

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

Quod Semper, quod
Absque, quod ab Omnibus
Creditum est teneamus

Her Foundations are upon the HOLY BILLS.



In necessariis Unitas,
In dubiis Libertas,
In omnibus Caritas.

THE CHURCHMAN'S FRIEND,

FOR THE DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION RELATIVE TO THE

United Church of England and Ireland Her Doctrine and Her Ordinances.

EDITED BY CLERGYMEN.

VOL. II.—No. 5.]

WINDSOR, C. W., FEB., 1857.

[Published Monthly.]

Church News.

ENGLAND.—The new Bishops of London and Durham have been enthroned. The vacant Bishoprick of Ripon has been filled up by the appointment of the Rev. Robert Bickersteth, Rector of St. Giles' in the Fields, and Canon of Salisbury. Mr. Bickersteth, who at the early age of forty and after having been only fifteen years in holy orders, has been raised to the Episcopate, is known as a popular preacher of the "Evangelical school," and as an earnest and benevolent clergyman. His selection by Lord Palmerston will not increase the confidence of churchmen in the Premier's judgment, especially when it is remembered that the vacant diocese contained such a man as Dr. Hook. Another proof is thus afforded that a minister who depends upon mere popularity for his tenure of office, is no fit dispenser of the Church's patronage.

The Court of Arches has dismissed the appeal of Archdeacon Denison, and it appears even to be a controverted point whether there is any appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Every step which is taken in this unfortunate affair convinces us more and more, that there is no tribunal which, under our existing Constitution of Church and State, has power to define the Church's doctrine.

The following letter, which we take from a

late number of the Guardian, appears to us to be remarkably judicious and sensible, and to mark out the right view which is to be taken by sound churchmen:

Sir—The calm but earnest discussion which is going on in your columns cannot fail to promote the cause of truth. I am glad to observe that your correspondents are beginning to turn their attention away from the mere technicalities of this particular case, to the simple ground of the Church's doctrine. May I request your permission to propose the following queries, which, if answered as I imagine they ought to be answered, might save a good deal of needless controversy.

Is it not probable that the awfully mysterious words of Holy Scripture—"He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body"—may be all that we are intended to know, and all that we are capable of knowing about the doctrine?

Is it not a fact that the Church Universal has never attempted to define anything further on the subject?

With regard to the Roman dogma, that the wicked eat sacramentally, but not spiritually; and the English dogma, that the wicked "press the sacrament with their teeth," but are not "partakers of Christ;" are they not mere vague and inadequate, though not necessarily false, paraphrases, which add neither force nor meaning to the tremendous words of Scripture?

Is it not true that the great teacher of the Church, St. Augustin, contradicts himself, or at least speaks vaguely on the subject; showing

that either he had not considered it as vital, or that it was beyond even his grasp?

Is it necessary to believe more than the three following propositions:—

I. The words of our Lord, in their plain sense, 'This is my Body;' 'This is my Blood.'

II. That they who receive worthily do 'verily and indeed' receive the Body and Blood of Christ.

III. That they who receive unworthily 'eat and drink their own damnation, not discerning the Lord's Body.'

Does Holy Scripture or the Church require us to believe anything positive beyond this?

If not, then is not all this controversy as to the reception or non-reception by the wicked, about a dogma not revealed in Holy Scripture, not taught by the Church, and which is, in truth, beyond the scope of the mind of man to understand or elucidate?—Yours truly,

Brighton, Dec. 1, 1856. W. GRESLEY.

The Bishop of London has commenced his Episcopal career by presiding at a public meeting held in the parish of Islington for the purpose of raising funds for the erection of ten new churches in that parish. It is a note-worthy fact that this one suburb of the metropolis of England contains a larger population, comprising 200,000 souls, than all the cities of Europe with the exception of about twelve. The new bishop subscribed the sum of £600, one-tenth of his first year's income, and alluded to the fact that his predecessor had been instrumental in building upwards of 200 new churches in London and its vicinity.

At a late meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the following notice of motion was given by the Rev. Dr. Biber:

"That the standing committee be requested to take into their consideration the expediency of publishing, under the sanction of competent ecclesiastical authority, an edition of the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures with such additions to the marginal readings as might serve to bring the sense of the original text more fully and correctly before the minds of the people." The motion stands for discussion at the next general meeting on the 6th of January.

UNITED STATES.—We limit our Church News this month to two extracts, one of which, from the Central Presbyterian, depicts, in forcible colours, the destructive rapidity with which the "denominations" are crumbling in pieces; and the other presents a curious development of the fashionable methods of "raising the wind," which religious people have recourse to, in the

absence of the Catholic principle of giving to God the first-fruits of their substance.

The Central Presbyterian says of the Baptists:—

"Eleven or twelve years ago, the acting Board of Baptist Missions in Boston refused to appoint slaveholding Missionaries, and the consequence was that the Southern Baptist Churches withdrew from the Triennial Convention and formed an organization of their own.

The Baptists of the northern States then held a special meeting in New York, to provide for this emergency, as they were heavily in debt. And at this meeting, they formed a new organization which was called "The American Baptist Missionary Union," and entered afresh upon their work with apparently great unanimity and zeal. Their Southern brethren, however, predicted that this new organization would be broken to pieces by the same sort of "Radicalism" that had given it life; and it appears from present indications that they were not altogether false prophets. For the Baptist Examiner, of New York, says, "Division, contention, and alienation, entered the Missions in Burmah—and what a harvest has been already gathered? Who is capable of estimating the disastrous influences of the controversies and disclosures of the last two or three years of our Missionary history?"

It appears that the Rangoon (Burman) Mission has separated from "The American Baptist Missionary Union," and become independent—making their appeals for support to another organization, called the American Baptist Free Mission Society. Several of the Missionaries of the Union have resigned. Consequently there will be two classes of appeals to the Northern Baptist Churches on behalf of Foreign Missions. One for the Missionaries in connexion with the Union, and the other for the Missionaries who have become independent. Thus is it that anti-slavery radicalism ever tends to strife, and animosity and contention and division and every other evil work. The Boston Board sowed the wind and they seem now to be reaping the whirlwind."

Our other extract is from a Baltimore paper:

"The ladies of the Sixth church, corner of Maryland Avenue and Sixth street, respectfully announce to the public that their Fair is now open, and that they will be most happy to receive visits from all who feel disposed to patronize them and promote the cause in which they are engaged.

The Committee of Arrangement are most happy to announce that they have succeeded, at considerable expense, in making an arrangement with the proprietor of the celebrated elephant Young Columbus, who has created such a furor in private circles in this city, and that he will exhibit his wonderful sagacity and amazing in-

tollect in the performance of various astonishing feats between the hours of 8 and 10 during the week.

—

AUSTRALIA.—A new Church Society has been lately formed in Sydney. According to the census of 1851, the members of the Church of England in the Diocese of Sydney numbered 66,700 souls, and allowing for the increase in five years and for the population at the gold-fields, the number may now be stated at 70,900. To supply the ministerial wants of this population, there are at the present time only fifty-eight clergymen, a number found to be totally inadequate to the spiritual necessities of the people. To remedy this state of matters is the object of the Society. How it is proposed to accomplish this end may be gathered from the following passage in the opening address of Bishop Barker, from the chair:—

“In the first place, we are not going to cast ourselves upon the voluntary system for the future maintenance of the clergy. We are going to make use of the voluntary system as supplementary to government assistance, and are about to prove that we deserve additional aid because we use our best endeavours to help ourselves. So far from repudiating State assistance, I greatly desire the increase of it in proportion to the increased wants of the community, and think that if given in such a way as to call forth a corresponding amount from the Church, it would be a great boon. In the second place, we are not going to abandon the cause of religious education. I am inclined to think we shall do a good deal on its behalf. But I think that the State may so liberally assist the Church in her endeavors to educate the children of her own communion as to make the assistance of any society unnecessary. If the Church and the Legislature can agree upon the terms on which this shall be done, there can be no necessity for a society to interfere. I believe that such agreement is possible, upon terms which shall not interfere with the right of the clergy to instruct children of their own Church in the tenets of the Church; and I, for my part, shall be ready to meet any proposals of the Government with an earnest desire to co-operate with them in the great work of the education of the people.”

