic coast.

Before proceeding in our narrative, let us give a glance at the portrait of St. Paul, as painted by early artists and tradition. The Apostle is spoken of as having the strongly marked and prominent features of a Jew, yet not without some of the finer lines indicative of Greek thought. His face long and oval, with an aquiline nose, and sparkling dark grey eyes, under thickly overhanging, contracted eyebrows; a high forehead, and his contemplative, yet elegant head, bald. His hair and beard brown, the latter long, flowing and pointed. Though of small and meagre stature, and body disfigured by some lameness or distortion, he resembled the Greek philosophers in appearance.

(To be Continued.)

Correspondence.

THE "NEW YORK GUARDIAN" REVIEW.

No. I.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—I was interested and much impressed by the enquiries made in your extract from the *New York Guardian* as to wherein consists the Baptist strength and element of success, and by the inference drawn from it that some useful lessons may be learned thereby.

Some years ago I used, from a Church standpoint, to envy the confidence and the full assurance with which Roman Catholics and Baptists seemed to enjoy and maintain the places they severally occupied in the Church of God. Doubt as to their position never seemed to trouble them, whereas in the members of my own Church I saw the very opposite state of mind, an habitual doubting whether they were children of God, and apparently satisfied if when they came to die they could only venture to hope they would not be cast out. The Scripture, sir, speaks of and enjoins the full assurance of

knowledge, faith and hope, as when Job says (19:25), "I know that my Redeemer liveth." Now the Roman Catholic and the Baptist appear to me to know, believe and appropriate to themselves the objects of their faith more completely than ourselves. Their religion is at once *objective* and *subjective*. Looking *around*, they feel safe; Looking *within*, they feel assured. They know strongly and firmly whom and what they believe; hence they are, as the *Guardian* writer expresses it, thoroughly sure they are right and everybody else wrong. They admit none into communion with them who refuse to bow down at the door of their Baptism, and, acting on their confidence, they push ahead with a zeal and vigor well calculated to insure success. The one is strong in his corporate unity; the other is strong through personal assurance. The one is an army of heroes; the other is mighty *en masse*.

The enquiry hence arises, May not the English Churchman learn some useful lessons from both? May he not feel as safe and as bold on the vantage ground he occupies, and in the cause which he has in hand? Must our Church as a body go on creeping, and its members be ever hesitating, uncertain, diffident, either as regards the Church's corporate position, or personal membership with it? Well does the *Guardian* reviewer challenge the enquiry, Where is the fault among us? When will it be otherwise?

You naturally expect, sir, by inserting in your columns the extract above referred to, that some one will take up and answer these questions, and certainly they are heart-searching, soul-stirring questions for every live Churchman to ponder. And as I have for some years past held decided opinions about them, I should be doing injustice to myself and my fellow-Churchmen if I hid in my half bushel the result of much observation. My views may differ from your own. Possibly you will like them none the less for that, as they may open to you a new vista into the boundless realm of mind and thought. May it prove to be a *Bona Vista*!

I have already stated that the confidence of the Baptist is of a different kind from that of the Romanist. The confidence of the latter is in the Divine authority of his Church; with the Baptist it arises from his own independent, personal membership with Christ. The Baptist would be as well assured of his position if there were not another Baptist or Christian in the world as if the entire Christian body were made up of Baptists. The Roman Catholic feels safe because he regards himself as a member of one only true visible Church to which salvation is pledged. Prove a flaw in his line of succession, and the ground is taken from under his feet. He has no ecclesiastical head, no faith, no valid baptism. Whereas the Baptist says, Christ, by His Word and Spirit, has spoken to my soul, commanding me to be baptized, and, as I believe, in a certain way. He rises assured from the water that he has put on Christ. He accepts at once the privileges and the responsibilities of being made a Christian. And thus, *objectively* the one, *subjectively* the other, knows *what* and *whom* he believes, and each of these men, the Romanist and the Baptist, from his personal standpoint, realizes what he says, that he is working, and giving, and contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. Hence comes his generous self-denial, his never-ebbing, unswerving, unquestioning zeal.

Yours truly,

FIDELIS.

(To be Continued.)

A FREE CHURCH.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—I fancy most people will find the letter of "Free Church," in truth, an additional argument against his own cause. Is that cause so weak that he cannot bring forward some practical reasonings without citing the instance of a wedding, or the example of a gallery corner of free sittings? The case of the wedding proves nothing, for the crowd and annoyance occurred in churches where the seats are appropriated! If on the contrary the churches had been free and in the hands of the corporation, under a good system the annoying circumstances would not have been. For the doors would then have been locked, and only a reasonable

number admitted. As it was, with the rich people of Halifax, holding their little "parcels" of "property" in the sacred edifices, the Church officers had no right to bar the doors.

And further his "gallery" free seats instead of proving that all free seats are a mistake, do most unanswerably go to show that the custom of giving the best seats to those who can buy or rent, and distant and disadvantageous ones to others, is mischievous in the extreme.

I know nothing of "Trinity Church," but I think "Free Church" is mistaken about Windsor. A larger, more liberal, and more reverent congregation could not easily be found than is there, and with a free system too. I have very often attended Divine Service there during the past few years, and never saw or heard of any disturbance such as your correspondent mentions.

The difficulties, which advocates of the free Church system meet with, are the results not of abuse of their own system, but of the sinful abuse of the purchase or rental one. Would it be a very great excess of generosity or justice for a man who had given five, ten, or fifteen dollars for a pew, to drop the same amount into the offertory instead? Too often, when the consideration of personal comfort and convenience and pride is at an end, the money drops instead into the owner's pocket. "Free Church" says the poor will not go to church, as they have not a "meeting-house suit." True, they will not in some places. While the seats in God's House are sold to rich men, and elegantly upholstered; while these seats are filled Sunday after Sunday, with gorgeously dressed ladies "bejewelled and be-fanned;" while the choirs look like "fashion plates,"—just so long will the poor and shabby keep away. But let the Church be declared free, and furnished the same throughout; let people learn that Church is not the place for displaying the latest fashions; let *laity* as well as clergy show that they hold fast the principle that all souls are equally precious in God's sight; let them go out to the "highways and hedges," to the "street corners," to the "Parade," and invite "the poor" as honoured guests, more welcome than any, to the Master's Feast, and I warrant you they will come, come willingly, joyfully! The experiment has been tried over and over again, and has been successful beyond all expectation.

Free Church advocates a very strange theory, but one which is strongly condemned in New Testament teaching. "My brethren have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ with respect to persons. For if there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile apparel. And ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, 'Sit thou here in a good place;' and say to the poor, 'Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool.' Are ye not then partial in yourselves and are become judges of evil thoughts. Hearken my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world. * * * * But ye have despised the poor."—St. James ii., 2, 3.

"CATHOLICUS."

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—Why does not Free Gospel, as he wears a "Cassock," go into the chancel? It is an *inhuman*, not a *Free Church*, that denies accommodation suited to an invalid. As to "*taking a hassock*," hassock's or other "kneelers" should be provided for all.

S. JAMES.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—Your issue of the 17th inst. contains a letter signed "The Church." On such matters anything is of value but *experience*. Until 1873 I was in favor of "free sittings." In that year I was appointed to the charge of a large parish with eight churches and ten assistants. It was decided that at the Easter meeting following each Church should carry out any scheme it thought advisable without any interference whatever from me. As "free seats" were all the talk, five of the eight congregations determined to try the system. After two years we found this result: the free churches had each the *same* congregation as before, seated in precisely the *same* places, and the finances came out about the same as when there were pew rents. Some paid more than the original rent, others gave nothing be-