

that there is no possibility of fairly evading it. Especially do their controversial writers find themselves embarrassed when challenged to an examination of the Fathers on the subject of Church Government, and we have seen in too many painful instances, that for extraction they will not scruple to employ the most flagrant mutilation and falsification. We had supposed that the unenviable fame acquired by Dr. Miller, of Princeton, in the use of such dishonest methods to support a weak cause, (in his "Letters on the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry," in all his quotations from the Fathers, particularly Ignatius, omitting the very substance of the controversy, viz. that the Apostles left the Bishops their successors, delivering to them their own place of Government—as was so fully shown several years ago, with a knowledge of the subject gained by the most extensive and laborious reading, by Dr. Cooke, of Kentucky,—was not likely to be eclipsed in the present age. But he must give way to a Mr. Thomas Powell, an English preacher in the Wesleyan Society, who has recently published an Essay on Apostolical Succession, which has been lauded to the skies by dissenters of every class, and is already triumphantly republished by the Methodist Book Concern at New York, who are labouring to give it the widest circulation. In all its references to ancient writers, it proves to be a tissue of misquoting, misrepresentation, and falsehood, and we are glad to find that it has been unmasked in a valuable little publication entitled "The Weapons of Schism," by the Rev. Edward A. Stopford, a Clergyman of the Church of Ireland. For such knowledge of this work we are indebted to *The Church*, the Editor of which, after reading its complete exposure of Mr. Powell's wicked misrepresentations, justly characterizes the Essay as "an imposture, unparalleled perhaps in the annals of literary dishonesty and political legerdemain." We have had the curiosity to examine a number of Mr. Powell's pretended quotations from the Fathers, and to compare them with those given in Dr. Miller's Letters; and so far as we went found such a perfect coincidence, as satisfied us that he has largely "entered into the Doctor's labours." Our contemporary gives copious extracts from Mr. Stopford's Review, exposing no less than eighteen absolute forgeries, misquoting, misrepresentations, and we know not how many other contrivances of deceit; and he well observes, that such an attempt to depict the Episcopacy of the precious testimony of the primitive Fathers but confirm us in our estimation of the strength and justice of our cause; "for it may reasonably be considered strong presumptive evidence of the truth of our doctrine, fact, or opinion, that falsehood must be brought to bear upon it, in order to counteract its influence or disturb its foundations."

THE CHURCH.

COBBOURG, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1843.

CONTENTS OF THE OUTSIDE.

First Page. Present aspect of the Church. The Church's alleged tendency to Popery. The Men of the Disruption. Testimony of the Fathers.

Fourth Page. Poetry.—Worsted Park. English and Irish Ecclesiastical Intelligence. Garner—Rev. Thos. Scott; Abp. Stanley; Bishop Stirling; Bishop Horner; Dr. C. Sullivan.

The celebrated challenge of Hooker never has, because it never can, be answered: "We require you to find out but one Church on the face of the whole earth that hath been ordered by your discipline, or hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say by Episcopal regimen, since the time that the blessed Apostles were here conversant."

The fact implied in this challenge is, that, for fifteen hundred years from the establishment of the Christian Religion onwards, not a Church in the wide bounds of the inhabited world,—in any kingdom, or people, or continent, or island, where the name of Jesus was known and his faith embraced,—owned any other government but that by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. The adversaries of Episcopacy admit the universal prevalence of that regimen within less than a hundred years from the Apostles' times; indeed within fifty years of the death of St. John. Blosfeld admits that Episcopacy was introduced before Tertullian wrote his book on Baptism, which he dates in the year 197; and states that Episcopacy was every where admitted before the end of the second age. SATURNUS acknowledges that "about the beginning or middle of the second age a chief singular Episcopacy over presbyters was introduced." DE MOULIN candidly affirms, "I am not so fastidiously presumptuous as to oppose myself to all antiquity, and reject as faulty and wicked a thing which was received into the Church from the age succeeding the Apostolic." PROFESSOR CAMPBELL, a Scottish Presbyterian, concedes that, "before the middle of the second century, a subordination in the ecclesiastical polity began to obtain very generally throughout the Christian world; every single Church or congregation having a plurality of presbyters, who, as well as the deacons, were all under the superintendency of one pastor or bishop." And the Presbyterian Divines, in the Isle of Wight conference, thus replied to King Charles: "We grant that, not long after the Apostles' times, bishops, in some superiority to presbyters, are, by the writers of those times, reported to have been in the Church."