Resolutions in accordance with the objects of the meeting were unanimously passed. As an earnest of sincerity of the Bishop of Sydney in this new organization, it may be stated that he gave a donation of £500, and promised an annual subscription of £100.

Reasons for Returning to the Catholic Church of England;

IN A CONVERSATION BETWEEN MR. SECKER, A CHURCHMAN, AND MR. BROWN, A METHODIST.

DIALOGUE VI.

Mr. Brown.—Since our last conversation, Mr. Secker, I have been considerably disturbed in my feelings; not that I have been shaken in my intention of returning to the Church, so far at least as to attend upon her public services once every Sunday, and upon her services regularly, for you have proved, beyond reasonable doubt, that not to do so would be to commit the sin of schism; and when a duty is once *proved*, no objections, however painful their existence may be, can excuse the neglect of such a duty: but the uneasiness to which I allude has arisen from this cause, that after I had almost come to the resolution *altogether* to leave the Methodists,—the reasons for which I will tell you immediately,—I named my intention to some of my friends, and they pressed me so strongly with the argument that “when the Church becomes worldly and formal, men are not only justified but imperatively called upon to separate it,” that I confess I was unable to answer them to my own satisfaction. Pardon me, but before you endeavour to meet this objection,—if indeed you are able to do so,—permit me to state why I have thought of entirely leaving the Methodists. You remember what was said respecting “authority” as a rule of conduct in our last interview. Now if the Church has the right to forbid Dissent, and even to excommunicate those who refuse to obey; I cannot but see that her authority must be equally binding as regards *partial separation*, such as that in which some Methodists indulge; I see also that if such separation be not absolutely schism, it is the very next step to it; and then I am all but convinced that no ministry is lawful, but that which is Apostolic and Episcopal. — Now as *every thing* connected with Christ and his Church is of the most awful importance, I felt that I durst not longer remain in questionable paths, lest haply I might be found in those which are absolutely forbidden. I was therefore about fully to return to the Church, when the doubts of which I speak as to its being formal and worldly, were afresh suggested to my mind in a manner which has made me feel, particularly uncomfortable. I know that duty never calls two ways, and yet I am, I acknowledge, quite at sea; I fear to move, lest I should leave Christ, and I dare not stay in flat opposition to those principles of submission to lawful and scriptural Church authority which we were lately considering, and to those injunctions which require us to “mark them which cause divisions and to avoid them,” and the solemn commands to “withdraw ourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received” (Rom.

xvi. 19; 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14; 2 Tim., Titus, &c. &c.)

Mr. Seckor.—I understand your difficulty perfectly; it is one which long painfully affected my own mind; but rely upon it, Mr. Brown, it arises from a *distortion of facts, and a misapprehension of duty*. You know nothing is easier than to bring slanderous charges against either individuals or communities, which, though they be entirely false, it may yet require long and painful efforts to disprove. Thus, if I were to begin to insinuate in public that you were not thoroughly upright in your commercial transactions, or not a strictly sober man, false as both one and the other would be, it might yet cost you considerable trouble before you could entirely disabuse the public of the suspicion that there was some ground for the slander. So it has been with the Church; the Dissenters have studiously represented it as being devoid of all spiritual religion, a lifeless image, cold and dead,—a congregation of mere formalists, who neither sought Christ nor desired the influences of his Holy Spirit; while, on the contrary, their own communities are represented as the sanctuaries of primitive purity and simplicity, in which alone the truly pious can find either Christian communion or spiritual profit. With regard to these latter assertions I shall say little,—I do not wish to become the accuser of the private characters even of those who, not content with the error of having forsaken our Reformed Catholic Church, do yet add the sins of unholy hate and slanderous speaking concerning her; this only will I say, that those who, amongst the Methodists and other Dissenters, are the most distinguished for their well-informed piety, are the individuals who have the least to say respecting the piety of Dissent as contrasted with that of the Church. With respect to the Church itself, while I know how far short too many of its members come of that spiritual devotion, and of that hungering and thirsting after righteousness which should distinguish every believer in Christ Jesus, still I trust that that “pure and undefiled religion,” which only springs from a true faith in Him, and which St. James declares to be this, “to keep ourselves unspotted from the world, and to visit the fatherless and the widow in their affliction,” is to be found in our Church in greater abundance than elsewhere. It is charitable to hope that the Dissenters have commonly judged otherwise, not altogether from their unholy jealousy of the Church, not to use harsher terms, but from their strange ignorance of what composes the visible Church of Christ.

The holy sacrament of baptism was adopted by Christ himself as the rite whereby all, whether Jewish and Pagan adults or the infants of Christians, were to be admitted into his Church; and mark, my dear sir, that as it is the only rite sanctioned by divine authority for this purpose; therefore, all who are duly baptized are

thenceforward positive members of the Church, and continue to be so, unless, by competent authority, they are openly excommunicated, and thereby cast out of the pale of the Church,—a measure which the Bible only permits in extreme cases. It is evident, therefore, as the heart of man is naturally prone to sin, that in the Christian as it was in the Jewish Church, very many of its members will be unworthy. The Methodists and other sectarians, on the contrary, have, I fear most unwarrantably, made new and unscriptural conditions of entrance into, what they call, their various churches; hence though they profess to baptize the children of their people, and thereby to unite them to Christ, they do most inconsistently refuse to regard them as true members of their religious body; their condition of membership being not that which Christ instituted, but a test of their own! This, I may just remark, was not originally the case with Methodism; Mr. Wesley always strongly insisted upon it that his people were *not a Church*, but simply *societies within the Church of England*; therefore, however unadvised this step might be, still he did not usurp the authority of Christ, by making new conditions of admission into his Church. Nay, such an usurpation as this the Romish Church itself, either by Pope or Council, never ventured upon; this was left for the boasted ‘private judgment’ of Dissent to do; and now alas! Methodism has fully fallen into this snare also. I have made this statement for the purpose of showing you how it is, that, by superficial observers, the Church should be thought to be less holy in its members than Dissent; namely, that as the sectarians acknowledge none as members of their so-called churches, except persons chosen from amongst adults who have already exhibited some degree of seriousness; it may well be supposed that, in proportion to their numbers, they will have an appearance of greater purity than our Apostolic Church, which does not deny the rights of membership to any of those who, according to Christ’s institution, have, by baptism, been once received therein, even though the lives of many of them should be far from such as becometh those who have the vows of the Lord upon them. Thus, Mr. Brown, I think persons are mistaken as to the matter of fact in the grounds upon which they suppose Dissent to be more holy than the Church; for you see that to make the comparison fair, it is the serious and devout communicants of the Church, those who are attentive upon her various ordinances, who must be compared with the members of dissenting denominations, and then in practical godliness I do not suppose that you yourself think that the Church will suffer by the comparison.

Mr. Brown—No indeed; for though I have no doubt as to the true piety of very many of the Methodists, still I am quite of the opinion of your candid friend the Rev. Mr. —, ‘that

piety in the Church is generally much more solid than amongst the Sectarians.* Your incidental remarks too respecting the *new conditions* of church-membership, which the Dissenters would establish, strike me very forcibly; indeed now you have brought the matter before me I could wonder how an innovation which appears so dangerous and unscriptural could so long have escaped my observation; it is like robbing those of their Christian privileges and casting them again out of the pale of the Church into the wide world of iniquity whom, in the name of Christ, they have professed to receive as the children of God; and truly those who are thus treated can never be expected to feel that having been 'baptized into Christ' the vows of the Lord are upon them. I fear such Ostrich-like conduct towards the 'lambs' of Christ, interwoven as it is in the very nature of dissent, goes far to prove how great is the evil of schism.

