

which the very essence is love—which commands us to love our enemies—to do good to them that hate us—to pray for them that despitefully use us—to bless them that curse us—to bless and not curse? It has been feebly replied by some, "this was under the Jewish dispensation, which was less perfect than the Christian, and which tolerated many things that the Gospel condemns." But will this satisfy those who remember that true religion is the same in essence under every dispensation? Can we forget that the Old Testament expressly commands us to exercise benevolence towards our enemies? Has not Moses in the law said, "if thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back again—if thou seeest the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help him." Was it not from the old Testament that our Lord quoted that precept, worthy of the Saviour of mankind, "if thine enemy hunger feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head," to melt him down to love? Has not Christ, in the parable, expounded the grand precept of the law, "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," as enjoining acts of kindness towards the Samaritans, whom the Jews considered as their worst enemies? There is more weight in the observation, that many of the most awful imprecations are in those Psalms, which not only speak expressly of Christ, but in which he himself is the speaker, so that the denunciations fall upon his enemies, and are predictions of the fate of Judas and the Jews. But this answer will seem insufficient, because it will scarcely apply to all the imprecations. The first, which is mentioned above, is from the 5th Psalm, which cannot, without forcing it to bend to an arbitrary hypothesis, be interpreted to speak of Christ. If then, there is but one imprecation (and there are many) which cannot be accounted for by this observation, we must seek some more comprehensive solution of the difficulty. For this, it has been usual to have recourse to the criticism on the form of words in the original Hebrew. It is observed that the Hebrew language employs the same form of speech to express both the imperative mood and the future tense of the indicative, so that the same words may be translated, *let them go down quick into hell, or they shall go down quick into hell*; thus all the predictions might with equal fidelity to the letter of Scripture, be read as simple prophecies of future events. Hence it has been much the vogue to translate in the future, instead of the imperative, all those passages which contain imprecations or denunciations of vengeance. There is, however, a serious objection to this plausible mode of extricating ourselves from the difficulty. The Holy Spirit has himself, in other parts of Scripture, determined that some of these passages in the Hebrew language has not the same ambiguity in this case as the Hebrew, and, in the New Testament, some of these imprecations are quoted by the inspired apostle, in such a way as to overthrow the favourite hypothesis, which would render all these passages in the future tense as simple predictions. Hence the late Dr. Horne, Bishop of Norwich, in his pious Commentary on the Book of Psalms, might seem to deserve some severity of reprehension for translating the 69th Psalm in the future, when the Holy Spirit, in the Apostles of the New Testament, has declared, that it is to be understood in the imperative. In Acts i. 20, we read, "it is written in the Book of Psalms, let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein, and his Bishopric let another take;" but the Bishop so far differs from the Apostle as to render it, "their habitation shall be desolate." In the same way he treats other verses which are quoted by St. Paul in Rom. xi. 9, 10. Now, whatever uncertainty there may be in the Hebrew, the Greek of the New Testament is unquestionably in the imperative and optative; which should have checked the prevalent propensity to translate the Psalms in the future.