After such admissions from the most learned of the anti-episcopal controversialists,—we certainly do not include in that number Mr. Thomas Powell and his Apologists,—is it fair, is it rational to resist the conclusion, that Episcopacy, being universally prevalent throughout the Christian world within fifty years of the death of St. John, was an Apostolic and therefore a Divine institution? Unless the opponents of this system can show that it is *contrary* to the Apostles' teaching and practice,—and we are not aware that such has been attempted by any respectable controversialist,—no reasonable or candid person surely can deny, that it must be *agreeable* to their doctrine and custom, and that, of consequence, it was enjoined by them.

For what is implied in the denial of this inference? Nothing less than this,—that the whole Christian world, within fifty years of the death of the Apostle St. John, was chargeable with a grievous, and, as opponents of Episcopacy profess to argue, a most pernicious innovation upon the simple polity which our Lord and his Apostles instituted in his Church; that ambition,—the love of power, or the love of gain,—was, at that early age, so strong and so universal amongst the followers of Christ, that they overturned the principle of equality which had been intended to prevail amongst the rulers of the Church, and that one individual in every Christian society or congregation usurped a power and privileges which had formerly been delegated to a number. This is the serious accusation against the early Christians, which is implied in the alleged Apostolic origin of the presbyterial form of Church government, and in the affirmation that the episcopal regimen can be dated no farther back than the middle of the second century.

This is an allegation which every pious and reflecting mind must reject at once as unjustifiable and wicked; one which must be repudiated as calumnious and sinful in the extreme degree, unless the fact can be established,—and that unequivocally and unquestionably,—that our Lord and his Apostles *forbade* the establishment of Episcopacy; unless it can be proved affirmed in God's word, in some portion of the Apostolic history or the Apostolic epistles, that the Churches of Christ must be governed by a body of elders with equal power and authority. Unless, we repeat, we discovered this, we could never assent to the proposition,—started, let it be remembered, for the first time about fifteen hundred years after the Apostles' times,—that the Christians of the second century introduced a great and unjustifiable change into the government of the Church; substituting Episcopacy for presbytery, and delegating, in each Christian community, the ordaining power to one, instead of dividing it amongst many.

But what intelligent or charitable mind is there that will admit such a monstrous supposition as this,—so monstrous, as impugning the moral rectitude and spiritual pureness of the early Christians,—so monstrous, as implying that they were, by common consent, guilty of conspiring against the known institution of Christ and his Apostles? But it is as absurd as it is monstrous. For is it credible that such an innovation should be introduced without the record of a warning or a remonstrance against it; that not a work, or fragment of a work, of those times, which has come down to us, makes the slightest allusion to this universal and

sweeping change; that no martyr, with dying voice, is known to have protested against this sin of his brethren; that no heretic, jealous of those in authority, pleaded the Apostolic practice in opposition to their assumption of episcopal pre-eminence? And is it credible that such a change,—if a change it will be affirmed to be,—should, within less than half a century, have prevailed from India to the pillars of Hercules, from Ethiopia to the regions of Pontus; that no corner of the world, no inlet of the ocean, which professed the faith of Christ, knew any other form of Church polity than the one which is alleged to be diverse from the Apostolic institution? Well has Tertullian said, "If the Churches in this respect had erred, they would have varied"; some would have been discovered, adhering to what our opponents call the primitive model: in some remote and sequestered corner where, it may be believed, the stride of ambition would not have penetrated, we should have found the simplicity of the Apostolic regimen prevailing, episcopacy abjured, and parity asserted. Some such result as this of an innovation upon the Apostolic system of government must somewhere assuredly have been discerned; it is incredible that the whole body of Christian believers could have been in a state of sleep so profound, or in an indifference so lethargic, as to have had this violence done to their faith, their customs, and their prejudices, without the record of a murmur against it,—without a sign or token, that can be discovered, of dissent or opposition. That there have been, or may have been, records, now suppressed, which avouched an anti-episcopal form of Church government, is what Bishop Hall calls "a very poor and beggarly evasion." "Suppressed," he adds, "and by whom? I hope, by the hierarchy. What? when there was no opposition? no colour of offence? Suppressed! what, not only their edition in this age of presses, but their very mention? Can they persuade themselves? Others, sure, they cannot: or, if they can, I would fain see them that, among so many holy fathers, and faithful records of all occurrences that befel the Church, whose worthy monuments are in our hands, there should not be the least touch, either of their dislike of Episcopacy, if there had been any, or of their allowance of the discipline called for; not so much as the least intimation of any city or region, that was, or wished to be, otherwise governed, than by a Diocesan Bishop?"

