

Poetry.

A POOR MAN'S DELIGHT IN MUSIC.

Yes! sweetly fall the dying tones of music on the ear:
They bring back many lovely thoughts and recollections dear.
For music flows for rich and poor, in many a gushing sound,
And spreads the majesty of God and nature all around.
The pealing organ in the church, the voice of singing men,
The strings of harp and lute, and when a boy I loved them then,
I love them now, and when I was a boy I loved them then,
O! think not that poor country-men, who work and till the land,
The feeling of delightful music do not understand!
The warbling of a thousand birds, the murmuring of streams,
With every voice of earth and sky that haunts the poet's dreams:
Such is the precious music which the poor delight to hear,
And they love the music nature gives in the opening of the year.
While I myself have often sat, and listened to the breeze,
And heard some ancient fairy harp, was moaning in the trees:
And when on some lone mountain top, where nothing could be
heard,
Saw when at times there came the scream of the wild mountain
bird:
O! then the very silence there, was music to my mind,
And I listened to such melody with head on hand reclined.
Verses by a Poor Man.

CALVIN ON EPISCOPACY. (From the Banner of the Cross.)

[We observe in the *Lincoln* (N. C.) *Republican* of the 10th November, a letter from the Right Rev. L. S. Ives, D.D. (Bishop of North Carolina), in reply to one which had previously appeared in that paper from the Rev. Dr. Miller, of Princeton, denying, in very unbecoming language, an assertion made by the former, that Calvin had entertained and expressed views favorable to Episcopacy. It appears that while Bishop Ives was on his last visitation to the village of Lincoln, he preached a sermon preparatory to confirmation, in which no allusion was made to other denominations. This discourse was made the foundation of a subsequent scurrilous attack upon the Church by a young Presbyterian minister who happened to be present, and on the young man's return through the place, he was requested to deliver a course of lectures on the claims and views of the Church, to which he consented. In one of these lectures he stated that "Calvin was favorable to Episcopacy, and that he endeavored to obtain it from England." Our Presbyterian friends, being either deficient in the learning or courage necessary to contradict this, forthwith addressed their great champion, Dr. Miller, who, nothing loth, soon dispatched an answer, which will be found below, together with the reply of Bishop Ives. We need not say that the latter triumphantly vindicates and establishes the correctness of his assertion, and that, too, in a dignified and Christian spirit, which contrasts most remarkably with the letter of the former—*Editor of the Banner*.]

DR. MILLER'S LETTER.

Princeton, Sept. 8, 1841.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Your letter reached me four days ago, and would have been answered immediately, had not inferior health, united with the infirmities of age, together with an unusual press of duties, rendered it impracticable.

Bishop Ives, you may rely upon it, has been practicing deception upon his hearers. There is no ground for the allegation which he has made. The following considerations will, I think, satisfy you that the story which has been again trumpeted up and palmed upon the weak and credulous, has no foundation but in their own minds.

1st. I am somewhat familiar with the works of Calvin, and have tried to make myself acquainted with all the documents relating to that illustrious man to which I could obtain access, and I have never seen any evidence which so much as looks like the fact which Bishop Ives alleges; nor do I believe that the least evidence of such a fact exists. He has vamped up an old fable, continued by prejudices and folly, and renewed from time to time with that reckless disregard to historical truth with which blind bigotry is so often chargeable.

It is impossible to suppose what Bishop Ives alleges to be true, without considering Calvin as either a knave or a fool, or both; for he declares in many different parts of his writings, dated at different times, that he considered the parity of ministers, and the identity of Bishops and teaching Elders, as founded in the word of God, and of course as resting on divine authority; and in a letter *ad quemdam Curatum* found in his Epistles, page 386, he declares in the most solemn manner, that "in conducting the reformation in general, he had been governed merely by God's word, which is the only rule by which it is to be ordered, and lawfully defended." Now that a man should write in this strain in his Institutes, and in a number of other works, appealing to the Bible for the defence of his Presbyterian system, and be at the same time writing to England, requesting the bishops there to assist him in setting up an opposite system, is one of the most incredible things that can well be imagined. We cannot suppose it without considering him as both an unprincipled and foolish man.

III. Again, if such a man as Calvin had seriously applied to the English bishops to ordain him, can any intelligent man believe that they would have refused him? No, it is certain that they would have eagerly caught at the request, and been desirous, and even anxious, to exhibit such a triumph over an illustrious Presbyterian—or rather over his principles. Besides,

IV. There was no necessity for Calvin's going to England to receive Episcopal orders. There were several men on the continent who had been *Romish* bishops, who became Protestants. These could easily have given him orders in the prelatical way, if he had wished to receive them. It would have been both ridiculous and dishonest for Calvin to plead necessity for establishing the Presbyterian system, not a shadow of which necessity existed.

V. What temptation had Calvin to reject prelacy upon any other principles than a conscientious conviction of its unscriptural character? Every one knows that if bishops had been thought of in Geneva or France, he would have been, unquestionably, the first man selected to put in the office. If he had wished to wear a mitre, no intelligent person can doubt that it was within his reach. All his early habits and all his old prejudices were in favour of prelacy. Why did he resist and turn away from them all? I am amazed at the folly as well as at the dissimulosity of those who talk as Bishop Ives does on this subject.

THE REPLY OF BISHOP IVES.

New York, Oct. 21, 1841.

REV. AND DEAR BROTHER,—Your letter should have been answered on the day I received it, had it not found me in the House of Bishops, engrossed with the most urgent duties. Our Convention having yesterday adjourned, I am this morning, although much exhausted, at leisure to communicate the required information.

It grieves me, not a little, on account both of Christian charity, and of that truth in which Christian charity is said specially to rejoice, that Dr. Miller should have thought it necessary to use such asperity, and positiveness of assertion, in his communication. As to the Doctor's asperity, I shall say nothing, but in prayer to God, that he may be brought to a better mind. In regard to his positiveness of assertion, I say the following:

My first position was that "Calvin favored Episcopacy." In support of it, I adduced Calvin's own

words. And now, that the people may see that I was guilty of no unfairness, I here repeat what he says on the point.

1. In his commentary upon 1 Tim. iv. 14, a passage so much relied upon by Presbyterians—he gives an interpretation, which makes it perfectly consistent with the Episcopal character of Timothy.

2. In his commentary upon a text in the Epistle to Titus, he uses this language—"We learn, also, from this place, that there was not then such an equality among the ministers of the Church, but that some one had the pre-eminence in authority and counsel."

3. In his commentary on Gal. ii. 9, he represents it as "highly probable that St. James was prefect of the Church of Jerusalem." Now, a prefect is a chief and permanent ruler of others.

4. In a letter to an old friend, who had become a bishop in the Church of Rome, (see DURELL'S *View of the Foreign Reformed Churches*, page 162), Calvin expressly recognises Episcopacy as of divine institution. His words are:—"Episcopatus ipse a Deo profectus est. Episcopi munus Dei autoritate constitutum est et legitimum definitum."—"He who is made a bishop proceeds from God himself. The office of Episcopacy was established by the authority and regulated by the laws of God."

5. Finally, in his work *De Necessitate Reformandarum Ecclesiarum*, Calvin holds this remarkable language:—"If they will give us such an hierarchy, in which the bishops have such a pre-eminence as that they do not refuse to be subject unto Christ, &c. &c., then I will confess that they are worthy of all ANATHEMAS, if any such shall be found, who will not reverence it, and submit themselves to it with the utmost obedience." (See *Joannis Calvinus Tractatus Theologici Omnes*, in unum volumen certis classicibus congressi, &c. page 69.) The length of this and other passages has prevented my giving the original. The translation, however, I believe, will be found faithful.

The above testimony from Calvin's own pen, I shall not hesitate to consider sufficient with all candid persons, to justify my declaration that Calvin was favorable to Episcopacy.