But, after all, I ask, with some surprise, how it is that those who believe the Psalms not to be the private suggestions of the writer's own mind, but that holy men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, should have found any difficulty in the imprecations alluded to? So much of the Psalms are evidently beyond any human mind, that they compel every Christian to exclaim,—the voice of a God and not of a man! This divine Book contains the most minute predictions concerning future events, foretelling what thoughts would arise in men's minds, the dispositions they would feel, the exact words they would speak, and the extraordinary actions they would perform, hundreds of years after the Psalms were penned, so that it is evident that the Psalmist was not then uttering his own views, but was the organ of the Deity to express God's will and intention. In the simple prophecies, he uttered things which he often could not thoroughly understand, and, of course, could not feel all their force; so in those passages which are imprecations or denunciations, as well as declarations of future events, he did not know upon whom they would fall, and of course could not feel any ill-will or revenge, but was himself carried away by the divine afflatus, to utter the oracles of God to men. Now when we read the predictions in the Psalms, no one says, what a penetrating mind David's must have been to tell what men would exist, and how they would think, feel, speak and act hundreds of years to come! No one says, what prescience he must have possessed, to know so long before hand how Christ would appear on earth—what reformation the Jews would give—to tell exactly what words he would speak on the cross—and what the Jews would throw in his teeth—to discover that they would give vinegar and gall in his thirst, and part his garments amongst them, casting lots who should have the whole of his robe! Every one says, this was not David's singular foresight or wisdom, as if he could search the hearts of men, and even know what they would think, feel, speak and act in future ages: the sweet Psalmist of Israel himself explains the affair when he says, "the Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his words were in my tongue." Then, why should we say that it was a revengeful spirit that dwelt in David's breast when he uttered such dreadful imprecations? We might as well ascribe the prescience of the royal Psalmist to his penetrating mind, as the vengeance he denounces to his revengeful heart. The same inspiration which furnished him with the one, caused him to utter the other. The only material objection to this statement is, that many of the Psalms are composed on events in David's own life, and are thought to apply directly to his enemies, Saul, Doeg, or Abiathar. But it is evident that David's whole character and history were typical, and adapted to convey the divine mind in various important particulars. Thus, when he was meditating on events relative to his own life, his spirit was transported to utter predictions of Christ and his history. Hence, what would suppose the thoughts of his heart concerning his enemies, evidently are exact predictions of futurity, though it is the will of God that they be delivered as denunciations, and not as mere predictions. If then I heard a person utter such things as proved him elevated above humanity, delivering the mind of the omniscient God, revealing not only my most secret thoughts and wishes, but even ascertaining what they would be,—which only the spirit of God could foretell,—if, in the midst of these I heard him say, "let death seize upon him, and let him go down quick into hell," I should no more attribute this to the evil disposition of his heart towards me, than I should ascribe the former to his knowledge of my heart, and of futurity; but I should tremble at the denunciations of a righteous God, convinced that the speaker was the organ of the Deity, to utter views and determinations not his own.

April 1, 1840.

DUTY OF THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER.

Let our Christian orator, who would be understood and be heard with pleasure, pray before he speak. Let him lift up his thirty soul to God, before he pronounces any thing. For since there are many things which may be said, and many modes of saying the same thing, who knows, except He who rules the hearts of all men, what is most expedient to be said at the present hour? And who can cause us to speak what we ought, and as we ought, unless He, in whose hands we, and our words, are? And by these means he may learn all that is to be taught, and may acquire a facility of speaking as becomes a pastor. At the hour itself of

speaking, a faithful spirit will think his Lord's words adapted to his circumstances: "think not what or how ye shall speak, for it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of the Father which speaketh in you." If the Holy Ghost speak in those who are delivered up to persecutors for Christ, why not also in those who deliver Christ to learners? But, on the other side, if any say that men need to know no rules, nor follow any studies; if the Holy Ghost make men teachers; it might be said, also, men need not to pray: because our Lord saith, "your Father knoweth what ye have need of before ye ask him."—St. Augustine.

THE CHURCH.

COBOURG, SATURDAY, APRIL 18, 1840.

In the productions of the vegetable kingdom there is much that bears an analogy to the condition of man, as well in their frailty and perishableness as in their restoration to life and beauty after a temporary death. The grass and the flower,—to which man, in his fragility, is compared,—have their summer day of pride, and then their season of decay; but when the blight of autumn and the frost of winter have withered their freshness and effaced their beauty, there is a renewal of their life and glory in the spring. The earth, released from winter's icy thralldom, is clothed again with all the magnificence of flowers and fruits. Even now we are anticipating the speedy presentation of this general resurrection of the vegetable world. The "grass," lately sapsless and to all appearance dead, is regaining its life and verdure; the "flower of the field" will soon again spread its tints to the sun and shed its perfume on the breeze.