The first mention we have of anything like a general or recognized dissent from the acknowledged regimen of the primitive Church, is, as has often been observed, at the period of the Reformation in the sixteenth century,—that is, about fifteen hundred years after that form of Church Government is admitted to have been established. But it is instructive to observe the manner in which this dissent was originally expressed. Amidst the struggles which, on the continent of Europe, arose in consequence of the Reformation,—when, in short, its advocates were stated to be reduced to the alternative of either abandoning Episcopacy, or abandoning the Reformation,—we find that it was with reluctance, with sorrow and pain, that they consented to the adoption of the former alternative. In the public Confessions of the Continental Churches, as well as in the private declarations of their leaders and rulers, we find this regret unfeignedly and undisguisedly expressed. The Augsburg Confession speaks of Episcopacy as that "which they exceedingly desired to preserve;" and in another place it states that their "desire is to testify to the world that they would willingly preserve the ecclesiastical and canonical government if the Bishops would only cease to exercise cruelty upon their Churches. This their desire (they express a hope) will excuse them before God, before all the world, and unto all posterity; that it may not be justly imputed unto them, that the authority of Bishops is impaired amongst them." The venerable MELANCTHON, who drew up this Confession, in writing to Luther, says, "I know not with what face we refuse Bishops, if they will suffer us to have purity of doctrine." CALVIN says, "I should account those men deserving of even the severest anathema, who do not submit themselves reverently and with all obedience to such a hierarchy." BUCER expresses himself to this effect,—"We see by the constant practice of the Church, even from the time of the Apostles, how it hath pleased the Holy Ghost, that among the Ministers to whom the government of the Church is especially committed, one individual should have the chief management both of the Churches and of the whole ministry, and should, in that management, take precedence of all the brethren. For which reason, the title Bishop is employed to designate a chief spiritual governor." BEZA says,—"If there be any who reject altogether Episcopal jurisdiction, (a thing I can hardly be persuaded of) God forbid that any one in his senses should give way to the madness of such men." JEROME ZANONIUS makes this strong protestation,—"I profess before God, that, in my conscience, I repute them no other than schismatics who make it a part of reformation of the Church to have no Bishops, who should preside over their Presbyters, in degree of authority, where this may be had. Furthermore, (he adds) with Mr. Calvin, I deem them worthy of all manner of anathemas, as many as will not be subject to that hierarchy which submits itself to the Lord Jesus." In another place, he says,—"What is more certain, out of histories, councils, and all the writings of the Fathers, than those orders of ministers of which we have said, that they were established and received in the Church by the common consent of the whole Christian commonwealth? And who am I, that I should disapprove what the whole Church hath approved?"

But it is needless to multiply these quotations, which might be extended through many columns; what we have adduced is sufficient to show the mind of the early Continental Reformers upon the subject of Episcopacy, and with what reluctance, amounting to grief and distress, they abandoned the apostolical government of the Church. Yet, by-and-by, when the presbyterial system, which, as they avowed, they adopted only from the sternest necessity, acquired some degree of strength and consolidation; when it stood in an attitude of more positive rivalry to the hierarchy which they felt it a duty to abjure; when, rather, they came to be borne on by an impulse which they would have been glad to restrain, but could not control; when the jealousies and strifes of political rivalry served, more than any consideration of religious necessity, to maintain this bolder front of opposition to the apostolical order of the Church; then they began to change their language of apology into tones of defiance and vituperation. They began to defend the change, or as they themselves had confessed it, the innovation introduced, to assume a higher ground than that of mere necessity; and in process of time, not content with this latter plea, proposed at first in so humble and christian a spirit, they attempted to support their new position by a show of argument from scripture, and even from primitive antiquity. Nor was this long confined to a defensive mode of warfare; it soon assumed an offensive and aggressive character. In a little time, the authority of Bishops was represented as a presumptuous encroachment on the rights and privileges conveyed to Presbyters by the Apostles; and Popery and Prelacy were declared to be so closely in alliance as even to be synonymous!