Mr. Secker.—I think then we are agreed that, with all its faults, we shall not mend ourselves by leaving the Church in the hope of finding a purer Christian community; especially when we bear in mind that great improvement, which, by the mercy of God, has taken place within the last few years in the Church of England both as respects Apostolic Order, Scriptural zeal and personal holiness. But to give your friends all the advantage of the objection, I will suppose that 'the Church is as cold in its love to Christ and as formal in its piety towards God' as they imagine, and even then I am prepared to show, as I stated a while back, that it is an entire misconception of the path of duty to suppose that even *in such a case* it would be right to leave her communion, for that the man who does so, is guilty of the sin of schism. This I prove by the following considerations:—

1. That in the Jewish Church, however sinful were its priests, or however corrupted were its ordinances, no one could forsake its pale or neglect its services without rendering himself liable to the judgments of Almighty God for so doing. Thus we find it written in the book of Deuteronomy, 'And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken to the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die;' (xvii. 12) and in Leviticus dreadful are the threatenings which Jehovah pronounces against those who 'should despise his statutes,

or whose soul should abhor his judgments so that they should not do all his commandments but break his covenant.' (xxvi. 15, 16, &c.) And here you see is no exception made, in case the priesthood itself should become unholy, as indeed we know it oft-times did; the command to unity is exceeding broad. I thus judge therefore that as schism was a crime so hateful to God, under the Old Dispensation as to be punished with death, even so still He must look upon it with abhorrence.

Mr. Brown.—But what have we to do with Jewish laws? Christ you know came to do away with the Mosaic Ritual and to set us free from all such bondage.

Mr. Secker.—True; Christ did abolish the Mosaic Ritual, with all its burdensome ceremonies; but remember, my dear friend, that He himself says, 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.' (Matt. v. 17.) Now from the way in which most Dissenters speak of the Jewish Dispensation, one would be ready to suppose it to have originated with Moses, and that Christ, as its bitter enemy, sought to destroy it root and branch. Whence, Mr. Brown, I appeal to you as a man of sense, and candour, whence has arisen this desire of the Dissenters to pour contempt upon a Dispensation which was established solely by God himself? Is it not because *there*, God himself speaks so clearly, both by precept and example, respecting the Divine authority of Ministers and Rulers, the necessity of obedience, the sin of division, and the other evils necessarily connected with democratic insubordination and religious dissent, that they feel themselves bound, in self-defence, to deny the authority of these his former teachings? But this cannot be right; for God changeth not, and human nature also remains the same in all its distinctive peculiarities; hence I can scarcely understand how any honest man can dispute that the great principles upon which God acts towards His people must be the same in all ages; it is the mode of carrying them out only which can vary; and it is the Jewish Church alone to which we can look for an example of those principles by which He would have His Church guided; as under our Dispensation He tests our reverent obedience and holy love by pointing us, as it were, to that, to learn his will as respects the principles upon which he would have his visible Church ordered. Thus St. Paul tells us that the Jewish Dispensation was 'the shadow of heavenly (or Christian) things'; and 'the pattern of things in the heavens' (Heb. viii. 5; and ix. 23). I judge, therefore, by the example of the Jewish Church, that even spiritual deadness forms no sufficient apology for our forsaking the Church of God.

2. The next reason, why I think it wrong to leave the Church on account of its supposed deadness and formality, is, that no provision for

*[The person here alluded to is Mr. Hughes, a Baptist preacher, who was Secretary to the Bible Society. His words are these:

"From my extensive intercourse with Christians of all denominations, I have come to the full conviction, that there are no body of persons in the nation among whom the Spirit of the Gospel is so consistently exhibited as among the pious members and ministers of the Established Church. The piety in that quarter is of a better cast, more deep, more solid, more simple, more scriptural, less showy, than in any other."—Ed. CH.]

so doing is made in the New Testament. I have, in our former conversations, shown how exceedingly strong is its language against the sin of schism and division; surely then, seeing that so much is said against leaving the *one* Catholic Church of Christ, if the formality of its ministers or members had been a sufficient reason for doing so, such an exception to the general rule would have been explicitly stated; whereas I think you will find, upon examination, that *there is not the most obscure hint to that effect.*

Mr. Brown.—Nay, there I think you are scarcely correct. I will mention three passages that do appear to me, I confess, to authorize separation; at least I know that the Dissenters build greatly upon them. They are these:—‘Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord’ (2 Cor. vi. 17). The next is this: ‘Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly’ (2 Thess. iii. 6). And lastly, that striking and important injunction in the Revelations, ‘And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues’ (xviii. 4). These, I think, contain the strength of the Scriptural argument in favour of Dissent; and would they not justify it, if only their charges against the Church of especial lukewarmness were correct? which, however, I agree with you in believing they are not.

Mr. Secker.—Really, I am astonished when once the thing is fairly brought to the test, to find how *entirely* unsupported by Scripture is the separation from our Church of either the Puritans of former times, or the Methodists of modern days. And indeed, my good friend, I can easily perceive that you are only trying to make the most of your friend’s objections, satisfied yourself that they are baseless. I will, however, take your texts in the order you gave them.

The first, then, taken from the Second of Corinthians, you will find, if you read the context, relates solely to the obligation which rested on those who professed to be disciples of Christ, entirely to forsake the rites of Paganism, and to form no intimate friendships, and especially no matrimonial connections, with their heathen neighbours. This passage then has not any, not even the most remote, reference to the relation which Christians bear to the Church.

The next, taken from the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, so far from sanctioning separation, does itself positively command us to avoid all such persons; for the disorderly person whom the Apostle commands the true Christian to avoid, is the very man, as the rest of the verse you quoted says, who walks ‘not after the tradition which he received of us; that is, who re-

fuses to submit himself to his lawful spiritual rulers. And if, owing to a lax state of discipline, disorderly or worldly-minded persons are unhappily found in communion with the Church, the utmost that this passage enjoins, or indeed permits, the conscientious Christian to do, is to stand aloof from such individuals so far as not to seek their friendship, or close intercourse;—to leave the Church of Christ on their account were to fall into that very sin, against which the text in question is mainly pointed, namely, spiritual disobedience. In truth, Mr. Brown, it is this very spirit of *spiritual insubordination* which causes so much division. Private members of Christ’s Church, instead of humbly seeking for personal holiness, are sitting each one in judgment upon his brother, and fancying that they are to purify the house of the Lord, and to improve His prophets.

The last passage you advance, from the Book of the Revelations, is an exceedingly important one, but has nothing to do with the present question; it speaks in reference to a Church which has apostatized from the truth, or wickedly and wilfully corrupted it. The passage referred to does, I think, satisfactorily vindicate the German Reformers in leaving the Church of Rome, though not, I fear, in setting up a *new and human polity*, and dispensing, on the plea of necessity, with the Divine institution of Episcopacy; and certainly it fully justifies our own Church in having thrown off a foreign and unscriptural yoke, and in refusing to hold communion with other churches, so long as they sanction the iniquities, and share in the corruptions, of Papacy. But as the Dissenters in general, and especially the Methodists, do not charge the Catholic Church of England with apostacy, or wilful corruption of the truth, this passage, themselves being judges, does form no apology whatever for their separation from it, and consequent violation of the Divine precepts to unity and spiritual submission, which are so often repeated in the Sacred Scriptures. Indeed, the command to unity in the Christian Church appears to me to be *positive*, with this single exception, that ‘we ought to obey God rather than man.’ And therefore, as many of the requirements of the rulers of the Romish churches are directly contrary to God’s Word, it is clear that men ought not to obey them, and you know unless even the laity in the Romish Church conform in *every thing*, they are liable to be cast out of its pale; so that no choice is left to them but either to disobey God, or to submit to alienation from the Romish communion. But how different is the conduct of the English Church! She teaches no unscriptural doctrines,—enjoins no superstitious rites; and yet if the weak minds of any of her laity should be scrupulous, she tenderly bears them, and does not cast them out of her pale, because they may not comply with all that she thinks desirable. How totally,

therefore, without excuse, are those who separate from *her!* for, supposing the charge of formality against her were true, yet as she certainly does not *forbid* her members seeking after all holiness, they are in no wise justified in leaving her; because she neither enjoins any thing contrary to the Word of God, nor forbids any thing which it teaches us to seek after.