With the same confidence does the Christian, looking to his risen Saviour and the promises of that Saviour's word, anticipate a glorious spring beyond the grave,—a resurrection of the inanimate and decayed body to an unending life,—a clothing again with immortal flesh of the "dry bones" which have whitened on the plain, or blanched in the deep, or mouldered in the soil. There is something in the allusion to the "dry bones" by the prophet Ezekiel, very striking and very appropriate to the reflections naturally awakened at the present season of the religious year, when we are commemorating the joyful resurrection of our Lord from the dead. For although this passage, in its first and more direct sense, is that of a barren and unproductive condition, yet it may be considered as strictly appropriate also to the resurrection of human nature,—to the release of the body from the bands of death and the imprisonment of the grave, and to its re-union with the soul never again to be severed.

The resurrection of our blessed Lord—the great event which it is, at this season, our privilege to commemorate—is the earnest of our own resurrection; but like him we must first pass through the grave and gate of death. Nor in the prospect of a future triumph over the sting of death and the corruption of the grave, is the contemplation of their terrors to be repressed. And perhaps no warning is needed to induce a becoming reflection of seriousness upon the change which we must undergo, and the fearfulness of the struggle which with the "last enemy" is to be endured. For that change cannot be a happy one, and that struggle cannot end in victory, unless the anticipated resurrection have a spiritual commencement now,—unless it be realized, in time, by a change of the heart and a renewal of the life.

Even in this sense the "dry bones" can live; that is what is spiritually withered and dead can be renewed to the beauty of holiness and the image of God. It is true that with men this is impossible; but the analogy of nature, as well as his own revealed word, proves that it is possible with God. When we look at the withered herbage as at one season presented, and observe its transformation to luxuriance and fruitfulness at another, we know the reasons for the change. We know that the sunshine and the showers which God is pleased to send are the instruments of that new life,—that without his providential interposition, there could be no renovation of that decayed verdure,—no clothing again of the forests with their leaves, or the land with its herbage and fruits. But if God so clothe the grass of the fields,—if, without his solicitation, he grants to them this renewal of life,—much more, as the answer of importunate prayer, will he send the dew of his Holy Spirit into the corrupt or barren hearts of those beings whom Christ's precious blood hath been shed to redeem, and for whom he is a continual Intercessor at his Father's right hand.

And here let us not deceive ourselves. There can be no future resurrection of the body to glory, unless there be a present resurrection of the soul to the holiness and the purity which the Author and Finisher of our faith demands. For assuredly it is the doctrine of the Bible that they who are in Christ Jesus should be new creatures—be transformed in the renewing of their mind—be converted, and in the temper of their souls, in the guilelessness of their spirits, become as little children: assuredly it is the doctrine of that Liturgy which we daily use and which is founded upon the Bible, that "as Christ died and rose again for us, so should we die from sin and rise again unto righteousness." To hold any other doctrine—apart from its Scriptural authority—would, indeed, be an absurdity, something abhorrent to plain sense and reason; to think, for example, that persons may call themselves Christians—indulge the hopes and look for the privileges of Christians—and yet live, at the same time, in as much indifference and neglect of Christian faith and practice as if they had no knowledge of a crucified and risen Saviour. These are things to be considered and corrected, if any would profit by the death, and be made partakers of the resurrection of Christ.

By nature we are in a state as lifeless and unpromising as the "dry bones" of Ezekiel's vision; and from this barren condition nothing can deliver us—nothing can re-animate our spiritual decay—but the breath of the Almighty: the same power that created, can alone restore; and this restoration can be accomplished only in the way which, in his death and resurrection, Christ our Redeemer hath manifested. We must die unto sin, before we can live again unto righteousness. The heavenly life and holy spirit of the spotless Lamb of God must be revealed in our hearts: an intimate union and communion must be formed betwixt us and our life-giving Saviour: we must dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we must be one with Christ and Christ with us; and then, then only, will these "dry bones" live, and rise, and reign with their Deliverer forever.