In reverting to the era of the Reformation on the continent,—when its advocates were driven to the alternative of adhering to a communion which inculcated soul-destroying errors, or of departing from the Apostolical government of the Church and becoming schismatics,—we can deeply sympathize with their situation, so long at least as the position they felt themselves constrained to adopt was maintained with the temper of regret and humility. But if we cannot sympathize with the after wariness, obstinacy, we may almost say dishonesty, which they have evinced, much less can we speak in terms of sympathy

of those who had no similar plea of necessity to advance for the abolition of this ancient and apostolical polity of the Church, and the snapping of the chain which links the Bishops of the Church new with the Apostles of the Lord Jesus. In no portion of the British Isles, was such a violation necessary of the principle of Church government which has claim to be Apostolic and Divine. The magnitude, the extent, the duration of a proven error, forms no excuse for its retention; and never must we shut our eyes to the misfortune, if we may not denominate it a sin, of the inference, in believing that the principle of dissent is right in proportion to the breadth of the surface which it covers, or the root which it has been permitted to take. It is as much an exotic and a tare, when covering the land with its shadow, as when it lies isolated, diminutive and unnoticed; and it is internally and essentially as erroneous, even as the established faith of a nation, as when shamed into some obscure corner, the contempt and abhorrence of the rightly-judging and the sober-minded. "Hic defensor communis furore est furemum multitudinis," is the statement of an ancient Christian Apologist, Minucius Felix: the multitude of the mad is their justification of the common madness!

With the very worst features of this infatuation,—if we may venture to term it by so gentle a name,—are the Methodist body chargeable in leaving the "old paths" of Episcopal authority, and striking out into by-ways of their own devising. But as we have often taken occasion to shew, their leader Wesley shuddered at such an innovation as they have subsequently, without remorse, thought proper to admit. His original idea obviously was, to revive and rouse into more vigorous life a system which he did not deny was sound and apostolical: a rival institution, such as his followers have set up, mingled not, we must believe, with at least his early views and hopes of the revival of the national religion; and if we can understand his meaning at all, it was that his followers might exhort their brethren in England and in all the world,—as long at least as the necessity for such exhortation remained,—to a more vigorous maintenance of the truth, and a purer development of it in the life; but that none should take upon them the priest's office, or presume to administer the sacramental ordinances of religion.

Without a shadow of the excuse which the continental Reformers might, with some show of justice have pleaded, these more modern innovators have abjured the ancient ecclesiastical polity, and set up a rival and schismatical institution of their own,—creating their own ministers, and desiring, if possible, to supplant the national hierarchy itself. We repeat that for this they have not the shadow of an excuse, because they admit the soundness of the articles of faith which the Church propounds, and subscribe with professed heartiness to the principles and spirit of her Liturgy and Homilies. In fact their own system of faith is an extract from that of the Church of England; and whatever in it is defective or superfluous, can easily be demonstrated to be in contradiction to that interpretation of the Scriptures of truth which has been bequeathed to us by the voice of the Church from the Apostles' days to the present times.

And now, too, as did the Continental Reformers,—modest, and reluctant at first to repudiate a principle which they confessed to be scriptural, and only to be parted with from necessity,—they attempt to defend their unlawful and schismatical position by an appeal to the authority of Scripture and even of the early Church! This, as we not long ago shewed, was attempted in a work written by Mr. Thomas Powell, of the Methodist Connection in England,—professing to overthrow the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, and to shew that Presbyterianism and not Episcopacy was instituted by the Apostles, and asserted by the primitive Fathers! This work has been ably exposed by the Rev. E. A. Stopford, a Clergyman of the Church of England; and we a few weeks ago, gave the substance of his remarks in two editorial articles. These were regarded by Mr. Richey, a friend of Mr. Powell, and a preacher in the same Connexion in this Province, as unreasonably severe, and as evincing a misconception or misrepresentation of Mr. Powell's reasoning and meaning; and he has, accordingly, lately published a pamphlet for the purpose of demonstrating this. Not content, however, with the endeavour to shield his friend from imagined obloquy, he enters into the spirit of all his arguments, and endeavours to maintain the ground upon which Mr. Powell's position is taken.

It may be highly praiseworthy in Mr. Richey to stand forth in defence of a friend in his hour of need; and if, in the progress of our strictures upon his pamphlet, we can discover that we have over-stated any of Mr. Powell's alleged delinquencies, we shall gladly acknowledge it; but that both he and Mr. Richey have grossly mistaken, if they have not willfully misrepresented, the merits of the question at issue, it would require no extraordinary learning or ability to prove.