My second position was that he endeavored to obtain Episcopacy from the English Church. My reasons are as follows:

1. Calvin desired, as is manifest, to retain the Episcopal regimen in his system of Church government. See his explicit language in the Confession of Faith, which he composed in the name of the French Churches. In the articles drawn up by the delegates, of whom Calvin was one, to the Conference at Worms, by order of Charles V., are the following words:—"Our learned men have expressly yielded ordination to bishops." (See articles.) Calvin severely censures the clergy of Colten, for endeavoring to put their head bishop out of his place, inasmuch as he had declared in favor of reformation. (*Vide Calv. Epist.*, page 517.) Writing to Ithavius, a Polish Bishop, whom he styles illustrious and reverend Lord Bishop, so far from advising him to lay aside his Episcopacy, he exhorts him to consider what place he holdeth, and what burden is imposed upon him. (*Vide Johannes Calvinus illustri et reverendo Domino Jacobo Ithavio Episcopo Epist.*, page 287.) In his Epistle to the King of Poland, Calvin expresses his approbation of all the degrees of the hierarchy of the ancient Church; and he seems to advise the king to introduce the system into his own dominions. (*Vide Calv. Sermonis Regi Polon.*)

2. Having, by untoward circumstances, been unable to retain in the Geneva system the Episcopal regimen, Calvin made, as will appear from the following fact, an actual attempt at one period, to introduce the Episcopacy from England. This fact is related by the excellent and accurate historian Strype; a fact that has remained unquestioned for more than two centuries. "How Calvin stood affected in the said point of Episcopacy, and how readily and gladly he and other heads of the Reformed Churches would have received it, is evident enough from his writings and epistles." (See *Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker*, page 69, 70.) "They (the foreign Protestants) took such great joy and satisfaction in this good King (Edward VI.) and his establishment of religion, that Bullinger, and Calvin, and others, in a letter to him, offered to make him their defender, and to have bishops in their churches, as there were in England; with a tender of their service to assist and unite together." (See *Strype's Memorials of Crommer*, page 207.) This scheme seems to have been defeated by a forgery of the Papists. The last letter of Calvin on the subject was intercepted by Bonner and Gardiner, two Romish bishops, who returned such an ungracious answer, as offended Calvin and led him to give up the project. This is affirmed in a paper in the *handwriting of Archbishop Abbot*, who was a friend to Calvin, and was apologizing for him in this very document; which was found in the archives at Lambeth. The subjoined is the paper as published by Strype: (*Life of Parker*, page 70.) "Perusing," says the Archbishop, "some papers of our predecessor, Matthew Parker, we find that John Calvin and others of the Protestant Church of Germany and elsewhere, would have had Episcopacy, if permitted. And whereas John Calvin had sent a letter in King Edward VI.'s reign to confer with the clergy of England about some things to this effect, (that is, getting the Episcopacy), two popish bishops, viz: Bonner and Gardiner, intercepted the same; whereby Calvin's overture perished. And he received an answer, as if it had been from the Reformed divines, wherein they checked him and slighted his proposals. From which time John Calvin and the English Church were at variance in several points; which otherwise, through God's mercy, had been qualified, if those papers of his proposals had been discovered unto the Queen's Majesty during John Calvin's life. But being not discovered until, or about the sixth year of her Majesty's reign, her Majesty much lamented they were not found sooner; which she expressed before her Council at the same time in the presence of her great friends, Sir Henry Sidney and Sir Wm. Cecil."

From all this, it appears that Calvin was quite disposed to reform the Church on the ground of Episcopacy,—that he deliberately offered to do so,—and that he finally proceeded on a different system from the difficulty, as he supposed,—having been, in his view, repulsed in his application to England,—of procuring bishops without yielding to the enormous exactions of the Church of Rome;—and hence, it appears, that I had abundant reason for both parts of the declaration,—that John Calvin was favorable to Episcopacy, and that he endeavored to obtain it from the English Church.

I cannot conclude my present remarks, however, without furnishing a few passages from the admirer

of Calvin, to show that I have not misunderstood the citations from his works above. Mons. Daille, a friend and defender of Calvin, writes thus explicitly:—"Calvin himself honored all bishops that were not subjects of the Pope, &c., such as were the prelates of England. We confess that the foundation of their charge is good and lawful, established by the Apostles according to the command of Christ." (Bingham's *French Church's Apology*, &c.) Mons. De L'Angle, another of Calvin's followers, in a letter addressed to the Bishop of London, writes thus:—"Calvin, in his treatise of the Necessity of Reformation, makes no difficulty to say, that if there should be any so unreasonable as to refuse the communion of a Church that was pure in its worship and devotion, and not to submit himself with respect to its government, under pretence that it had retained an Episcopacy qualified as yours is, there would be no censure or rigor of discipline that ought not to be exercised upon them." (Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation*.) Jacobus Lectius, a Senator of Geneva, and public reader in the University, writes, in a book dedicated to the Senate, &c., as follows:—"We maintain that those are true and lawful bishops whom St. Paul describes in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus; and we do not deny, but that there were such formerly in that great kingdom of Great Britain; and at this very day, there are such bishops there. Neither was there any of our divines, I think, who ever denied it to be a most ancient custom in the Church, from the very times of the Apostles; to wit, that one should have the chief care of the Church, sitting, as it were, at the helm of the sacred ship. And they professed, by their public writings, that it was madlike to think meanly of the order of orthodox bishops, to whom therefore our men, and amongst them, Calvin, Bucer, Beza, and others, have deferred all manner of honor and affection." (See Durrell's *View*, &c., page 169, 170.)

The good Bishop Hall, in his *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, Introduction, sec. 2, meditating upon Calvin's views as contrasted with the Presbyterian hatred of Episcopacy in his own day, breaks out in the following strains:—"You hear how judicious and moderate Calvin's opinion was then; and had he been in your late pretended assembly at Glasgow, or this of Edinburgh, (you see), what vote he would have given.—How happy were it for your Churches if all among you, who so much honor his name, would as readily submit to his judgment. Sure I am, had it been so with you, you would have been as far from defying Episcopacy in holy professors, as you are now from truth and peace."

With these facts and reasonings before them, let the people of Lincolnton judge, who has imposed upon his auditors, or readers? For what has Dr. Miller been able to oppose to this unquestionable documentary proof? Why, Dr. Miller's bare assertion!—the real value of which is well understood by those who are acquainted with his controversial writings. But I forbear,—praying that, while you "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," you may be governed by that "charity which suffereth long and is kind," and which requires, "that we meekly instruct those who oppose themselves."

The God of peace be with you.
Most truly and affectionately, your friend and brother in CHRIST,

L. SILLIMAN IVES.

THE DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME IN THE DISPENSATION OF INDULGENCES.

(From a Sermon by the Rev. W. G. Barker, M. A., Minister of St. Paul's, Walsall.)

Let me refer you to Dr. Challoner's Garden of the Soul, a work in high repute among Romanists of the present day, and published with the authority of the Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District. At page 326, we have the following question and answer. "What is an Indulgence? An Indulgence is the releasing the temporal punishment, which often remains due to sin, after its guilt has been remitted."—In strict accordance with this are the views of the most distinguished advocates of the Papacy, since the days of the Council of Trent: so that I feel assured, the summary that I am now about to give of the doctrine, will be allowed by all Romanists to be fair and impartial; and they will not be able to charge me with mis-statements, when I meet them on their own ground, and prove them from their own documents, to have advanced doctrines, that are disowned and disapproved by the revealed word of God.