The prevalence of scepticism and the growth of infidelity, with all their demoralizing consequences, so generally complained of at the present day, is, we think, in no slight degree, to be ascribed to the character of the publications which have of late years been propagated with so much industry amongst all classes of society. The writings of Voltaire and of kindred spirits prepared the minds of the French people for that appalling overthrow of their government and subversion of their religion which, about half a century ago, startled and shook the whole civilized world; and history informs us with what assiduity similar efforts were employed in the British isles to bring about the same fearful revolution. The sound Christianity inculcated in the National Church

has proved, with God's blessing, a check to that formidable growth of religious and political error which could, at any time, render a general convulsion an object of immediate apprehension; but it is not to be supposed that while the watchmen are more faithful and awake than they were wont to be, the enemy has ceased to sow tares, or that persons even now are wanting of subtle wiles, by every device, are disseminating the wickedness who, by every device, are disseminating the poison of infidelity and the temper of anarchy amongst the British public. Where a broad and open development of their real principles might alarm, recourse is had, in the prudent wisdom of the world, to more insinuating methods of giving them circulation and ensuring them success. Where blasphemous treatises would meet with open and instant opposition, works are put forth in which, under the most alluring form, the principles of error are cautiously interspersed with some ingredients of truth; and where philosophical essays might not be read or understood, the spirit of republicanism and of infidelity is inculcated through the medium of some elegant poem or fascinating novel. A Byron and a Moore, with a host of imitators, have pretty successfully done their part in unsettling the primary truths of Christianity and the first principles of moral obligation; while, under the winning guise of romance, a Bulwer and others of a kindred caste have been quietly but surely working out the same baneful result.

We know not precisely the character of a work of fiction, some extracts from which have lately come under our notice, entitled the "Maiden Monarch, or the Island Queen": not having seen the work itself, we cannot pronounce upon its merits as a whole; but from the specimens published, we are warranted, we conceive, in advising the exercise of some caution as to the doctrines and views which, under a captivating exterior, it seems to promulgate. We may be mistaken in our suspicion; but we are strongly impressed with the belief that it is the work of an individual who, probably from some interested motives, seeks to uphold that system which is maintained by the radical innovators of the day, and who brings forward the venerated authority of the Queen's name in support of theories which are sectarian in their bias and republican in their tendency. We are led to an apprehension that the author is not imbued with any very sound principles of Churchmanship, when he is so indefensible in his opinions upon National Education, which he brings forward in his shallow but specious remarks upon that subject. The British nation have spoken out with sufficient manliness and distinctness upon the system of education which dissent and infidelity, in a temporary covenant, are desirous, if possible, of establishing in England. They know full well that nothing more effectual could be devised for undermining the influence of the Established Church and sapping the foundations of Christianity itself; and while one party have mainly in view the destruction of the first, they readily avail themselves of the alliance of another who, in seeking the same work of demolition, cherish avowedly the ulterior object of dispensing with Christianity altogether. This result of the proposed Education scheme, thoughtful and conscientious people in the Mother Country have at once foreseen; and petitions, by thousands, have therefore been poured in against it. We shall only add that the voice of the Church, the peers, the gentry, yes and of the respectable middling classes in England are somewhat more to be regarded than the irresponsible dogmas of a nameless novel-writer.

But the most onerous sentiment upon which, in these extracts, our eye has lighted, is the alleged manner in which the regal authority is conferred: the doctrine therein broached is repugnant, at least to those principles which we feel it a religious duty to cherish. We allude to those words which, by the writer in question, are put into the mouth of our gracious Queen,—"*My people have placed a sceptre in my hand, a crown upon my brow.*" The inference which a stranger would draw from this assertion is that England is an elective monarchy,—for here it is plainly implied that the source of regal power is in the people! We have scarcely patience with these republican innovations upon the scriptural view of the derivation of kingly authority which is so manifestly upheld in the whole spirit of our admirable and Christian Constitution, and which is so impressively brought to the mind both of the monarch and her subjects at the Coronation-Service: we feel that it will be enough to expose to our readers the tenacity of such modern refinements upon old established principles, and that they will reject as indignantly as we do ourselves a theory of government so unconstitutional and unscriptural. By and by, if such principles are allowed to make their way through the land, unnoticed and unchecked, we shall have a revival in our own country of the blasphemy so rife in France. Under the portraits of their present King, exhibited not long ago in every shop window in Paris, is the following inscription,—"*Louis Philippe, King of the French, not by the GRACE OF GOD, but BY THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE!*"