But we cannot, after so long, but not as we believe unnecessary, an introduction, go into the subject to-day: suffice it to say, that none comparatively more easy could have been proposed to us,—none in which we feel upon stronger ground,—none wherein the sophistry or perversion, so freely resorted to by the opponents of Episcopacy, can avail them less. In the intention to state fully and fairly the points impugned by Mr. Richey, it is not necessary now to speak particularly upon the merits of his pamphlet. This, abating the vicious pomposity of the style, and the great want of clearness and directness in the reasoning, may take respectable rank amongst the productions of the many who, in modern times, struggle to maintain a false position, by making a merit of a sin; who, with very little learning and a great deal of vanity, attempt to controvert and overthrow the arguments of such giants in polemical theology as a Jeremy Taylor, a Hall, a Hammond, and a Barrow. But we shall not prosecute the subject further at present, and must entreat our readers' indulgence for the length to which our remarks have already been extended.

The Editor of the *Christian Guardian* retreats very lamely from the dilemma into which, after a recent exposure, he admits that he has placed himself. He could hardly have overlooked the fact that we gave him credit for saying, that "there were two or three inadvertent expressions" in the article from the *Kingston Chronicle & Gazette* from which he so eagerly copied, because it was abusive of *The Church*. Those "inadvertent expressions," as we have shewn, evinced pretty clearly that the writer of them was but an unsafe guide in theological matters, and that his animadversions upon a religious journal must therefore go for very little. But the *Guardian* appeared unwilling to let the influence of that article upon its readers, by pointing out specifically the inadvertent expressions upon which he so gently touched,—it mattering little to him what erroneous doctrine was conveyed, so long as *The Church* was vilified.

In regard to our reference to Mr. Wesley's writings, and his repudiation of the assumption of the priestly office by any of his followers in England, we quoted his words not as applicable to a particular locality only, but as touching the principle of the question at issue. Mr. Wesley distinctly compares such an assumption of the priestly office to the sin of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and he fortifies his condemnation of such sinful presumption by the citation of this well-known and important text, "No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as Aaron." Did Mr. Wesley, then, mean that a man might commit the sin of Korah, Dathan and Abiram with impunity, as long as he did so out of England? Does he mean to say, that in Scotland or America it were no sin to imitate their presumptuous example, and that the violation of the Scripture rule, which he so pro-

perly adduces, might be made correctly and with impunity in any quarter of the world except in England? Such is the *Guardian's* version of Mr. Wesley's words, and he confirms the interpretation by a quotation from a "private letter" of the Corypheus of his correspondents, written with about as much delicacy as it has been cited. If this be a correct application of Mr. Wesley's words, both the *Guardian* and his ally make him out a more inconsistent and disingenuous man than even the opponents of his system have felt disposed to consider him.

But supposing their interpretation of Mr. Wesley's words to be a correct one,—viz. that, according to his injunction, no follower of his was to assume the priestly office in England on the peril of incurring the guilt of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and of violating an obvious Scripture rule,—allowing that Mr. Wesley was right in limiting the force of his injunction to a country where there was a regularly ordained and established priesthood, upon what grounds do they consider that rule to be inapplicable to the next age after Mr. Wesley, and even to the present times? Surely, according to the *Guardian's* own interpretation of Mr. Wesley's words, his followers, in any generation after him, will be liable to the same condemnation, as when he lived, if they violate the Scripture rule which he has adduced for their guidance. They must, therefore, admit that Mr. Wesley was a very absurd and inconsistent man, or else allow that the words which we quoted from him, stamp him, according to their interpretation of those terms, a "Puseyite" and a Papist.

Our attention has been directed by a valued correspondent to the reception and consecration (as it is most improperly termed,) or some relics at Yamachiche, in the District of Three Rivers, as the Yamaiche is related in *Le Canadien* of December 11, 1843. The ceremony took place on the 23rd November last, and it illustrates one of the most absurd and humiliating superstitions which have crept into the Romish Communion, we cannot but concur with our correspondent in the persuasion that such a transaction in the present age, establishes the "fallacy of the oft-asserted, and alas! seldom controverted opinion, that the Roman Catholics of the present day are not given to the superstitions of the Roman Catholics of the olden times." It proves indeed that the corruptions of Rome, however preposterous and irrational, are deeply rooted, and well calculated to exclude from the minds of her worshippers the light of religious truth; but we are disposed to view the occurrence to which we allude rather with compassion than with those feelings of strong indignation with which the lover of Scriptural truth is accustomed to regard the more flagrant spiritual delusions of the Papal system.