Thus, then, the state of the scriptural argument appears to be this,—that in God's holy word, the unity of the Church and a dutiful submission to its pastors is strongly insisted upon, nay, strongly enjoined; and that no permission whatever is to be found in the whole Bible authorizing men, under any circumstances, to forsake the communion of, or to refuse obedience to, the one Apostolic Church; (saying the one fact, that it should become, as in the case of Rome, decidedly *anti-Christian*); and further, that in the Bible we have an example of the Church of God being in that state in which the Dissenters profess to believe the Church of England to be in, namely, itself lukewarm, and its priests corrupt; and that yet none of its members were permitted to leave it under the pretence of forming a purer church; but, on the contrary, the man who, *at any part* of its history, forsook the Jewish Church, was declared to be cut off from the privileges of the people of God, and was even to be put to death! The same principle is evidenced in all the apocalyptic addresses to the angels of the Seven Churches, and especially in that to the Church of Laodicea; for, fallen as it was, and fearful as were the threatenings denounced against it, *not one word* is said intimating that the truly pious who remained in it should leave it and form a new and purer church; so with respect to the Church of Sardis, also, surely if dissent were at all justifiable, the "Spirit" would have enjoined those few names, "who alone of all the Church in Sardis had not defiled their garments," to forsake their brethren, of whom God himself declares, that though "they had a name to live, they were dead,"—but no, not the least hint of the kind is given. It appears then, Mr. Brown, I think, beyond reasonable contradiction, that *he who forsakes the Church of England does so, not only without the sanction of the holy Scripture, but in direct opposition to its sacred teachings.*

Mr. Brown.—You have indeed most satisfactorily answered the objections of my friends. Ah! Mr. Secker, what a sad pity it is that men will "lean to their own understandings," and be guided by their own imaginings, rather than by that "sure word of Prophecy" to which the Apostle directs us. I tremble to think how awful is the responsibility which the Dissenter of every grade takes upon himself.

Mr. Secker.—I am rejoiced that you view the matter so seriously; it is, in truth, a subject of vast importance; and the more I investigate it,

the more deeply do I mourn over the errors and dangers of dissent. There are yet two or three other reasons, which are all that I shall at present adduce, which, though not perhaps so obvious as the last, are yet worthy of your serious attention.

3. The doctrine of the Catholic Church of Christ in all ages has been this, that He left upon earth One Church, and in that Church certain holy sacraments and other ordinances which were to be administered by One Apostolic Episcopal Ministry, and by them only; and that when so administered, they were designed to be the channels of Divine grace to the faithful. I am not now speaking of the correctness or incorrectness of these doctrines, but wish simply to impress your mind with the fact, that they were the opinions of the universal Church of Christ for thirteen or fourteen centuries, and are yet held by its overwhelming majority. Now the argument which I would found upon these facts is, that the conduct of Dissenters in leaving the One Catholic Church, and making to themselves teachers who are not of that One Apostolic line, is in direct opposition to the doctrines and teachings of the Church, both ancient and modern; and surely the truly *humble* Christian will fear to associate himself with those who thus oppose themselves to the wise and holy, the confessors and martyrs, who have composed the holy Catholic Church; indeed, if such an opposition of our private judgment to the general voice of Christ's holy and primitive Church be not in very many cases indicative of that "haughty spirit which goeth before a fall," I know not what is so. And especially has the conscientious believer, who has wandered into the paths of dissent, reason to tremble, when he considers that, according to the faith of this Church, the very sacraments are invalid when administered by unepiscopal or schismatic hands; a doubt even on this subject is awful to those who know how "generally necessary" the Bible teaches us that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are to salvation.

4. Another sin consequent upon dissent is this, which, however, I think I have named to you before, that if the individuals who leave the Church are holier and better than those they leave behind, they, by their dissent, rob the Church of the benefit of their righteous example; of the blessing attendant upon their faithful prayers; for when a man has left the Church, *it will not* any longer be the subject of his continual fervent prayers; and then it greatly prejudices the thoughtless against spiritual religion, to see its loudest professors thus self-opinionated and regardless of the voice of the Church, and, I must add, so careless also even as respects the intimations of the Word of God itself, when they oppose their sectarian prejudices. It is impossible to say how great has been the mischief done by dissent in this way.

5. Lastly, the sin of modern dissent may be read in the evils which have flowed from it. The Puritans left the Church under the plea of seeking greater purity; and the consequence has been the spread of Quakerism, of the Baptists, Socinians, Chartists, &c., &c., and the sowing of bitterness and wrath and strife amongst those who are called the children of God. For what sect is there that does not frequently indulge those feelings towards the Church? Nay, how can it be otherwise,—when once men imagine that they are at liberty to leave the Church of Christ for every cause, division must produce discord. The Primitive Church dwelt in peace, because its members were of “one accord,” and of “one heart and one mind.” And once admit the right of individuals to dissent from the One Catholic Church, and you have no longer any sufficient argument whereby to stop these infinite divisions to which men’s fancies will undoubtedly lead them. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, for many years the Church of Christ in England was one; now, those who profess to belong to it, form a most bewildering variety of sects, the number of which is almost daily increasing. Mr. Brown, can principles, of which such multiplied divisions are the unavoidable fruits, have the sanction of Him who prayed that “His Church might be one, as He and the Father were one?”

Mr. Brown.—Thank you, thank you, Mr. Secker. I do most clearly see that the Divine example of the Jewish Church, the Bible, the voice of Christ’s Church, individual safety, the good of the Church, and the welfare of the world, are all opposed to dissent; and, therefore, deeply feel that the Christian’s only lawful weapon, when he fears that the Church is lukewarm or its ministers unfaithful, is fervent, continual, believing prayer, like that of the Prophet Habakkuk to Almighty God, that He will graciously pour out the influences of His Holy Spirit, and “revive His work in the midst of the years, and in wrath remember mercy.” May I, my dear Sir, trespass again upon your kindness, as there are yet some other matters upon which I wish to obtain your views, and will for that purpose postpone my journey.

“Gold and the Gospel.”

WE stated last month our intention of giving extracts from these excellent Essays and Lecture; in proceeding to redeem our promise, we must again warn our readers that some of the incidental sentiments are such as we cannot endorse, believing them to be contradictory to the truth as taught by Christ and His Church; still, taking them as a whole, we should rejoice to see them very widely distributed.

The two best Essays are undoubtedly those

of Mr. Constable and Dr. Morgan; though as a striking platform address Mr. Arthur’s speech is very worthy of note.

Mr. Constable thus speaks concerning Jewish Tithes:

“A *tithe* was the general law for Israel, but Jewish liberality was by no means confined within that limit. . . . How delightful to look back upon those glorious pages of Jewish history, when this free spirit animated the nation as one man; when all, both high and low, from the prince and noble to the humblest Israelite, vied in pouring their gifts into the treasury of God! . . . How sad the contrast with other periods when covetousness and selfishness took the place of bounty and gratitude; when not merely free-will offerings were grudged, but the appointed tenth was withdrawn! Not less striking was the contrast between the conditions of Israel at these different times. In the one, the windows of heaven were opened, and Plenty poured out from her free horn, while gladness dwelt within the heart, and joy beamed on the countenances of a happy people; in the other, God in displeasure dried up the fountain whence the streams of refreshing love had flowed in their various channels, and gloom overshadowed the face, and repining saddened the spirits, of the selfish nation; for it was true which Solomon said, There is that scattereth and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, and it tendeth to poverty.” . . . “To give a tenth* was the bounden duty of every Israelite, but the free-will offering depended on the ability and willingness of the offerer. The one was required of all the people; the reluctant and grudging were scarcely invited to join in the other.”

Speaking of the readiness of the offerings to the Tabernacle, and concerning those of even later Jewish ages, our author thus speaks:

“How strangely does it read, in these days of calculating selfishness, the command which Moses caused thereon to be proclaimed throughout the camp of Israel, ‘Let neither man nor woman make any more work for the offering of the sanctuary!’ In the wealthy reigns of David and Solomon, the amount contributed almost exceeds calculation. While on the return of the captives, in poverty no doubt, from Babylon, the language of the inspired historian is brief, but very significant, ‘They offered freely for the house of God,’ ‘They gave after their ability.’ . . . Oh, had they been always thus, and in other respects as in this, then would Jerusalem have been, what she will one day be, ‘a praise upon earth.’”