We have marked, with every becoming feeling of Christian compassion and sympathy, the desire lately manifested by our contemporary of the *Guardian* for the restoration of peace and amity amongst some of the conductors of the public press as have hitherto unhappily differed. We believe our journal will not generally be accused of having evinced a controversial or pugnaeous attitude; or of having deviated from the line of defensive warfare, where any warfare was rendered unfortunately necessary. We have stood forth honestly, boldly and calmly in support of those first principles by which good subjects and sound Christians ought, in our humble judgment, to be guided: we have fearlessly met any open attempt which has been made to subvert those principles; and we have endeavored to unravel the wily web of sophistry by which others, with less courage but equal wickedness, have sought to loosen and destroy them. In this course it is our determination, without wavering, to persevere; and no opponent of those principles which as supporters of the altar and the throne we are religiously bound to maintain,—whether high or low in station, whether in lay or clerical garb,—shall we ever meet with compromise, or accept into a league which truth and honesty must condemn. And here we must observe that the terms upon which the *Guardian* so condescendingly offers peace, are such as we cannot in conscience accept: they would involve a rejection on our part of what we hold and believe to be true, and what, with that solemn conviction, we feel it a duty to inculcate. That power, either civil or ecclesiastical, is lodged in the people; in other words, that the voice of the multitude is to decide what form of government we shall live under, or what system of religious polity it is most expedient to adopt,—is a tenet which, as grossly unscriptural in its theory, and most mischievous in its practical workings, we shall firmly and perseveringly resist. On both these points—so essential to the well-being of the body politic and the welfare of the Church of God—the divine wisdom has furnished us with revelations sufficiently explicit. Men, without sin, cannot as whim or fancied interest may direct, change their form of government; and touching the priestly office, "no man may take that honor to himself, except he be called by God, as Aaron was,"—except credentials can be exhibited of its having been conferred according to the divine intention and the apostolic institution.

We observe in a late number of the *Guardian* a very disingenuous application of the term "Apology," as adopted by Mr. Perceval in his excellent and, we believe, unanswerable work; when every man of moderate education knows so well the sense in which, as thus employed, it is meant to be understood. If the erudition of that editor—which is probably not very extensive—reaches so far back, he will probably have heard of, if he has not read, Justin Martyr's *Apologies* for Christianity; he is perhaps aware of the existence of Bishop Jewell's *Apology* for the Anglican Church: he is no doubt acquainted with Bishop Watson's *Apology* for the Bible, in answer to Gibbon and Tom Paine; and what- ever may be the meaning at present almost exclusively attached to the word, it is but reasonable to believe that the excellent prelates last mentioned had knowledge enough of the English language not to make a misapplication of the term in using it in the sense in which it is obvious that they did, viz.—An answer for, or defence, as the Greek word (*απολογία*) from which it is derived, literally signifies. We can hardly impute to ignorance in the editor of the *Guardian* his late perversion of that word, as used by Mr. Perceval; but perhaps he will deem this to be more charitable and complimentary than to ascribe it to the only alternative,—a wilful and dishonest misapplication of it, in order to deceive his readers.

