

Whatever power Timothy and Titus were invested with as eminent ministers and evangelists in the primitive Church, Mr. Shreve has certainly not proved that they were *Diocesan Bishops*. As it respects "the angel of the Church of Ephesus," (Rev. ii. 1,) to whom John was directed to write, every one admits that he was the *Minister, Presbyter, or Bishop* of the Church; and as such "superior" to all the members of the Church, and its "responsible Governor;" but this surely will not prove *three orders* of clergy, or that the Minister or Bishop of Ephesus was a *Diocesan Bishop* in the modern sense of the term.

To what Mr. Shreve says of Timothy and Titus Mr. McLeod replies,—

"The conclusion to which I have arrived, is that they were extraordinary messengers, called 'evangelists,' (Ephes. iv. 11,) 'assistants of the Apostles,' who acted under their special authority and direction;—and as the Apostle Paul directed them to ordain Bishops or Presbyters in the several churches, but gave them no authority to ordain successors to themselves in their particular office as evangelists, it is clear that 'evangelists' must also, as well as 'Apostles and Prophets' be reckoned among the number of extraordinary and temporary Ministers suited to the first age of Christianity." p. 21.

Mr. Shreve's attempt to prove the *divine authority of Diocesan Episcopacy* was a complete failure; and by requesting that publicity might be given to his letter, the public have learnt that the Rev. Rector of Guysborough, while he asserts that the form of church government to which he adheres, "was instituted by Christ himself," and by that form Christians must be guided: under that form all must be admitted to the *Ministry*, for none other can be considered valid."—Yet he has not given one single text of Scripture that can be said with any propriety to prove those arrogant pretensions.

Mr. Shreve finding himself foiled in an attempt to prove *Diocesan Episcopacy* of Scriptural, and therefore of divine authority, attempts a retreat by saying, "I am of necessity obliged to be brief, for all that is to be gathered from the Scriptures on this important and interesting subject, cannot be contained in one letter." p. 6.

Mr. McLeod considers this as "thrown in by way of *salvo*," and observes "notwithstanding then the *salvo*, we have reason to believe, that your letter does, in fact, contain the strongest proof in favour of your statement that you could produce from the Words of God." p. 13.

We are not surprised that Mr. Shreve flew so quickly from the Scriptures to the Fathers, in order to prove his point. But he should have remembered that if he could have proved from Scripture that Jesus Christ or his Apostles instituted three orders of ministers: as, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, then the corollary would have been irresistible, that the Church of England was truly Apostolic in its constitution, and that wherever Diocesan Episcopacy prevailed, there, and there only, could a Christian Church be said to exist. But until this is proved, direct from the New Testament, all that any Fathers, whether ancient or modern, may say about it, will fail to produce conviction.—*To be continued.*

Recent Intelligence.

IDOLATRY IN INDIA.

THE following letter from Sir Peregrine Maitland to the Bishop of London, appeared in the Times a few days ago:—

My Lord,—it is not on account of the particular connection which I happen to have had with the

subject of your Lordship's motion in the House of Lords on Tuesday last, but it is as a member of the Christian Community that I desire to acknowledge myself deeply indebted to your Lordship for the zeal and ability with which your Lordship on that occasion exhibited the true state of the question which has too lately been agitated, in respect to the propriety of our assisting in the Heathenish rites of the Hindoo worship.

Next to the importance of giving to the people of this country an accurate knowledge of the truth as it respects this question, it is material to its right and satisfactory adjustment that the efforts which are used to that end should not be misapprehended in India, either in respect to their object or extent. And I am persuaded that if pains are taken to prevent misapprehension, there will be found on the one hand no resentment, and on the other no occasion for alarm.

There are one or two points in respect to which any public discussion of the question in this country is too likely to afford ground for erroneous impressions, either because all those who take part in the discussion have not that intimate knowledge of its natural bearings which opportunities of local observation can alone confer, or because such as have enjoyed those opportunities are to imagine that it is not necessary to explain so distinctly what to themselves is so familiar and obvious.

I do not mean that in the statements and observations of your Lordship any room was afforded for the error to which you more particularly allude; but for the tone of some part of the highly interesting discussion which followed, it is possible that an erroneous idea might be formed of the change which every Christian must desire to see introduced into the practice of our Government in India. It cannot be too plainly avowed, or too clearly inculcated, that all that was intended by the Court of Directors in their Despatch of 1833, and all that is desired by those who wish to see that despatch faithfully acted up to is, that the Hindoos shall be left to perform by themselves their acts of public worship to their idols, unaided and unmolested by the civil and military authorities of the company.

Hitherto we have given our positive countenance and active support to this idolatrous worship. That henceforth we should abstain from doing so, is the only change that is contemplated, or ever has been contemplated. Neither the Government, nor any of its servants have proposed or desired that the natives should, by any compulsion, be constrained to abandon their own religious observances, or to adopt ours.

However slow may be the effect of teaching, example, and persuasion, the most zealous Christian is not only content to look to no other human means of conversion, but he feels himself prohibited by his own religion from resorting to any other.

That we do either intend or wish to propagate the Christian religion by force in our Eastern possessions, is not imagined by any part of the population there, and there is no point on which we ought to be more careful than to preclude the possibility of such an inference being drawn, from any thing that may be done, or said, in this country.

But, on the other hand, nothing can be more vain and unreasonable than the fears of those persons who imagine that the forbearing to assist in the superstitious and idolatrous worship in the East will excite tumult and hostility, and be resented by the natives as an invasion of their religious freedom.

Blind as their attachment is to their superstitions, they do not require that we shall become idolaters; and I venture to assert, that whenever the Government shall think fit to allow their own order to be executed (as I imagined they did intend to do, or rather had done, when I accepted the military command)