Mr. Constable powerfully bases the perpetual

* Or rather nearer *three-tenths*.—Eds. Churchman’s Friend.

obligation of Tithes, amongst other reasons, upon its being not simply Mosaic, but given as a law most probably to Adam, certainly to Noah, and from him pervading all nations, not as a self-devised but divinely imposed law; and hence proceeds concerning its undying character thus:

"The reason is a plain one. The commands of God to men continue in force until they have been repealed by Him. On the contrary, when a new dispensation (the Jewish), to answer peculiar circumstances, was instituted by Him, He made this original command part and parcel of its constitution; He gave it a leading position in it, down to the latest prophet (Mal. iii. 8.) He insisted on it as most obligatory on His people, while not one of the prophets ever spoke of it as a temporary institution; by the mouth of His Son He continued still to assert His full claim to the observance of it (Matt. xxiii. 23), and thus handed it over in all its force and all its freshness to the Christian dispensation. Not one link is wanting in the chain of evidence which brings this precept from the days of its primitive appointment down to our own; not a shadow of pretence exists for asserting, that if it had ever been imposed by God, He had withdrawn its obligation, or suffered it to become obsolete from want of observance."

That our author reasons most correctly and unanswerably we feel assured. What then must be the guilt of Protestant Christendom for its so general neglect of this solemn duty; whereby God is dishonoured and the souls of men left to perish? Are not the insane divisions and the notorious worldliness of modern Protestantism the consequence of God's controversy with us, He having greatly withdrawn His Holy Spirit, indignant at the grovelling ingratitude and base selfishness with which we have "robbed" him?

Again Mr. Constable, proceeding to consider tithes even on the ground of their being a Jewish Ordinance, combats in a very masterly manner the common error, that Christians are under no obligation to consider Old Testament teaching, or Mosaic law as binding upon them. He clearly shows, on the contrary, that whatever God has once instituted must ever remain in force, unless it were fulfilled in the person of Christ, or distinctly abrogated by Him. Thus he says:

"Now neither in the New Testament—where, in all probability, every departure from Jewish practice has been noticed—nor in any part of the writings of the Old, has it ever been hinted, that in Christian times men were to cease to

honour God with their substance as His servants of previous times had done. If such an intimation can be pointed out, we will at once confess ourselves mistaken; but since none such can be shown, it plainly shows that the obligations of Christians are continued in all their force.

"Again, it is allowed that, even while the civil and ceremonial laws of Judaism do not bind Christians, its moral law is still as binding as ever. Now the giving of a Tenth was certainly a part of the Jewish moral law, and therefore it is in force with Christians. That the giving of a tenth was a moral duty to the Jews is of easy proof. It had nothing typical or ceremonial about it. In all times, both previous and subsequent to Judaism, the giving of some portion of man's substance to God was esteemed a moral duty; and when God in the Jewish dispensation, if not before, named a TENTH as His expected portion, then the gift of a tenth to Him became of moral obligation. *Thenceforward it could not be altered, except by the same authority that imposed it.*

"Every reason exists now, and exists even in greater force, for the giving of a tenth, which existed in Jewish times. God is still the Sovereign Lord of all, and therefore to be honoured by His creatures in those gifts which He has bestowed upon them. Man is still the recipient of blessings, and bound to show in some sensible manner his gratitude and love. The interests of religion are to be upheld in a world, which would quickly, if left to itself, turn aside from, and forget, and oppose, the truth. The widow, the orphan, and the destitute, are still amongst us,—recommended to us by that same God who gave them in charge to His ancient people. In one important respect the need of a tenth is more felt in the Christian than in the Jewish Church. The latter was not missionary in its character—its calling was merely to uphold the faith among the chosen people; while that of the Christian is to bear the name of Christ to every dark land of heathenism."

Our essayist thus forcibly states the deeper obligation of Christians, as compared with Jews, to abound in thoughtful liberality:

"It is surely not to be thought of for a moment that the time of God's displaying most fully His love to man is to be seized upon by the latter as the time for *diminishing* the expression of His gratitude; or the acknowledgments of God's sovereignty are to be less manifest when He has made us and ours doubly His own. If the elder and less prejudicial system honored God with the tenth" (we repeat, it was neerer a fourth at least) "of their substance, can it be imagined that we, so much more favoured, are to be left behind them in our gratitude?"

Concerning the Christian evidence of the continued obligation of, at least the law of tithes, he further thus ably argues:

"As the grand reason—namely, the honouring of God—still exists in all its force for the gift of a tenth, as well as the uses to which he would have it applied, so the New Testament everywhere requires a portion of his substance. This portion was to be greater or less, according as God had prospered each individual. (1 Cor. xvi. 2.) True, a tenth is not named in the New Testament; but that was not required, because that proportion was already fixed in the Old. This is quite a sufficient reason. . . . Already laid down, there was no occasion for its repetition."

Here we cannot but remark that to the Apostolic Church the Old Testament was the only Bible; and to it Christians, especially Jewish Christians, clung with holy tenacity; hence there was no danger of their forgetting such clear moral precepts as the law of tithes.

Besides, as our author continues,—

"From what we know of the liberality of the early Christians,—in some instances giving away their all, in others, 'out of deep poverty abounding in liberality, to their power, yea and beyond their power, being willing of themselves,'—we should not expect that the proportion of a tenth would be urged upon them as a duty, when, in all probability, few of them were satisfied with that portion, but gave much more. This same silence has been observed in the New Testament on another most important point."

He refers to Infant Baptism, for the *direct* proof of which we must, as in the law of tithes, go to the Old Testament, though for both there is abundant *inferential* evidence in the New. He also points, as another instance in which the Old Testament is to a remarkable degree the almost sole guide of Christendom, namely, to "the degrees within which marriage is permitted. Now this case," says our author, "we contend, is far more difficult of proof than the obligation of the tenth."

But we must for the present stay our extracts from these able essays, trusting that what we have now given will be duly pondered; and hoping to resume them in a future number.

Worshipping God according to Conscience.

"Well, Thomas," observed Mr. Sharp to his parishioner Thomas Prollstone, when accidentally meeting him one morning; "Well, Thomas, I am sorry to hear that you have left the Church, and have joined the new sect lately sprung up among the Methodists."

Thomas.—Why yes, sir: to speak plain truth, I have left the Church and have joined the body

you mentioned. But I don't see why you should be sorry at that.

Mr. Sharp.—I am sorry; because you have left the Church, and have become guilty of the sin of schism.

Thomas.—Schism, sir! Surely every man has a *right* to worship God according to the *dictates* of his conscience.

Mr. Sharp.—That all depends, Thomas, whether his conscience be a right or a wrong conscience.

Thomas.—But how can a man's conscience be wrong, sir?

Mr. Sharp.—If a man pretend that it was *against* his conscience to pay his debts, would you say that he acted *rightly*?

Thomas.—No, of course not.

Mr. Sharp.—Why not? He *says* he is acting according to conscience.

Thomas.—Because, sir, he is breaking a common law of honesty, which he certainly has no right to do.

Mr. Sharp.—Then you think that his conscience is bound by certain laws: and if it teach him to act contrary to those laws, then it is a wrong conscience.

Thomas.—That's it, sir.

Mr. Sharp.—Very well; I quite agree with you. But let us apply this principle in the matter of man's religion. You say every man has a right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Thomas.—I do, sir, and maintain it.

Mr. Sharp.—Don't be too severe, Thomas. A heathen worships God according to the dictates of his conscience; so does a Mahometan; so does a Jew; and of course since they possess *this right*, their religion (as far as they are concerned) *must also be right*. Why, then, do we try to convert them?

Thomas.—Oh, but I don't mean that, sir. Of course, I meant *Christians* have this right, and no one else.