It is said, that the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross was so infinitely meritorious, that one drop of his blood was sufficient to atone for the sins of the whole world; but many drops of blood were shed; therefore there is a vast fund of superfluous merit, over and above the merit needed for the salvation of the whole world. To this fund the Church of Rome lays claim, as the treasury from which indulgences are issued; and that it may never suffer any diminution, she adds thereto the superabundant merits of all the Saints; that so, however large the draughts made upon it, the Papal spiritual exchequer may be always full. This fund of merit is employed to release men from the temporal punishment due to sin; which temporal punishment is of two kinds: Canonical penance, and suffering in Purgatory. Indulgences are of two kinds—plenary and limited. A plenary indulgence remits all the temporal punishment that is due for sin, committed up to the time at which it is gained; and if granted, as they often are, to be used, "in articulo mortis," in the article of death, that is, at the very last hour of life, then the indulgence frays the sinner from all fear of any temporal punishment for sin; by the sacrament of penance the guilt of his sin is remitted; by the indulgence, the purgatorial punishment is remitted; and without further ado the sinner's soul goes immediately to heaven. A limited indulgence, on the contrary, remits only so many days or years of the punishment as is expressed in the indulgence—some remit forty days—some a hundred years—some ninety thousand years. That there is a temporal punishment due to sin, as well as an eternal punishment, Romanists profess to prove from the case of the children of Israel, who though pardoned, were shut out from the promised land (1 Num. xiv. 20.)—or from the case of David, who though pardoned for adultery and murder, lost his child, and was punished, in the sword never departing from his house (2 Sam. xii. 10). These, say they, prove that God inflicts both a temporal and eternal punishment for sin; and part of this power of inflicting temporal punishment, God has bequeathed to his Church, that it may be inflicted or remitted at her good pleasure.

I turn now to the practice of Rome as regards Indulgences. And first, they are one of the undoubted novelties of the Romish Church. I adduce in proof of this, the words of *Basilius*, the Romish Bishop of Rochester. He says, "Who can now wonder that in the beginning of the primitive Church, there was no use of Indulgences? Indulgences began awhile after men had trembled at the torments of Purgatory."

One of the earliest Indulgences on record is that of Urban II. A. D. 1096, who promises to all crusaders, who are confessed and contrite, "indulgence of all their sins, and an entrance into the paradise of bliss."

In the year 1300, Boniface VIII. granted to all those who should for a certain number of days visit the Churches

of St. Peter and St. Paul, "not only a plenary and larger, but a most plenary remission of all their sins." Here there are already a full, a more full, and a most full pardon—a perfect, a more perfect, and a most perfect remission of all their sins—and it is too much to assume, that after gaining the latter, the happy votary of Rome considered himself as freed from all the penalty of all his sins?

Indulgences are sometimes of a more individual character. Fifty years after this, we find Clement VI. granting a most extraordinary indulgence to John and Joan, king and queen of France, and to their successors upon the throne—in which express leave is given to their confessor, to free them from the obligation of all such acts as they may have taken, and find it inconvenient to keep. If this has any force or meaning, it is not a direct sanction to perjury? And if perjury is sin, is not this a leave to commit sin?

Later still, at the end of the 16th century, Clement VIII. granted a plenary indulgence to all those who should take part in a contemplated rebellion in Ireland against Queen Elizabeth. But instances of this nature might be multiplied without end. I will mention a few of a less public character, to show how cheaply the most lengthened indulgences may be obtained.

In a work called, the Hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary, printed at Paris, A. D. 1553, fol. 62, we find the following:—"To all them that before this image of pity (an image of Christ) devoutly say five paternosters, and five aves, and a credo, piously beholding these arms of Christ's passion, are granted thirty-two thousand seven hundred and fifty-five years of pardon: and Sixtus IV., Pope of Rome, hath made the fourth and fifth prayers, and hath doubled the aforesaid pardon."

Again at folio 73, we find "These three prayers being written in the chapel of the Holy Cross in Rome, otherwise called Sacellum sanctae crucis septem Romanorum. Who that devoutly say them, shall obtain ninety thousand years of pardon for deadly sins, granted of our Holy Father John the 12th, Pope of Rome." These are only two out of many that might be produced equally extravagant and impious; although Romanists affect to disbelieve the existence of such indulgences, and talk to Protestants of forgeries and so forth, they did exist, and were granted, and believed in, as can be proved by evidence absolutely incontrovertible: nevertheless it is not to be denied, that if one Pope can by his decretals destroy what another Pope declares to be of force, then very many of these indulgences have ceased to exist: for we need not say the words of an eminent modern writer, "they had increased so enormously, that it was found necessary to weed this wilderness, in order to find room for fresh plants. In 1678, two decrees were passed at Rome, abolishing a vast number of indulgences called Apocryphal."

It is convenient to be able thus to get rid of worn-out indulgences, to create a more speedy sale for new ones: but is the wilderness any the better for changing its old weeds for new ones? There is no lack of them now in the Church of Rome: in spite of all abolitions, they remain in every order that exists in the bosom of the Church. To take but one instance,—in a work published in the year 1838, in Dublin, entitled, "A Treatise on the Order of the Scapular," a selection is given out of what is called "the multitude of indulgences" that have been bestowed by different Popes on the members of that order. Out of this selection I may mention, a plenary indulgence on the day of admission into the order—another on the 16th of July, to all who pray for the Church—another for all those who assist at procession on the 3rd Tuesday of every month—another to all those who visit the Church of St. Teresa on the 5th of October—another to all who say five paters and aves, and a salve regina in honor of the Virgin—another at the hour of death, to the confessed and contrite, who devoutly utter the name of Jesus. Besides these, every member, by visiting the Churches of the order, and praying for the ordinary necessities, may free a soul out of Purgatory, every Wednesday throughout the year. And lest persons should fancy that these may have been revoked, it further declares that all these indulgences are unrevoked, and in full force at the present day.

Brethren, this is the TRASH with which the minds of the poor ignorant Romanists are filled,—this is the light which is given them by their priesthood, to compensate them for the loss of that divine knowledge, the key of which they have taken away,—to help them to give their way through all the windings of the vast labyrinth of that Church's superstitions! Any Romanist, by undertaking to wear the Scapular, which is merely a strip of cloth, made out of the cast off gowns of the Carmelite monks, may entitle himself to the benefit of all these indulgences; and every other religious order in the Church of Rome, is endowed with as many as the order of the Scapular:—indeed they have swarmed like the plague of locusts, ••••• and like that plague, have been followed by another, an Egyptian darkness—a darkness that may be felt.—Oh! fearfully, terribly felt, in every corner of every land whither her pestilent sway extend!

Such has been the profligacy with which indulgences have been dispensed—such the heedless extravagance with which these so-called spiritual treasures have been squandered,—each Pope striving to outdo all his predecessors, in cheapening these wares—one giving ninety thousand years of pardon for that for which others would only give thirty thousand years—such I say has been the heedless extravagance with which they have been granted, that I hesitate not to affirm, that if all the indulgences that have been supposed to be obtained, by good deeds or otherwise, have been made available according to the intention of the Church, first to the relief of individuals, and then to the souls suffering in Purgatory, then has Purgatory been effectually swept at again and again, and every man ever kept empty; for Indulgences have been granted, and supposed to be obtained, enough to satisfy for all the sins of all the sinners that ever lived. Protestants have little idea of the desperate flagitiousness of the Pope in the matter of Indulgences. "Pope Paul III," says Bishop Taylor, in his *Disquisitions against Popery*, "he that convened the Council of Trent, and Julius III. for fear, as I may suppose, the Council should forbid any more such follies, for a farewell to this game, gave an indulgence to the fraternity of the Sacrament of the altar, or of the blessed body of our Lord Jesus Christ, of such a vastness and unreasonable folly, that it puts us beyond the question of religion, to an inquiry, whether it were not done either in perfect distraction, or with a worse design, to make religion to be ridiculous, and expose it to a contempt and scorn." The indulgence amounted to this—every member of the order of Corpus Christi, who shall visit the Church of St. Mary at Chartres every day in Lent, can gain of thereby double again and again, and then has seven hundred and forty thousand years of pardon for himself, besides twelve plenary remissions for himself, and deliver four souls out of Purgatory. All the surplus of this huge mass of pardons, is applicable by way of suffrage to souls in Purgatory. To turn this monstrous matter then into an arithmetical calculation, if one man, belonging to one order, and using only one method, can gain all these, what must be the amount that can be done by all pious Romanists, of all orders, and using all methods?

Oh! surely, surely, in all this, there must either be the most accumulated mass of spiritual trickery, or else there is a wholesale licence to commit sin!