The work on Canada from the pen of Chief Justice Robinson, to which we alluded a few weeks ago, has just been republished at Toronto; and a careful perusal of it has fully sustained our antecedent impressions of its ability and its value. It is entitled "Canada and the Canada Bill,"—its main object being an examination and dissection of the proposed measure of Re-union;—but a long and valuable introductory chapter is given, containing a succinct account of the resources and political condition of the North American Provinces. We had commenced a review of this excellent work; but our time and space compel us to defer it until next week. In the mean time, we offer the following extracts from the dedicatory letter to Lord John Russell:—

"It has been stated in public debate in strong terms, and I think by your Lordship, that the difficulties which have occurred in Canada, including the late calamitous insurrections, and the whole train of evils which led to them, have flowed from the unfitness of the measure, as it is now presented, to Parliament by a Royal message; and if the opinion just referred to be correct, then that person would have rendered an inestimable service to his country, who by a timely warning could have saved the Government from falling into the supposed error. But, my Lord, having been an inhabitant of Canada during the whole period of the separation which has been thus lamented, I have ventured to form a different opinion of the effect of that measure. I ascribe to other causes the difficulties which have arisen in Lower Canada; and I believe that the remitting the provinces would prove to be, in fact, a much more unfortunate policy than the separation of them is even supposed to have been. However this may be, infallibility in the measure of the Government is not assumed to be an attribute of the present age any more than of the last; and I am anxious that while there is yet time, those considerations which her Majesty's Government have thought it safe to disregard should, at least, pass in review before those whose judgment as to the destinies of the Canadas must soon be decided, for good or for evil."

"If, upon matters connected exclusively with Upper Canada, I have spoken with more than usual confidence, it may be accounted for by the facts, that for the last eighteen years I have been a member of the legislature, having served nearly an equal period in each house; that I have been, for a much longer time, in the public service of the Province; that I have had the satisfaction of receiving the thanks of the legislature for the part taken by me in adjusting their financial difficulties with Lower Canada, and have been honoured with the express approbation of my Sovereign, and the repeated approbation of the Secretary of State during my long career in public duty. I may venture, I believe, further to state to your Lordship that, notwithstanding the many changes of administration in England and in the Colonies, I have not, that I have been aware of, been so unfortunate as to incur the displeasure, in any instance, of those under whom I have had the honour to serve. The three distinguished persons who have represented the royal authority in Upper Canada for the last twenty years are now in England; and they will bear me witness that their confidence and friendship, which I believe I retain, were not purchased by the surrender of my own judgment, or by the suppression of my opinions on any matter that could affect the welfare of the province."

"I am well aware, my Lord, that so long and intimate a connection with the colony as I have described may very possibly, in respect to some points, have produced a bias which persons actuated by their position to more extended views would be in no danger of contracting. And I dare say that the apprehension of this has induced the British Government to resort frequently to the expedient of sending out commissioners to report upon the institutions and condition of colonies to which, up to the period of their employment, they had been utter strangers. But on this side there lies another danger not altogether imaginary. It may happen that the officers selected for this special service may, by their previous course of politics in England, have been committed to the support of theories and opinions not merely visionary, but pernicious and unsound, to which they may bend, however insensibly, not their reasonings and recommendations only, but their statements. They may have principally in their view the advancement of some personal or party object quite apart from the interests of the colony to which they have been sent, but to which objects they may nevertheless be content to sacrifice the safety, the internal peace, and the religious interests of a distant territory with which their fortunes are in no measure identified, and to sacrifice with still less hesitation the character of local administrations, of public bodies, and of public servants, whose claims to justice may be esteemed a small matter in comparison with some general course of policy to be advanced on this side of the Atlantic."

"Your Lordship, I am sure, will readily admit that, in looking to the present measures, my testimony may most safely be relied upon as the foundation of parliamentary proceedings, the first requisites to be ascertained are integrity of character and honesty of purpose; and where these are equal, it will hardly be believed by your Lordship that Providence has condemned the inhabitants of Canada to such a hopeless inferiority of intellect, that they must be supposed incapable of giving an account of what they have seen and heard, and experienced in a daily intercourse of thirty or forty years, as may be gathered by strangers in travelling along its borders, and in mixing with those whom chance and the courtesies of society may throw in their way."