Mr. Sharp.—But since a heathen, Jew, or Mahometan has a *conscience* as well as a *Christian*, who gave you the power or liberty to make this distinction?

Thomas.—But you don't think they are right, sir?

Mr. Sharp.—Ah, that is another question, Thomas. But let us look at your rule with this limit, that it must be applied to Christians.

Thomas.—I think, then, you will find it right.

Mr. Sharp.—Very well, we shall see. Now some Christians (for so I suppose you would call them) deny the sacraments; some the divinity of our Lord; and some worship God (as they say) in images and saints. Should you think it right to try and convert any of these?

Thomas.—Why, yes, Sir; because they are in error.

Mr. Sharp.—But they all worship God according to their conscience; and surely you have no right to interfere with them.

Thomas.—I see, sir. When I said every man had a right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, it must be taken with certain limits.

Mr. Sharp.—Ah, now, Thomas, you are speaking sensibly.

Thomas.—But how are these limits to be defined?

Mr. Sharp.—Let us try and see if we can find out. What do you understand by conscience?

Thomas.—A something within us which *approves* when we do right, and *reproves* when we do wrong.

Mr. Sharp.—But we must *first know* what is right or wrong before conscience can approve of the one, or reprove us for the other. Must we not?

Thomas.—Well, I suppose so.

Mr. Sharp.—For example: If a man were to commit a theft, would not conscience reprove him for doing wrong? I am speaking, of course, of conscience generally, not of a hardened conscience.

Thomas.—Yes, I should think so.

Mr. Sharp.—Why?

Thomas.—Because the Bible says we are not to steal; and in the case you mention the man would be stealing.

Mr. Sharp.—Then, before his conscience could reprove him for stealing, he must first know whether stealing be contrary to the law of God or not.

Thomas.—Yes, that seems certain.

Mr. Sharp.—So that you see *conscience* implies a knowledge of the Divine law or rule, which should direct or govern a man's own choice.

Thomas.—You mean, sir, that when a man

does wrong, his conscience reproves him for doing wrong, because it is based upon the Divine law, which forbids him doing wrong.

Mr. Sharp.—You have just hit it, Thomas. And so again, before a man can worship God according to his conscience, he must first ascertain what the law of God is with regard to the worship of God.

Thomas.—Yes, sir, I see now.

Mr. Sharp.—And if a man's conscience tell him to worship God *contrary* to that law, he has no right to follow his conscience.

Thomas.—No; I am bound to confess so.

Mr. Sharp.—So that your principle 'that a man has a right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience,' is not altogether right.

Thomas.—I see it cannot be defended, sir.

Mr. Sharp.—If the Jew had said that he claimed this privilege of worshipping God according to conscience, and had refused to worship in the Temple, the one place appointed, would his worship have been acceptable?

Thomas.—I should say not.

Mr. Sharp.—So you see, a man must worship God (*i.e.* to be acceptable or right worship) in the manner and place, how and where, God has made known to us in the Holy Scriptures, and not according, as he thinks, to the dictates of his conscience.

Thomas.—I see, sir, very well what you mean.

Mr. Sharp.—Well, then, it remains for you to consider whether, by worshipping in places and manner *different to the Church*, you are worshipping God, according to His Divine laws. With this consideration I shall leave you; praying that God may guide you into all truth.

[*Penny Post.*]

Church Matters at Clackington in 1875.

CHAPTER XVIII.

'WELL!' exclaimed Mrs. Slowton interrogatively, sitting up suddenly in bed on her husband entering the room, 'I hope you've settled the affairs of the parish to your satisfaction; you've been long enough about it, at any rate, keeping people out of their beds when they ought to be asleep. I should like to know what all this talking has been about, eh?' And this 'truly pious' lady looked hard and sharp and inquiring to the very frills of her nightcap.

'Why, my dear,' responded Mr. Slowton mildly, 'it has been, as you suppose, mainly about the affairs of the parish.'

'Of course it was,' said Mrs. Slowton impatiently. 'What I want to know is the particulars.'

'Oh, why, the bishop as usual was most kind and——'

'Kind!—one is sick of hearing of his kindness,' exclaimed Mrs. Slowton vehemently; 'it would be a good deal better if we heard more of his being truly evangelical. I want to know if he means to show his kindness to you by ruining you, which he will surely do if he nourishes that mad and unjust scheme of Crampton and Jackson and that set, about the division of the parish.'

'Why, my dear, you see,—and here Mr. Slowton put out the light, and, we must say, rather slunk into bed—'you see, the bishop has a great idea, an overstrained one I think, of the great importance of this place and the prospects of its increase. He thinks, too, that we have done a great deal—and he intends—ah—that is—ho is?'

'The amiable Mrs. Slowton had been grimly silent while her husband went stumbling on in his search for some term whereby to soften the expression of the bishop's decision; and after apparently enjoying his difficulty for a moment, she exclaimed abruptly:

'Come, come; no shilly-shallying, Mr. Slowton, but out with it like a man. This model bishop is so impressed with the importance and advantages of Clackington, that he considers you no longer fit to have charge of it, and is therefore going to turn you out and put some of his Pusoyito pets in your place—eh?'

'Don't be excited, my dear,' said Mr. Slowton soothingly; 'pray don't, you must not allow your zeal for the truth, nor your regard for my rights to carry you away: the bishop is very far from wishing to turn me out, as you say—indeed, he could not if he wished it; but he thinks I have a great deal too much to do, and'——

'Do, indeed!' exclaimed Mrs. Slowton; 'as if it was man's *doings* that was to save people's souls. Don't you preach the Gospel to them? and if the people won't hear it, or heed it, surely it's no fault of yours. These Tractarians, with their *doings*, are always wanting to get glory to

themselves. Wretched creatures! if they only knew what it is to be evangelical, they would know that the less is done by man the more glory goes to God in the salvation of a soul; but they are always worrying about *work, work*, as if it was not the Lord that gives the increase.' And Mrs. Slowton bounced round in bed in a state of great disgust at those whom she was pleased to call Tractarians, generally, and with the Bishop in particular.

The conversation with the bishop was gone over at length, but those arguments which had a great influence upon Mr. Slowton produced no effect upon his wife when retailed to her at second-hand by her husband. She was strong in her indignation, and declared that nothing should prevent her from raising the whole parish and setting them against the project.

The next afternoon Mrs. Slowton issued forth with the full purpose of carrying her threat into execution. It was a beautiful September afternoon, but the calm beauty of the day did nothing towards tranquilizing the angry vexation of her spirit. She avoided Mrs. Brown, whose shrewd worldly sense was not sufficiently subordinated to her religious prejudices to be as easily wrought upon as she desired, and who, together with her not very brilliant but honest-hearted husband, were so wonderfully taken with the bishop that she was doubtful of her ability to alarm them by fears of his tractarianism, or to excite any feeling against him and his plans by charging him with injustice towards her husband. She resolved that such suggestion should reach them through others, and to this end she directed her steps towards Mr. Jeremiah Cryson's. The wife of that orthodox gentleman, who was, like her husband, among the ranks of the truly pious—indeed, I may say they were both in the front rank—received her with a sort of doleful gladness, which was considered spiritual.

'Good day, dear Mrs. Slowton,' she exclaimed; 'I am delighted to see you; it is so kind of you to come to see us so soon after all your late fatigues: I am sure I felt for you very much, for though bishops are all very well in their way, I would rather not have one to stay with me for a week—of course I mean nothing disrespectful towards his lordship—I'm sure he is a very agreeable person, and although'——

'I wish he had staid away altogether,' said Mrs. Slowton abruptly, 'and not come here poking his nose into other people's business, and trying to steal away the hearts of the people by fair speeches, so that he may the more easily pervert them from the simplicity of the Gospel.' And the worthy lady sat erect, looking the very embodiment of evangelical meekness.