That indulgences are made subservient to the most unblushing trickery, is illustrated in what are called "Privileged Altars," one of which is set up in many Churches, where masses for the dead are recited. A privileged altar is simply, an altar, to which an indulgence is attached, importing, that one mass said for a soul in purgatory at that altar, will infallibly deliver the soul out of Purgatory. Now it is not an uncommon thing for Romanists to leave money for many masses to be said for the repose of their souls; Cardinal Albertus, for instance, left money by his will for fifty thousand masses to be said for his soul: an operation, which performed at common altars, would employ one priest for more than a hundred years: recourse is therefore had to the privileged altar, where one mass solves the difficulty, happily rendering all the rest superfluous, and setting the priesthood free from the discharge of a laborious and irksome duty. But what name will express the villainess of a system that can foster corruption so tainted as this?

I must turn now to another part of the History of Indulgences: they have been, and still are sold for money: they are to be obtained at their fixed price.

Romanists profess a holy horror of this practice, talk of it as an abuse, and deny it as a doctrine. It is not difficult however to show that this has been the practice of the Church, from the days of the Reformation to the present day; yet the system, without the money, is so iniquitous, that, though the selling of indulgences proves and seals the iniquity beyond the possibility of equivocation, the mere sale adds but little to the flagrant of the whole: for the evil effects of the indulgence are equally sure to follow, whether it is granted for muttering over three prayers, or paying down three shillings.

In the year 1500, being the year of Jubilee, Pope Alexander VI., granted to the inhabitants of the whole realm of England, a plenary indulgence, with power to choose their confessor, and obtain from him "absolution a parva et culpa, from the guilt and punishment of sin," and a dispensation or changing of all manner of vows. In the bull however there is a clause, strictly limiting the privileges of the indulgence to those who "being contrite and confessed, put into the chest for the intent ordained such sum or quantity of money, gold or silver, as is limited and taxed." It then follows a scale of sixteen different prices, accommodating the bull to the wealth and ability of so many grades of purchasers. Polydore Virgil, the historian, who mentions this bull, asserts, that though the money was collected, professedly to go to war with the Great Turk, yet that after vast sums had been amassed, no war was waged, but all found its way into the private coffers of the avaricious Pontiff.

Eighteen years after this, the monstrous excesses of Tetzel, threw all Germany into an uproar: he unblushingly assumed to those who came to purchase release for the souls of their parents, "The amount the money thinkers in the chest, your father's soul mounts up out of Purgatory." "The profligacy of the priesthood proved infectious, and spread to the laity; it was no uncommon thing for a man, who had purchased an indulgence, to carry it to the gaming table, and make it the stake in a game of cards or dice."

Oh! bitterly did the Church of Rome rue the folly and imprudence of that most unprincipled agent; yet, rotting as she was under the baneful leprosy of her own venality and corruption, her hands could not cease from sin; the evil continued, and even increased; so that five years afterwards, in the year 1523, the Prince of the Germanic Empire presented to the Pope a list of a Hundred Grievances,—in which they complain "that the Roman Pontiff had sucked all the marrow of their estates from the simple and too credulous Germans"—"that by this traffic in indulgences the greatest encouragement is given to the commission of all manner of crimes, fornication, incest, adultery, perjury, murder, theft, robbery, extortion." "This catalogue of crimes is no monument of the Germanic princes; as though to verify the charges that brought against the Church, a book was at that very time openly sold in Paris, called 'The Taxes of the Apostolic Chancery, and Sacred Penitentiary,' in which these very crimes, and a multitude of others are enumerated, and the prices marked for which abolition from them might be obtained! For instance, murder and incest might either of them be pardoned for seven shillings and sixpence, while perjury would cost nine shillings, and robbery twelve shillings. Romanists have made many efforts to overthrow the authority of this book; at one time, they called it a Protestant forgery, at another, a list of the Fees of Office; but both these subtleties are rendered useless by the honest indignation of Claude d'Espence, a doctor of the Sorbonne, and Rector of the University of Paris, who in his Commentary upon the Epistle to Titus, having cited several charges that were made against the See of Rome, proceeds to say, "that all those charges might be considered as the fiction of the members of the Pope, were it not for a book, printed and exposed for sale at Paris, entitled, 'The Tax Book of the Apostolic Chancery,' in which more wickedness may be learned than in all the summaries of all vice, and in which licence of sinning is proposed to most, and absolution to all who will buy it." This authentication of the book, by one who would have been glad to have been able to deny either its authenticity or its existence,—who laments over it, as doing an injury to the cause of Rome; puts the fact of its existence beyond a doubt; and it stands an incontrovertible witness against Rome, and her unblushing venality in the sale of indulgences.

A singular circumstance proves that the sale of them still continued, two centuries after the publication of this book. "In the year 1709," says Bishop Burnet "the priests of Bristol took the Gallion (a Spanish merchant vessel), in which they found 5000 bales of these bulls, and 16 reams were in a bale, so that they reckoned the whole came to 3,840,000. These bulls were imposed upon the people, and sold, the lowest, at three pence, a little more than twenty pence; but to some at 80 pieces of eight, about eleven pounds of our money; and this to be valued according to the ability of the purchaser, once in two years; all are obliged to buy them against Lent. Besides the account given of this in the preceding voyage, I have a particular attestation of it by Captain Jamper, and one of the bulls was brought me printed, but so that it cannot be read. He was not concerned in casting up the number of them; but he says, that there was such a vast quantity of them, that they careened their ship with them."

To come down to our own day. In a work entitled, "Rome in the 19th century," the author says, "I was surprised to find scarcely a Church in Rome that did not hold up at the door the tempting inscription of 'Indulgencia Plenaria.' Two hundred days' indulgence I thought a great reward for every kiss bestowed upon the great black cross in the Colosseum, but that is nothing to the indulgences, for ten, twenty and even thirty thousand years, that may be bought at an exorbitant rate in many of the Churches." "Indeed the charges of the Germanic princes in the 16th century, may safely be reiterated on behalf of Italy in the 19th; for if we may believe the author of a work entitled, 'Three months residence in the mountains east of Rome,' it is as easy to obtain absolution for money now, even for murder, as it was then. "At Tivoli," says the author, "a man was pointed out to us, who had stabbed his brother, who died in agonies within an hour. The murderer went to Rome, purchased his pardon from the Church, and received a written protection from a Cardinal, in consequence of which he was walking sacredly. Oh! how atrocious that system which can thus set at defiance the laws of God, and even under his name and the pretended sanction of his authority, reverse the decree which said, 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed!'"

It may be objected, that these are only the tales of travellers—they are worthy of credit nevertheless,—however the sale of indulgences in the 19th century is proved under the hand and seal of Pope Leo XII. himself; in a bull granted so late as the year 1828, for the use of the faithful in Spain. Among other privileges, it impowers its purchaser "to choose his own confessor, and obtain from him plenary indulgence and remission of whatsoever sins and censures, even those reserved to the Apostolic See (except the crime of heresy) once in his life, and again in the article of death." It then proceeds to suspend during that year all other indulgences; so that by whatever means any of the faithful may have earned the benefit of standing indulgences, they are all declared null and void, unless this bull likewise be procured. A happy expedient truly, to ensure a speedy sale for this indulgence! And lastly, little will flux the price at which it is to be purchased, a little more than seven acres, Spanish money; signifying that when the money is actually paid, the indulgence comes in force, and not till then. The whole is indeed merely a long laborious receipt for a few shillings, professing in return to bestow certain spiritual benefits.

Here then is the sale of Indulgences amply and clearly proved, even in our day; here is undoubted evidence, that it is not only had been, but it still is: that Rome, in this, as in all her errors, is Rome still.

† Mendham's Venerable Indulgences, p. 21.
* Miller's Ch. Hist. vol. iv. p. 216.
* Taylor's Works, vol. x. p. 143. London, 1829.
* Facile. Her. Espect. by Orbilius Gratius. Cologne, 1833; quoted by Mendham in his Council of Trent, p. 5.
† Spiritual Venality.
* See Hodson's Three Letters to Green, p. 22.
* Vol. III. introd. p. 20.
* Vol. II. pp. 267-270.
* P. 34.
** Mendham's Council of Trent App. p. 344.

THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 8, 1842.

We are directed to intimate to the Reverend the Clergy of the Diocese of Quebec, that it is proposed to present the following Address to the Queen on the birth of the Infant Prince, and that they will be considered as signifying their concurrence by not expressing dissent.

"We devoutly bless the Sovereign Lord of all, that He has pleased to watch over Your Majesty in the hour of danger; and we rejoice that in appointing to Your Majesty a new source of domestic enjoyment, He has furnished a You with yet another claim upon the affections of Your people."

"We shall not cease to pray that every good and perfect gift may be vouchsafed to the Royal Infant, and that trained in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, he may prove a blessing to his parents, an ornament to the illustrious House of Brunswick, and a nursing father to the Church and Nation."

Our Canadian Ecclesiastical Intelligence of to-day, contains much to delight, and much to grieve the Christian mind.

The Rev. W. M. Hercher's noble donation to St. George's Church, at Kingston, is already known over the Province; but the manner in which he has acknowledged the vote of thanks, so justly tendered to him upon the occasion, enhances the value of the gift, and holds out an example, speaking both by precept and practice, to the opulent members of our communion to go and do likewise.

The Rev. W. M. Hercher's noble donation to St. George's Church, at Kingston, is already known over the Province; but the manner in which he has acknowledged the vote of thanks, so justly tendered to him upon the occasion, enhances the value of the gift, and holds out an example, speaking both by precept and practice, to the opulent members of our communion to go and do likewise.

Our excellent and servicable Philadelpha cotemporary, the Banner of the Cross, of the 25th ultimo, furnishes us with the subjoined most welcome evidence of the progress of Episcopacy:

"INTERESTING OBSERVATION.—We learn from the Western Episcopal Observer, that on the Second Sunday in Advent, 5th inst., the Rt. Rev. Bishop Kemper, in St. Paul's Church, New Albany, admitted to Deacons' orders, Andrew Wylie, D.D., President of the University of Indiana, and for many years a distinguished minister of the Presbyterian denomination.

We regret to learn that some of our Kingston friends are offended with us for giving insertion, in our paper of the 11th December, to a low and abusive communication addressed to the Editor of The Catholic.

Our friends and correspondents must kindly have patience with us. The Church of England, in almost every part of the world, presents so many evidences of growing zeal, that we scarcely know how to keep pace with the pressure of events.

We intend to furnish in our next some account of the Rev. Mr. Sibthorp's unfortunate perversion to Romish error. There is little in the case to cause alarm to the orthodox Churchman.

Sir Charles Bagot, we are happy to announce, arrived at New York, in the Illustrations 74, on Thursday the 30th December. His Excellency is expected to reach Kingston on this day.

The last Canada Gazette has never reached us.—We shall be glad to receive it.

high sanction to the Bishopric,—the highest that can be given by fallible men,—we need entertain no fears, that any rule of true Catholic order and unity has been violated. We add the proclamation of the King of Prussia, remarking, by the way, that this estimable and sagacious Monarch provides the means out of his private funds:—

PROCLAMATION OF THE KING OF PRUSSIA. The following proclamation of the King of Prussia is taken from the German Journal of Frankfurt, it is dated Nihilste, Sept. 6:—We, Frederick William, King, have appointed to the endowment of a Protestant Bishopric to be established at Jerusalem, with the concurrence of England, the sum of 15,000, sterling, the interest of which, viz. 600l. sterling, forming the half of the salary of the Bishop, we will pay beforehand. This sum is to be remitted to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishop of London, as trustees of this episcopal see. If at a subsequent period this capital can be invested in the purchase of lands in Palestine, but with our consent, the capital shall be paid up to the before-mentioned trustees. This sum of 15,000l. shall be mentioned in the act of endowment, that if the lands purchased in Palestine yield a revenue equal to an interest of more than four per cent, the surplus shall be given, not to the Bishop, but to be devoted to the funds of the Bishopric.—FREDERICK WILLIAM.

Next week we hope to furnish further details, respecting the new Bishopric; and at an early opportunity to commence giving the most interesting items connected with the proceedings of the Episcopal Missionaries in the East. We are compelled, from want of room, to defer a brief notice, which we had prepared, of the Rev. Dr. A. McCaul, to whom the Bishopric was in the first instance offered, but who declined it in the most disinterested manner.

Our excellent and servicable Philadelpha cotemporary, the Banner of the Cross, of the 25th ultimo, furnishes us with the subjoined most welcome evidence of the progress of Episcopacy:—

"INTERESTING OBSERVATION.—We learn from the Western Episcopal Observer, that on the Second Sunday in Advent, 5th inst., the Rt. Rev. Bishop Kemper, in St. Paul's Church, New Albany, admitted to Deacons' orders, Andrew Wylie, D.D., President of the University of Indiana, and for many years a distinguished minister of the Presbyterian denomination.

"In the afternoon and evening Dr. Wylie preached, (in the afternoon also performing the service,) when in his usual candid and truth loving spirit, he gave his reasons for seeking the fold of the Episcopal Church.

"As an interesting incident, we may also state that on the same day four students of the Andover Theological [Congregational] Seminary united themselves with the Protestant Episcopal Church in that place, by receiving the apostolic rite of Confirmation. We learn this from the New England Patriot, a Congregational paper."

We regret to learn that some of our Kingston friends are offended with us for giving insertion, in our paper of the 11th December, to a low and abusive communication addressed to the Editor of The Catholic.—Our motive for inserting it was simply to expose the scurrilous character of that journal, and to deter Churchmen from aiding Popery,—a system so hostile to their own Church,—by a false and unscrupulous liberality. We accompanied it by no remarks, for it stood self-condemned, and carried more than an antidote along with it, in its excessive indecency.

We beg to assure our Kingston friends that we have no partial feelings, or local jealousies. We rejoice in the donation to St. George's Church, just as much as if it had been given to St. James's Cathedral. It is irksome to outride personal feelings upon the public, but we must be permitted to say that if we have any local predilection, it is for the spot which is most spiritually destitute. We really think it hard that we should have been misunderstood, even for a moment, in this matter.

Our friends and correspondents must kindly have patience with us. The Church of England, in almost every part of the world, presents so many evidences of growing zeal, that we scarcely know how to keep pace with the pressure of events. This must also be our apology for not advertising more frequently to our sister Church in the United States. But the less frequent communication with England during the winter months, will, we trust, enable us to find room for all the principal occurrences in the Church, and to devote a sufficient space to Civil Intelligence.

We intend to furnish in our next some account of the Rev. Mr. Sibthorp's unfortunate perversion to Romish error. There is little in the case to cause alarm to the orthodox Churchman.

Sir Charles Bagot, we are happy to announce, arrived at New York, in the Illustrations 74, on Thursday the 30th December. His Excellency is expected to reach Kingston on this day.

The last Canada Gazette has never reached us.—We shall be glad to receive it.

Communications.

[Our communications are beginning to increase so much upon us, that we deem it necessary to limit the length of the London Church periodicals, and to apprise our readers that we are not responsible for the opinions of our Correspondents.—Ed. CANADA.]

CHURCH TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES.

Sir,—I regret very much that a letter signed by C. Q. should appear in your judiciously conducted paper, at this juncture, just when I am endeavouring to establish a Church Temperance Society in my own mission, on the broad basis and liberal principle of the Holy Scriptures. This is the only solid and rational foundation which claims the approbation of every consistent Christian. Christ's Church, C. Q. admits, is a Temperance Society, which was, beyond all controversy, established on this foundation. And a Church Temperance Society should be Christ's Church standing forth, united, as it were, in battle-array against the demon of intemperance, fortifying the people with rules, precepts and admonitions, as God hath done,—not in deference to our own wisdom, but the wisdom of God, even His written wisdom, which is eternal truth, and which demands, with an authority divine and irresistible, the respect and submission of all.