In contemplating an idolatrous ceremonial like the present one, we say that the feeling of pity is predominant in our hearts; for we cannot refrain from expressing the deepest concern at the ignorance which is indicated by the religious veneration of relics. The memory of those who in days gone by have lived a holy and a Christian life, and have bequeathed to succeeding generations the sanctified example of a godly conversation, ought indeed to be cherished with respect, and celebrated with pious gratitude. This is a tribute to departed worth which it is becoming and profitable for us to pay; and this principle our Church has fully recognized in prescribing the observance of Saints' Days, to commemorate the excellence and labours of the first emissaries of Christianity. From usages such as these, results the most beneficial and desirable will naturally follow; but that any god, that angel but evil, can be derived from the enshrining and adoration of spurious relics,—of the pretended remains of our forefathers, which it is utterly impossible should be anything but forgeries,—we are at a loss to comprehend. If it could even be satisfactorily proved that such relics as we find to enter into the construction of the Romish machinery of superstition were genuine remains, yet the mode in which they are collected, preserved, and finally venerated and worshipped by the great body of Romanists, would expose the whole system to the charge of gross idolatry, and, in that character, render it liable to the displeasure and vengeance of a jealous God.

But the history of relic-worship is the record of the vilest chicanery and deception. The credulity of folk, and made the sale of them a lucrative trade. The evil increased with the advance of medieval darkness, and when the gloom of secular and spiritual ignorance brooded deeply over the continent of Europe, no successful attempt over to the period of the Reformation was made to expose the delusions invented by that purpose. Those who have spoken to me with complaint of the fraud and imposture by which spurious relics had been formed and circulated even in his time; and the practice of paying any reverence approaching to religious worship even to genuine memorials, as it was distinctly repudiated by the Church of Smyrna and by St. Jerome, so it was condemned by all the early Fathers who had occasion to speak of it.

The case which has now been brought under our notice is one of singular extravagance. It is the "consecration" of a portion ("the articulation," the nail we suppose) of the left little finger of St. Anne, the patron Saint of the Church where the relic has been deposited. She is styled by *Le Canadien* "the glory of the two Testaments;" and, we believe, reputed to have been the mother of the Blessed Virgin Mary. As such a character is nowhere introduced in the Gospels nor in any other writing of the New Testament, we must infer that the knowledge of her name has descended to us through the medium of tradition. But this tradition, we apprehend, is not sufficiently Catholic and authenticated to justify any reliance on the information it conveys. There is, indeed, a statement to this effect in a sacred genealogy ascribed to Hippolytus the Martyr; but we know that genealogies are of all documents the most exposed to adulteration, and the fact in question is not, so far as we are aware, noticed by any of the more distinguished writers of the Primitive Church. We are acquainted with no one circumstance in any history, apology, or other record whatsoever, composed in the early ages of the Christian Church, which could even furnish a clue to the name, life, character, or death of the Virgin's mother.

But we shall be struck with the manner in which this pretended relic was, after great difficulty as it should seem, procured by the Romish bishop of Quebec. "His Lordship (writes *Le Canadien*) had obtained it after reiterated entreaties, from the proper authorities of the town of Carcassonne in France, where rest the precious remains of this 'glory of the two Testaments.'" A very ingenious story indeed! We fancy, however, that the genuineness of the "precious remains" would be rendered a little more credible, were we informed as to the mode of their preservation during the lapse of nearly 2000 years, as well as with reference to the cause which brought the body of St. Anne to Carcassonne at all. There is one sad event written on the pages of history in lines of blood, better authenticated than this,—the slaughter of the Albigenses within the walls of this same city. Wherever the mortal form of the Virgin's Mother was deposited, it is at least certain that the bones of thousands who were the victims of Popish persecution—have been bleached under the ramparts of Carcassonne. If the one be a silly fable, which the common sense of mankind must soon consign to oblivion, the other is written in imperishable records,—a stern and sanguinary reality.

Now this *Indenture* witnesseth; that the said Mahlon Burwell, for and in consideration of the foregoing reasons; and for and in consideration of the sum of one shilling, to him in hand paid by the said Lord Bishop of Quebec, hath given, granted, bargained, sold, aliened, released, conveyed and confirmed; and by these presents doth give, grant, bargain, sell, alien, release, convey and confirm, unto the said Lord Bishop of Quebec, and his successors for ever, *All and singular* that certain parcel or tract of Land and premises situate, lying and being in the Village of Fingal, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in the Township of Southwold, in the County of Middlesex, in the District of London, in the Province of Canada, containing by admeasurement six acres, be the same more or less, being composed of a part of Lot number Nineteen, North on Talbot Road East, in the said Township of Southwold, and is bounded and bounded, as may be otherwise better known and described as follows, that is to say: Commencing where a Post has been planted, in the Western limit of the said Lot number Nineteen, in