'Ah, there now, that's exactly what I was saying to Jeremiah,' exclaimed Mrs. Cryson, with an expression of great satisfaction. 'I said to him after we came home that night from Mrs. Brown's party, where the bishop made himself so agreeable to every one, that I should not be in the least surprised if he should turn out to be a Jesuit in disguise. I am *sure* he does n't believe the Gospel, and he managed so to draw one towards him, and to get such a strange hold over one, that I am sadly afraid of him. I was sure I would hear something suspicious of him, and I am so much obliged to you for coming to let us know—fore-warned, you know, fore-armed.'

'Very true, Mrs. Cryson,' returned Mrs. Slowton; 'and never was greater need of being fore-armed than in this case, for you little know what is in contemplation;' and Mrs. Slowton looked awfully mysterious.

'Bless me!' exclaimed Mrs. Cryson, excited by her curiosity almost into a kind of incipient prophanity. 'What is going to be done? Some half popish plan against the purity of the Gospel, no doubt.'

'You may say that,' returned Mrs. Slowton, 'and a deeply laid and plausible one it is, as you will see when I explain it to' —

'O, stop a moment, dear Mrs. Slowton,' interrupted Mrs. Cryson—'just a moment, till I call Jeremiah—he is only down in his office. He will be delighted to hear what you have found out, for he has been long suspicious that Mr. Crampton and Mr. Jackson have been hatching some plot between them.'

Mr. Jeremiah Cryson was accordingly summoned from his office, where he carried on the business of broker and land agent, in the pursuit of which occupation he had acquired the reputation of driving uncommonly keen bargains. When he once got scent of the probable disclosures of Mrs. Slowton, he looked as much alive as if he was about to enter upon a transaction by which he intended to clear 100 per cent.

'And now, pray, Mrs. Slowton,' he continued, after the usual greetings were over; 'what plans are these which Mrs. Cryson has hinted at as likely to be carried out to the injury of the protestantism of this parish?'

'Why, you see,' answered Mrs. Slowton, confidently, 'the bishop wishes to introduce his own opinions into this place—of that there can be no doubt; and he is evidently the more determined upon this since he has found a few under the Jackson and Crampton influence, who, corrupt as those opinions are, regard them with favor. He is fully bent, I do believe, to make Puseyites of us all.'

'Is he?' said Mr. Cryson significantly; 'don't he wish he may succeed, *that's* all.'

'Yes, that's all,' echoed Mrs. Cryson.

'At all events, he is resolved to *try*, continued Mrs. Slowton, 'but with the depth that marks these Jesuitical sort of people, he clearly sees that the great obstacle to the success of his plan is the evangelical nature of Mr. Slowton's preaching.'

'Ah, *dear* Mr. Slowton,' sighed Mrs. Cryson, 'what a blessing we have in him!'

'His object, therefore,' Mrs. Slowton continued, without much regard to such a matter of course interruption; 'his object plainly is to persecute him, and' —

'Oh!' exclaimed Mr. Cryson with a look of horror—'persecute Mrs. Slowton!'

'Well, upon my word,' said Mr. Cryson; 'we are coming to a pretty pass—we'll have the inquisition next.'

'The first step,' Mrs. Slowton resumed, 'is to neutralize his influence as much as possible, by taking away the greatest part of the parish from him and giving it to some of his Tractarian followers, and this step has been actually resolved upon.'

'Infamous!' exclaimed Mr. Cryson.

'Unpardonable!' echoed his wife.

'It is a fact, nevertheless,' observed Mrs. Slowton.

The whole party sat for a moment silent and aghast at the extent of the bishop's turpitude.

'And what's to be done?' asked Mrs. Cryson.

'That is the question,' said Mrs. Slowton.

'Done!' exclaimed Mr. Jeremiah; 'why, we won't stand it, that's all. We'll show that we are Protestants; we won't have our intellects confined and our souls enslaved; we'll stand up

for Mr. Slowton and the purity of the Gospel.'

'Yes, we will,' responded Mrs. Cryson; 'and we'll have a public meeting and denounce their jesuitical designs,' continued Mr. Cryson, more energetically. 'And I'll obtain the use of the columns of that truly Protestant paper *The Clackington Repeater*, and I'll expose the crushing tyranny and despotism and injustice of this smooth-tongued bishop. We'll show them that we are resolved to maintain civil and religious liberty to the last extremity.' And Mr. Jeremiah Cryson flourished his pocket-handkerchief and looked heroic.

'I am sure we are deeply indebted to you, Mr. Cryson, for the warm interest you take in our behalf,' said Mrs. Slowton, 'and it is well that Mr. Slowton has some one to uphold him; for with his yielding disposition the Bishop may carry every thing his own way.'

'But did not Mr. Slowton stand upon his rights as Rector of the place?' asked Mr. Cryson.

'O, it was all in vain,' replied Mrs. Slowton, 'the Bishop would listen to nothing of the kind. He seems to have been very high and mighty—he declared that *he* was the pastor of Clackington, and that Mr. Slowton was merely his subordinate whom he could order about as he pleased.'

'This is not to be borne,' said Mr. Cryson indignantly, 'and we won't bear it either. We must take immediate steps to arouse the people of Clackington to defend the rights of the oppressed, and to prevent themselves from being made papists of. There is some underhand work going on, I'm sure. I know what Mr. Jackson's predilections are; and as for Mr. Crampton, we all know what he is, and what he would desire; but we'll frustrate them—we'll out-general them, though no doubt they have got the Bishop's ear.'

'I've no doubt,' said Mrs. Slowton, 'that the whole movement is due to the influence of Messrs. Jackson and Crampton and those of the new comers into the place, who have little sympathy or fellow-feeling with the old parishioners. They talk about their Churchmanship,—a nice way to show it, by opposing and caballing against their pastor.'

'Yes, indeed,' echoed Mrs. Cryson, 'but it's just like them, all obedience and submission

when it suits themselves and all rebellion and opposition when they cannot carry everything their own way.'

'Never mind,' observed Jeremiah, 'never mind, we'll show them that we are not going to be trampled upon—we will soon raise a storm in the place that they don't dream of. We know how to stop their tractarian designs—and the first thing to be done is to spread these dismal tidings among the truly pious members of the congregation, and the next is for you to keep Mr. Slowton firm in the maintenance of his rights.'

'I'll do my best,' replied Mrs. Slowton, 'and if I can keep him clear of the Bishop's influence I may succeed; however, nothing can express the gratitude we owe to you, Mr. Cryson.'

'Pray don't mention it,' said Mr. Jeremiah with a sanctimonious look of important self-satisfaction, 'I am only endeavoring to act upon principle in any endeavours I may make in upholding the Protestant Faith, and in defending those who are unjustly treated. While, of course, gladly acknowledging my friendship for Mr. Slowton, I wish to act, not upon personal motives, but upon abstract principles of right and wrong,' and Mr. Jeremiah Cryson looked the very impersonation of the highest virtue.

The conversation was long continued but at length the party broke up, and while Mrs. Slowton returned to her duty of bringing Mr. Slowton up to the mark, and, if possible, keeping him there, Mr. Cryson and his wife went off in different directions bent upon the usual evangelical plan of hampering the Bishop's plans for the spiritual good of the place by eliciting popular feeling against those plans by the means of misrepresentation.

Saints.

We never could understand the extraordinary antipathy which many Christians have to the word Saint, except when applied to themselves. It is certainly true that the Church of Rome has in her calendar given the title to a good many persons whose claim to it is of the most doubtful kind; but this surely is a very insufficient reason for refusing it to those who in their lives and deaths, gave the best evidence of a saintly faith and saintly character, and of whom even the Holy Scriptures testify that they were "called to be Saints." If no loyal Englishman

would speak of his Queen as "Victoria Guelph," it does certainly appear very like irreverence to designate "the disciple whom Jesus loved," by the same plain "John," which we should apply to our coachman or footman. The same spirit exhibits itself sometimes in shrinking from any mention of holy men of old times, as if all virtue and holiness dated from the Reformation. We have before us a recent number of the "Youth's Penny Gazette," published by the American Sunday School Union, which contains a very beautiful and well-known legend of St. Ambrose and an Italian youth. But we are at a loss to conceive what good purpose is served by travestying that holy man into Mr. B—, the youth into Henry B—, and the touching language of the narrative into Yankee slang.