The principle of total abstinence, so congenial to the mind of your correspondent, and apparently so bewitching to his imagination, and so blinding to his understanding, was never imbibed by the Church of God, not even in the time of the Rechabites, and we may aver, would never have been adopted, though an host of Rechabites had risen up in its defence.

It does not seem good in the eyes of our heavenly Father, that His people should be debarr'd from the gifts of His providence, because the wicked abuse them to intemperance. The great and merciful Jehovah is not wont to be so regardless of the contentments of His law and despisers of His authority. And "shall mortal man be more just, more pure than his Maker?"

In my diligent investigation of the sacred oracles, I have found nothing to coincide with C. Q.'s nice, but fallacious, distinction, that "to drink wine with a view to present gratification" is sinful to a certain subordinate degree. Is it not unwise, is it not wrong, to burden men's consciences with nice discriminations about the gradations of sin, which have no foundation in the Word of God, but are rather repugnant thereto? Or is it the part of genuine humility to be wiser than what is written? I have been only able, as yet, to discover that excess only is prohibited; "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess," says an inspired apostle. And another apostle says, "Sin is a transgression of the law."

I should be obliged if C. Q. would point out any law forbidding the use of wine, with a view to present gratification. Holy Joseph and his brethren drank and were merry. Did they do so with a view to present gratification? Or, if not, for what other purpose? It is surely gratifying to drink and be cheerful with our brethren; for by the expressions of a cheerful hospitality

we strengthen the bonds of fraternal love and exalt our sense of the divine beneficence.

When C. Q. accepts an invitation to a party of friends, does he decline eating cakes and other nice, delicious preparations? If he does not, he commits some degree of sin. For, I conceive, he partakes of those dainties with a view to present gratification. Otherwise, some dry toast, or a crust of bread, would be quite as good to a palate that cannot relish the grateful provisions of a kind and bountiful Providence.

I remain, Sir, Your's truly and respectfully, R. R.

SCOTTISH EPISCOPACY.

To the Editor of The Church.

Sir,—I must set my brother Churchman and your correspondent *Statius* right in regard to the Duke of Buccleuch. His Grace is not an Elder of the Kirk, and never in his life crossed the threshold of the General Assembly. The assertion of the *Montreal Messenger* in regard to his Grace is a pure invention.

I am, Sir, Your's respectfully, A SCOTTISH EPISCOPALIAN.

THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF ST. JAMES.

To the Editor of The Church.

Sir,—In *The Church* of the 18th inst., there is an able article by A. CATHOLIC, respecting the benefits likely to accrue to this country from the establishment of a Chapter in Toronto. If I mistake not, A CATHOLIC assumes that St. James's Church is a Cathedral. Allow me then to ask, Mr. Editor, through the columns of your journal, what has made the said Church a Cathedral? and further, universally, what process is necessary to render any Parish Church a Cathedral? I humbly conceive that St. James's Church is still a Parish Church and no Cathedral; and if so, would it not be better to build a Cathedral; i. e., to erect a building something like a Cathedral, and that too in the immediate vicinity of the College, so that the pupils could all attend the daily service, and the choristers be selected from *them*? I am wrong in assuming St. James's Church merely a Parish Church? I hope you will set me right. In the mean time, I am your constant reader.

[I enclose a copy of the preceding communication, with my own hand, and sent it to a learned friend, who has favoured us with the following reply.—Ed. CANADA.]

THE CHURCH OF ST. JAMES PROVED TO BE A CATHEDRAL CHURCH.

To the Editor of The Church.

Sir,—With reference to *Presbyter's* letter I have to remark, that it is perfectly possible for the same Church to be both a Parochial and a Cathedral Church, just as the same individual may be a bishop and a rector. The only process necessary for imparting to a Parish Church the additional character of a Cathedral Church, is to make it the principal Church of a diocese, where the bishop is, as it were, always present. So that St. James's, Toronto, has by no means ceased to be a Parish Church in becoming a Cathedral. An accession of dignity has accrued to it from the fact of its having become the principal Church of the diocese. This fact may, or may not, be declared by the civil authority. The circumstance of its being the Home-Church of the Bishop is sufficient to constitute it a Cathedral. The Protestant Cathedral of Quebec was declared by the civil authority to be a Cathedral, when the Protestant See of Quebec was created. But then it was necessary to mark the distinction, inasmuch as there existed already in the chief town an established Cathedral belonging to the Church of Rome.—The Royal Patent which has erected Western Canada into a diocese, under the style and title of the "Diocese of Toronto," virtually and in essence renders the chief Church of the city from which the diocese has its name, the Cathedral Church. The case would be the same with regard to Christ-Church, Montreal, were it the fact that Christ-Church was the Home-Church of the diocese of Quebec, although in Montreal there would again be some need of a civil declaration, from the existence there already of an acknowledged Cathedral of the Church of Rome.—The civil interference in England, with regard to Cathedral Churches, relates principally to the establishment and regulation with them, of Corporate Bodies, Chapters, or Colleges of Prebendaries, Minor Canons, Secular Endowments for the promotion of learning, and the like. No one would raise more than myself at the appearance of any Royal Decree annexing similar beneficial appendages to our Church in Toronto,—a thing rather to be desired than expected. In the mean time, however, that Church is not a whit less a Cathedral Church, notwithstanding its non-endowment and non-equipment as such. I once put the question to the *British Magazine*—and there can be no better authority than this on Church matters.—Whether or no the Church now being erected by the Bishop of Calcutta would be styled a Cathedral Church, from the sole fact of its containing the Bishop's Chair?—and my response was that "He [the Editor] had no doubt that THE CHURCH OF THE BISHOP OF CALCUTTA IS AS TRULY AND STRICTLY A CATHEDRAL CHURCH AS ST. PAUL'S; and that for the reason suggested. (Vide Notices to Correspondents, Brit. Mag. No. cv. Aug. 1837.) Now if the Church of the Bishop of Calcutta is truly and strictly a Cathedral Church as St. Paul's, for this sole reason,—the Bishop of Toronto's is equally so; the only difference is that the Bishop of Calcutta is enabled by private and public donations to establish Canons, Readers, &c. for the daily service. If we turn to the *London Encyclopedia*, the definition of the word CATHEDRAL, used substantively, is "The Head Church of a Diocese;"—and among the illustrations of this use of the word, we find the following quotation from *Ascham's Tirocinium*:—"A Cathedral Church is that wherein there are two or more persons with a bishop at the head of them, that do make, as it were, one body politic."—"There is nothing here to contradict our application of the term to St. James's, Toronto. Again, if we refer to another Encyclopedia, that of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, the articles in which are written by men of good information, we read:—"Certain Churches are called Cathedral or Cathedrales, because their Bishops are consecrated in them, and have their seat of dignity (Cathedra), a Greek term for such a seat) appropriated to a Bishop or Archbishop. Thus there is the Cathedral Church of Canterbury, the Cathedral Church of Norwich, the Cathedral Church of Wells. They have usually also a Dean and body of Canons or Prebendaries, but this is not essential to constitute a Cathedral Church, nor is every Church that has a Chapter of Canons a Cathedral Church." Nothing can be more clear than this. Moreover, the idea of a Cathedral Church, divested of all other claims to the title but that imported by its name, comes nearer to the idea of the early Cathedrals, than even the noble Mausoleum of England. Bingham (*Christian Antiquities*, bk. viii. c. vi. § 10), remarking on the statement of Eusebius that the Bishop's seat was called *episcopos*, i. e., a tribunal, says "The Latins more commonly use the names of *Sedes* and *Cathedra* for the Bishop's throne; whence come our English names of Cathedral and See, for a Church where the Bishop's chair or seat is fixed." The same writer records a Rule of the Fifth Council of Carthage (bk. vi. c. iv. § 7), that "Every Bishop shall have his residence at the principal or Cathedral Church, which he shall not leave, to betake himself to any other Church in his diocese, nor continue upon his private concerns to the neglect of his cure and hindrance of his frequenting the Cathedral Church."—"From this, it appears," adds Bingham, "that the City Church was to be the chief place of the Bishop's residence and cure." The testimony of the Venerable Hooker is also quite to the point. He says, (*Eccles. Pol.* bk. vii. § 8.) "If so be, as some imagine, every petty congregation or hamlet had its own particular Bishop, what sense could there be in those words of *Abraham*, concerning castles, villages, and other places abroad, which having only Priests for to teach them, and to minister unto them the Sacraments, were resorted unto by Bishops for the administration of that wherewith their Presbyters were not licensed to meddle. To note a difference of that one Church where the Bishop hath his seat, and the rest which depend upon it, that one hath usually been termed Cathedral, according to the same sense wherein *Ignatius* speaking of the Church of *Antioch* termeth it his throne, and *Cyprian* making mention of *Evarestus* who had been Bishop, and was now deposed, termeth him 'Cathedra ceterorum,' one that was thrust beside his chair."