"I will end by observing that I shall bear, as cheerfully as others, my individual share of whatever consequences may flow from those measures which Parliament shall ultimately adopt, after the question has been presented, in all its aspects, to their consideration. But I could never patiently bear the reproach which I should feel I deserved, if, at such a moment, I refrained from communicating freely to others the apprehensions which I now feel so strongly myself."

We beg to acknowledge the receipt of the following Sermons, and to thank their authors for the courteous manner in which they have been transmitted to us:—

"The Mystery of Godliness, the Pillar and the Ground of the Truth, by the Rev. Benj. Slight, Wesleyan Missionary."

"The Exalted Objects of the Christian Ministry, by the Rev. Matthew Richey, A.M."

We have also to acknowledge a sermon from the able pen of our fellow-labourer, the Rev. E. Denroche, entitled, "An Apology for the Doctrine of Spiritual Temperance, or, the Church of Christ the true Temperance Society."—Of these publications we are obliged, for the present, to defer our further notice.

The Annual Meeting of the Newcastle District Committee of the SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE, will be held in the Grand Jury Room of the Court House, at Cobourg, on Monday the 27th inst. at half-past ten o'clock precisely. Members of the Society, and all others interested in its welfare, are earnestly requested to attend. The Annual Report, to the close of the year 1839, will then be presented.

We understand that an ORDINATION was held in the Cathedral Church of St. James at Toronto on Sunday last, when four persons were admitted to the Holy Order of Priests, and four were ordained Deacons. As the Toronto papers, thus far received, contain no notice

of this interesting ceremonial; and as we have not been furnished with an account of it from any of our private correspondents, particulars must be deferred to next week.

ECCLIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE. THE EPISCOPAL COMMUNION IN SCOTLAND.