LECTURES UPON HISTORICAL PORTIONS OF THE
OLD TESTAMENT, by A. N. BETHUNE, D. D.,
Archdeacon of York, &c.

WE have received this little volume at so late a period of the month, that we can do little more than call the attention of our readers to its publication. The Canadian Church has, as yet, contributed little to the literature of the day; of that little, however, we have no cause to be ashamed. During a recent visit to the neighbouring Republic, we were gratified to learn that Dr. Beavan's catechetical books are in very general use in Church Sunday Schools, and that Mr. Townley's little work on "The Sacerdotal Tithe" has elicited the warm approval of many distinguished American Churchmen. The volume before us will, we are sure, add to the reputation, not only of the Author, but of the Church, in which he holds a distinguished position. From a cursory examination we are disposed to judge that these lectures are eminently practical in their teaching. Avoiding controverted points of doctrine, and curious speculations, they appeal to the heart rather than to the intellect, and enforce the lessons taught in the histories of the Old Testament by clear and cogent arguments, and in singularly graceful language. We take, almost at random, a brief extract from the lecture on "The Shunammite and her Son:"

"There were bright and happy years after that, the child grew in stature and in wisdom, and, under the Prophet's tuition, we can believe also in piety, grace and goodness. About that cherished plant,—so emphatically of the Lord's planting,—there was all that was beautiful and engaging. He was the

pride of the Shunammite's house; and it can be believed that the great Elisha felt towards him more than the love and interest of a spiritual father.

"But, perhaps, in the parent's contemplation of his growing ripeness and beauty, there were some minglings of the alloy of this world. The soul, from its becoming sense of joy and thankfulness to God, may have slid into a secret idolatry; and, in the many speculations of a fond yet wayward heart, there may have been an occasional momentary forgetfulness that what was man's treasure was also God's gift.

"The heart is made better when, by a chastening from heaven, it is assured of this error. The little son of the Shunammite, in an unexpected hour, is cut off in the midst of his sports and playfulness. The flower, in the fullness of its bloom and beauty, is severed at a stroke. There is no premonitory languor, no gradual decay; but, in an instant, at one sweep of the destroyer, the fair plant is prostrated and dies. But few cries escape the little sufferer; the low, faint moaning is soon hushed in death. The assiduities of maternal care avail not; the appliances of medical skill cannot avert the death-stroke. Lingerer, where in health and strength and playfulness he loved most to linger, he sighs his life away upon his mother's knees."

Miscellany.

Though it be unquestionable that there is Omnipotence and Omniscience in God, and I cannot have a clearer perception of anything than that I am free, yet I cannot make Freedom in Man consistent with Omnipotence and Omniscience in God; yet I am as fully persuaded of both as of any truth I most firmly assent unto. Therefore, I have long since given off the consideration of that question, resolving all into this short conclusion, "that if it be possible for God to make a free agent, then am I free, though I see not the way of it."—Locke's Familiar Letters.

BISHOP BERKELEY IN RHODE ISLAND.—Though, as he declares, "for every private reason," he preferred 'Derry to New England,' pleasant was the abode, and grateful is the memory, of Berkeley in this rural seclusion. A succession of green breastworks along the brow of the hill beneath which his domicile nestles, by reminding the visitor of the retreat of the American forces under General Sullivan, brings vividly to his mind the Revolution and its incalculable influence upon the destinies of a land which so early won the intelligent sympathy of Berkeley; while the name of Whitehall, which he gave to this peaceful domain, commemorates that other revolution in his own country wherein the loyalty of his grandfather drove his family into exile. But historical soon yield to personal recollections, when we consider the memorials of his sojourn. We associate this landscape with his studies and benevolence; and, when the scene was no longer blessed with his presence, his gifts remained to consecrate his memory. In old Trinity, the organ he bestowed peals over the grave of his first-born in

the adjoining burial ground. A town in Massachusetts bears his name. Not long since a presentation copy of his "Mute Philosopher" was kept on the table of an old lady of Newport, with reverential care. In one family his gift of a richly wrought silver coffee-pot, and in another that of a diamond ring, are cherished heirlooms. His rare and costly books were distributed, at his departure, among the resident clergy. His scholarship at New Haven annually furnishes recruits to our church, bar, or medical faculty. In an adjacent parish the sacramental cup was his donative. His legacy of ingenious thoughts and benign sentiment is associated with hanging rocks that are the seaward boundary of his farm; his Christian ministry with the ancient Church; and his verse with the progress of America.—H. T. Tuckerman.

INDEPENDENCE OF AMERICAN YOUTH.—Boys in this country leave home at a very early age. Before the tenderness of their childhood has passed away, they are summoned from the direct immediate care of their parents, to begin the hard duties of their life: they are called to take their place in warehouses and stores, in offices and counting-rooms, in workshops, in ships. They start to seek their fortunes just at the time when precept and example tell with great power upon their own character, when the atmosphere which surrounds them carries to the very roots of their moral being either herculean energies or poisonous languor. How does this early exposure and discipline affect boys who have not formed habits of obedience and filial reverence? Just consider the atmosphere of most places where men are congregated together in the way of daily labor. How little reverence is there; how much profanity and blasphemy; how little faith; how much of the satanic. A new comer into a school, or college, or broker's office, or lawyer's, or merchant's warehouse or counting-room, or workman's shop, is surveyed, commented upon by his associates, and then the moral-stuff he is made of is forthwith put to the test. Not blasphemy only, but strong envy of the successful, hatred of the rich, a disposition to do as little as possible, and to extort as much as possible, idolatry of money, love of all the pleasures which money can purchase,—these form the ingredients of the moral atmosphere into which he is thrust. What awaits him, unless mighty counteracting influences shield him? He becomes as they with whom he associates, whose words he daily hears, whose example he daily feels. He begins to think himself wiser than any one else: he wishes to be independent—and independence is supposed to mean refusal to take any one's advice, and to do what one pleases. All thought of law and authority is distasteful in his extreme. He gets beyond submitting to his father

and mother. Old enough, as he thinks, to judge for himself, he displays his freedom by showing that he fears neither God nor man. This is his ideal of the manly state.—"Causes of Filial Impiety;" a Sermon by Rev. E. Harwood.

ROBBING GOD!—In Germany (says a certain writer, and we may add in Britain too!) the nobility being poor, were anxious to possess themselves of the riches of the monasteries and the estates of the abbays. This indeed they effected with great avarice and rapine; yet it does not appear that either the German princes or lords became rich in consequence of their plunder. "Experience," said Luther himself, "teaches us that those who have appropriated to themselves the wealth of the ecclesiastics, found in them nothing but an additional source of indigence and of distress." The Reformer quotes the words of a Counsellor of the Elector of Saxony, who says, "We nobles have added to our Baronial property that which belonged to the Convents. Yet by some means or other, this property of the Convents has devoured and consumed our Baronial property; so that at present we no longer possess the property of either one or the other." He concludes by the fable of the eagle, who, stealing from the altar of Jupiter a sacrifice which was placed upon it, took with it into his nest a burning coal which set fire to it."

Prayer.

"Sir, we would see Jesus."

St. JOHN xii. 21.

Would ye see Jesus? Come, with prayer,
And heart repentant to His feet;
None who will rightly seek Him there,
Shall fail his face of love to greet.

Would ye see Jesus? Come, with faith,
And "search" the word His grace hath given
For help and guidance, in the path
That leads to His abode in Heaven.

Would ye see Jesus? Come, and lave
In the baptismal waters blest;
Buried with Him in that sweet wave,
His hand shall lead to shores of rest.

Would ye see Jesus? Lo! he stands
Beside the Apostolic throne;
And grants thro' those dear, outstretch'd hands,
Grace to confirm and bless His own.

Would ye see Jesus? Come, and bow
In faith, at His dread Altar's side;
For there he ever waiteth now,
To feed the souls for whom he died

Would ye see Jesus? Day by day
Let thought and converse be on high;
And hast'ning on the Heavenly way,
With Jesus live—with Jesus die.