Tried then by every test, the test of matter of fact and common sense, the test of definition, both ancient and modern, and the test of early usage, the parochial Church of St. James's, Toronto, is also *bona fide* a Cathedral Church. That it has not been so styled in a Cathedral Catalogue is a matter of course, and may be explained in a manner which will be gratifying to the singularly good opportunity afforded by the lamentable fire in 1839, for giving to its interior more of a Cathedral air, was left slip. One might have supposed that at least "Winkie's Cathedral" had been accessible to the re-modellers, even if they had never had the happiness of viewing with their

eyes one of the sublime realities. But we must cease to think that retiring aisles and oaken stalls make a Cathedral. The Home-Churches of the several United States, where the diocesan customarily sit, are essentially and virtually Cathedral Churches, though not so called. The Church that contains exclusively the cathedra of a bishop, is a Cathedral Church, just as much as that part of the Church that contains the bells, is the belfry. Let the much needed Church of St. George be erected ever so soon, and with ever so much splendour, all architectural decoration and appropriate arrangement could amount to nothing in regard to its being the Cathedral Church, as long as it did not please the Bishop of the diocese to remove his chair from the present edifice. When the Diocesan does this, the Parish Church of St. James will cease to be a Cathedral Church, just as Sherborne, Crediton, Hexham, Theford, and other Churches, have ceased to be Cathedral. Many of these retain their colleges of ecclesiastics, their deans, prebendaries, &c., but simply because the Bishop's chair has been removed beyond their walls, they are no longer styled Cathedral Churches.

When *Presbyter* proposes the erection of a Church of Cathedral shape, with nave, aisles, choir, &c., near the College in Toronto, for the purpose of making the pupils attend the daily service and acting as chorists, as is the case with some royal schools in English Cathedral towns, he altogether forgets that the College of Upper Canada is an institution wholly independent and irrespective of ecclesiastical forms and usages, and is resorted to by the youth of all denominations of Christians.

I am, Sir, With great respect, Most truly your's,

Toronto, Jan. 5, 1842.

THE "CHURCH" AND THE "METHODISTS."

To the Editor of The Church.

Sir,—In your paper of the 25th inst., I observed an article over the signature *A British Wesleyan* soliciting an explanation of certain statements contained in my communication of the 11th.

In reply to his first inquiry, whether I designed my "remarks to apply to the Methodists indiscriminately," I beg to say, they had no reference whatever to that body called *British Wesleyans*, being intended solely to apply to the attacks of the *Guardian* upon the Church of England, nor can I imagine how any person could construe them to refer to any other body. At the same time, I am fully persuaded that many of them apply with equal force to the British, as to the Canadian party.

When I made an extract from Mr. Wesley's "Treatise on Baptism," I was fully aware that the Methodists would say, that "it was not included in the authorized exponents of Wesleyan belief, which is simply in the first series of his Discourses," and, to guard against this, added, that the same sentiments were contained in his volumes of Sermons. *A British Wesleyan* "cannot be ignorant of the fact" that, by his volumes of Sermons, I meant no more than those Discourses contained in Vol. II. of the present authorized edition, which, in the edition of 1771—1774, were published in four volumes, and to which reference is made in the Methodist discipline. In the examination "of Candidates for the Ministry," the discipline enjoins that "every person proposed to the District Meeting is to be asked," among others, "the following question, to which a distinct answer is required,—Do you sincerely and fully believe the doctrines of Methodism, as contained in our Articles of Faith, and as taught by Mr. Wesley in his Notes on the New Testament, and *Volumes of Sermons*?" Mr. Jackson, in his preface to the edition of 1829, says, "that in these first four volumes it is that reference is made in the trust deeds of the Methodist Chapels, as embodying, with his Notes on the New Testament, the Doctrines of the Connection." Mr. Wesley's sentiments on Baptism are as clearly expressed in those Sermons as in his "Treatise," and any person may satisfy himself of the correctness of this statement, by consulting the Sermons numbers eighteen and forty-five,—the one "On the Marks of the New Birth," and the other "On the New Birth,"—so that I repeat the assertion, that every Methodist Preacher received on probation, by the British or Canadian Conferences, whose views do not coincide with Mr. Wesley's, and consequently with the Church of England, is guilty of as much "hypocrisy, dissimulation, and evasion," as any that ever subscribed to the Articles.

As to discipline among the British Wesleyans, I admit with the impurer "in some instances," persons may have been "perhaps rather severely dealt with." But have not many others, perhaps equally guilty, not been dealt with at all? I am not aware that their discipline, in general, is better enforced than that of the Canadian Methodists, and although I had formerly no reference to any but the latter, I am perfectly willing that *A British Wesleyan* should, if he pleases, apply my remarks on discipline "to the Methodists indiscriminately."

In designating the Methodists *Modern Montanists*, I used the term in the sense in which it has been applied to the *Ancient Montanists*, for the schism they made in the Primitive Church, of whom Burton, in his *History of the Christian Church*, says, "The Montanists were not considered heretical in any Articles of Faith, but having set up Congregations and Ministers of their own, they brought themselves under the character of schismatics, though not of heretics." Perhaps your correspondent will be pleased to favour myself and others with the "snuff," no doubt a valuable matter, that he might address "in connexion with this inquiry."

Having now answered the several inquiries of *A British Wesleyan*, I would "calmly and kindly" advise him, for the future, to let the *Guardian* defend itself, lest, by meddling with the affairs of others, he should get himself into trouble.

December, 1841.

JONATHAN.

Canadian Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH, KINGSTON.

At a Meeting of the Building Committee, on Tuesday, the 21st December, the Rev. R. D. Cartwright, Assistant Minister, informed the Committee that he had been authorized by the Rev. W. M. Hercher to signify his intention of placing at their disposal the sum of 1000l., towards finishing the Church.

Whereupon it was unanimously Resolved—That the Committee, on behalf of the congregation, tender to the Reverend gentleman their sincere thanks for his very munificent donation. Although the Committee are sensible that Mr. Hercher's highest gratification will be the pleasure of seeing the Parish Church of his native town finished and embellished by his liberality, and witnessing the additional accommodation which will thus be afforded, they nevertheless cannot forbear expressing to him the high sense they entertain of his generous conduct.

"Kingston, 22nd December, 1841.
"MY DEAR HERCHER,—I have much pleasure in transmitting to you the accompanying Resolution of the Building Committee, which was passed at our meeting yesterday; and, in so doing, I gladly avail myself of the opportunity of expressing to you my personal thanks for your handsome contribution towards an object in which I feel so deep an interest.
"That you may long be permitted to enjoy the privilege of using your means to the glory of God and for the benefit of your fellow-men, is the sincere prayer of
"Your's faithfully,
"REV. W. M. HERCHER."