A Pastoral Letter, addressed to the Clergy and Laity of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland, by the Bishops of that Church, assembled in Synod, in September last was read last Sunday in the chapels of St. Andrew and St. John, in this city. "We cannot," say the Right Rev. Fathers, "commence our address without reminding our brethren, however briefly, that no religious community in the Christian world has had greater difficulties to struggle with than our Church in every period of her history from the Reformation to the present day. During the long period of neglect, reproach, and suffering, to which, as a Christian community, we have been subjected, we have patiently submitted without any effort, individually or collectively, to rouse the sympathy, and to guide the zeal, of our own people against any of those institutions which enjoy the countenance of law. More especially, though they may not be able conscientiously to approve either the form or the management of that establishment which they are legally bound to support, they have uniformly, and in all circumstances, contributed to its maintenance without a murmur. We may confidently assert, that we cherish no enmity against those who differ from us, and most sincerely do we desire to live in perfect charity with Christians of all denominations. This we conceive, at the same time, to be perfectly compatible with a strict and steady adherence to all those principles by which we are distinguished from other churches and communities." The Right Reverend Fathers proceed to congratulate their brethren on the cordial concurrence and respect with which the late Code of Canons has been received by the Clergy of all their six dioceses. They state the success of "The Scottish Episcopal Society," so recently commenced, has been already such as most gratify every genuine churchman; and they vindicate it from the suspicion of party objects and of principles not avowed. In recommending a strict adherence to the system by which, as a Christian community, they are distinguished, the Right Reverend Fathers remark that "it appears that the first step in the deviations of all those communities which have renounced the faith which was once delivered to the saints, was by renouncing the reverence due to the fellowship and the sacraments, which were instituted to guard the doctrine of the Church, and to guide the conduct of her members. Such men and such communities affect to find fault only with human confessions and standards, as unjust impositions on Christian liberty, while they profess to maintain the Scriptures to be the only rule of faith and manners. This sounds well, and in a certain sense it is true. But if we renounce the ancient land-marks preserved from the apostolic age by the Church catholic, and if we lightly esteem the sacred ordinances by which the truths of Scripture are ascertained, enforced, and applied, we in effect place the faith which the Scriptures require, and the doctrine which they teach, at the mercy of fallible and presumptuous men, at once deceivers and deceived. It would, indeed, be an interesting and an important task to trace, step by step, the various and very gradual deviations by which the reformed on the Continent and the Puritans in England and Ireland have passed from their original high doctrinal Calvinism to Semianism, to Arrianism, to Socinianism, and, last of all, to Unitarianism, which is but a single remove, if indeed it be in any respect a remove, from absolute Deism." In conclusion, the Right Reverend Fathers say, "Finally, then, brethren, let us faithfully maintain, as by the most solemn obligations we are bound, the principles and peculiarities by which we are distinguished; but let us do so, as is equally our duty, by cherishing, at the same time, the most Christian and charitable feelings towards all who differ from us; even towards those who, in utter ignorance and prejudice, bring against us the harshest accusations. We would willing remove, if we could, their unjust prejudices. But we cannot for this, nor for any earthly object, consent to alter the venerable system which the experience of so many ages has so happily approved. We dare not even dissemble the truths which we profess, however disagreeable they may be to some of those who differ from us. If they are satisfied with their own systems, which they hold as exclusively as we do ours, they must in all justice yield to us the liberty which they claim to themselves, and which we are not disposed to dispute. Our system, and even our phraseology, altered, so as to remove certain prejudices, and so as to meet, if that were possible, the popular current of the times, might for a very transient period increase our reputation and our numbers in some places; and might add to the influence and importance of such popular individuals as might be able and disposed to avail themselves of the change. The increase of our Church is not to be desired on such terms, nor for such purposes. We must continue humbly indeed, as is our duty, but yet steadfastly, to maintain our position, as our venerable predecessors did, in more perilous times, by maintaining all our principles and all our institutions. Numerical strength acquired by a dereliction of our approved principles, or any of them, and by an accommodation of our sacred institutions, so as to suit the cravings of private opinion, would inevitably, and very quickly, prove absolute weakness, by introducing among us those who would of necessity change the whole character and conduct of our communion, by leading it to other religious views, and by conducting it gradually, but certainly, to other modes of faith and practice. We have no reason to be ashamed of our past history, persecuted, calumniated, and despised as we have been by the hereditary prejudice and enmity of many. Our condition, as a Christian community, is still as humble as our enemies even can well desire, for in these days of universal toleration, they have, were they so disposed, neither the power to extirpate, nor even to persecute us. But we are much less careful of our external condition than our spiritual character, of that especially which attaches us to the Holy Catholic Church, and which brings down to us the fellowship (*κοινωνία*) and the economy (*οικονομία*) of the apostles, as well as their doctrine, which continues to us the sacraments in all their original power and efficacy—those instituted means of divine grace by which we are matured in time for the merits of eternity." From a statement which accompanies the address, it appears that, in the year 1838, the Scottish Episcopal Church, numbered eighty-three congregations, eighty-six clergymen, 2098 catechumens, and 8523 communicants. The number of baptisms was 2113; of confirmations, 784; of marriages, 204; and of deaths, 404.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM THE REV. T. D. GREGG TO THE MAYOR AND CORPORATION OF DUBLIN.

The advocates of the union between church and state do not hold it proper, lawful or right, to coerce men into the profession of truth, nor to punish those who are so infatuated as to hold erroneous doctrines. They only say that a Christian state should uphold the doctrines of the holy Catholic Church, denounce the destructive errors that are at variance with general and individual happiness, and on the principle of persuasion, co-operate with the church to extend the sway of truth, and diminish the measure of falsehood. Let it be understood, moreover, that the Holy Church has, under God, the power of compelling the state to do so much. Be it ever remembered that the power of truth put forth and exerted by the Church of Jesus Christ, overthrow Popery when it was firmly established in these lands before, and would overthrow it, or any other system of error, aye, or of indifference either, if it were adopted by the state to-morrow. Truth is great, and will prevail. It would do so, however, after the delay of years, and the shedding of oceans of the blood of martyrs. That, however, you may be brought clearly to perceive the nature of "the Voluntary System," which is now working against the church, allow me to give you the following extracts from a