"Kingston, 27th December, 1841.
"MY DEAR CARTWRIGHT,—I know that you will give me credit for sincerity when I say, that no action of my life has ever afforded me greater satisfaction than that which has called forth from the Building Committee the pleasing expression of feeling which you, as Chairman, have conveyed to me. Accept for yourself, and tender to the members of the Committee, my warmest thanks for the kind reception they have given to my proposed donation.
"The primitive settlers of this town, the faithful subjects of the British Government, through good report and evil report,—(very few of whom now remain to tell the delight they experienced as they were wont to repair on the Sabbath to the sanctuary which their own exertions reared to the honour of God),—they and their descendants can alone fully enter into the feelings which have actuated me in the step which I have taken, as regards the Church of my Fathers.
"I say the Church of my Fathers, because it is the congregation in which my Father, and Father's Father were shipped, of which both my parents were communicants; and in which I myself received by Baptism; it is the Church at whose foot I presented my first-born child, now at rest, and my youngest son for initiation into covenant with Christ.
"These circumstances have influenced me in forming the decision to which I have come, and have confirmed

me in the opinion that as a kind Providence has blessed me far beyond my expectation, it was incumbent on me to contribute liberally towards the completion of the Church to which I have so strong an attachment. For these reasons, I have set apart the sum already specified, to be expended in rendering the same already specified temple for God to dwell in; and I fervently pray that, since the want of Church accommodation begins now to be severely felt in this town, through the great increase of population, others who have also received good at the hands of the Lord, will go and do likewise.
"Believe me,
"My dear Cartwright,
"Ever your's faithfully,
"W. M. HERCHER."

"REV. R. D. CARTWRIGHT."

PORT ROBINSON.—A meeting was lately held at this place to ascertain what funds had been raised for building a Church, when it was found that the sum of 175l. had been procured. It is intended to proceed with the building in the coming Spring, if assistance can be obtained from opulent members of the Church in more favoured spots. This will make the second Church in the township of Thorold,—the present one being in the north-eastern angle, and the intended one in the southern portion of the township. The inhabitants of the village and neighbourhood have come forward according to their abilities, and hope that they will be able, with assistance, to carry their earnest desire into effect. Service was commenced there in the autumn of 1840, and can be afforded there only once in two weeks.

COBourg.—The Rev. A. N. Bethune begs to acknowledge, with many thanks, the receipt of 5l. from the Rev. W. M. Hercher in aid of the funds of the Parochial School House at Cobourg.

SALE OF INDULGENCES BY THE ROMISH CHURCH IN CANADA.

PASTORAL LETTER,

TO THE CATHOLICS OF THE WESTERN SECTION OF THE CITY OF TORONTO.

REMIQUIUS GAULIN, by the Grace of God, and of the Holy Apostolic See, Bishop of Kingston, &c. &c.

The spiritual welfare of the flock which divine providence has been pleased to confide to our care, however unworthy of the honour, and unfit for the charge we may impose, on us the strict obligation of using every means that prudent zeal suggests towards its promotion. It is consequently, our incumbent duty to exert ourselves and see that every portion (let it be ever so small) of this extensive flock, have at their convenience the means of being benefited by the sacred ordinances of their Holy Religion, which we would willingly bring to every individual's door, if it were possible to do so. At all events, we are bound to facilitate as much as lies in our power, the practice of the ordinary duties of religion. In order to this, the division of Parishes and Missions: the multiplication of Priests and Chapels, when they are possible, must be resorted to; hence the more Churches and the more Priests in a place, the more convenient it is to have the sick timely visited; the Youth more closely watched, and more carefully instructed; and with greater facility can every individual gratify his pious inclinations in worshipping his God more frequently, and derive from hence a greater share of his blessings.

Well, it is with a view to procure to you My Beloved Brethren, all those great benefits, that after the most mature consideration before God, of the subject, we have come to the fixed determination of forming in the western section of the city of Toronto, a new religious establishment, which shall be as centrally situated as possible, in order that every individual of that section of the Town may have an easy access to it; and we shall take care that a Clergy every way competent, be attached to it. You must do us the justice to think, that in this measure, no other motive prompts us, than that of seeing you adequately furnished with such religious attendance as you have every right to expect from us. But we need not remark to you that without your cordial co-operation, we cannot effect this purpose; and we feel confident, that we will not appeal in vain to you for this necessary co-operation. We feel the more confident in this appeal, because it is to the sons of St. Patrick we are addressing ourselves; knowing, as we do, that their generous zeal is proverbial whenever Religion or Charity is in question. But in order to regulate that zeal in such a way that the contributions to this very laudable purpose, may be made easy to every individual, we have deemed it more advantageous, that it should be done in the form of a Pious Association, to wit: An Association of five thousand persons of all classes, and of every age and sex, shall be forthwith formed; each associate will pay down a dollar, (no more) for the present; his name shall be immediately entered in a book kept for that purpose, and when there are five hundred names registered, we engage to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, on the first Monday in every month, for the spiritual and temporal prosperity of every associate thus registered, until the completion of the aforesaid establishment. Moreover, we shall impart the benefit of a plenary indulgence to the above mentioned registered associates, on each of the four principal Festivals of the Ecclesiastical year, on their confessing and receiving worthily the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, and praying for His Holiness the Pope, on the said Festivals; again, forty days indulgence to every subscriber who will induce another person to join the Association.

We shall conclude this pastoral by expressing our unfeigned sorrow for the opposition with which we are threatened, from a quarter whence we should least expect it. But we, at the same time, declare to you that we shall be, by no means, deterred from our purpose by such impotent opposers. We should be sorry for this opposition, merely because it would bring shame and confusion on those who would be so lost to every sense of religion as to offer it. Whether opposed or not, we shall steadily proceed in our intentions; and on these firm dispositions we beg of you to rely.

The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Charity of God, and the Communication of the Holy Ghost be with you all. Given at Kingston, in our Episcopal Residence, under Our Hand and Seal, this tenth day of December, One Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty One.
I.S. REMIQUIUS GAULIN, Bishop of Kingston.

By His Lordship's Command, PATRICK DOLLARD, Private Secretary.

From our English Files.

IRISH POLITICS.

(From the Times 30th Nov.)

The proceedings of the Dublin Fidelity Association, as detailed in our Irish correspondence of Friday last, deserve, we think, rather more attention than usual. Judging from what transpired on that occasion, we feel confident that O'Connell is ready discovering to his infinite chagrin, that his acceptance of the majority, under a Conservative Government, has been a serious practical error. Had he would have been a person of some consequence. Considering their tacit connivance in most of his Lordship's policy projects, there can be no doubt that had a Liberal Viceroi happened to have held sway during O'Connell's municipal elevation, the Right Hon. Repealer would have received all manner of egyphtian homage from the Vice-Royal Court, and in the absence of every respectable guest, would certainly have figured at the Castle as one of its most brilliant appendages. But his Lordship's year of office has unhappily fallen upon unpropitious times. Perhaps we should hardly be wrong in saying that the present Lord Mayor of Dublin is, in some respects, the most insignificant nonentity in the peer of the unworshipped splendour and popularity of Earl De Grey's Lieutenancy, the mighty Mr. O'Connell is as completely obscured as the tiniest twinkler in the gorgeous and bedizened skies. Even on occasions of State-procession, when he donned his civic tinsel, the tawdry medallion hung upon the skirts of the cavalcade to catch a few residuary cheers, in such the same way as a spangled rope-dancer figures on the out-boards of a race-course, and then hands round his tambourin to gather the clausy of the "ran-hoo cheys."

Now assuredly this is a very palling vicissitude for a man who for some years has revelled in the patronage of Phoenix-park, and commanded the obedience of the Lightest Ministers of the Crown. Moreover, his altered circumstances are extremely mortifying in other respects. During the nominal reign of Whigs, Mr. Daniel O'Connell was virtually the sovereign of Ireland,—the monster behind the throne, greater his damage throne itself. In those halcyon days, when he made his power, ever paramount to that of Her Majesty, made him contentedly wanton in abusing it, his contented position could scarcely be better indicated than by the following well-known words:—

"There's a difference between
"A Beggar and a Queen,
"And I'll tell you the reason why—
"A Queen cannot swagart, and not the a beggar,
"Or be half so joyful as I."

