

Poetry.

THE SECOND ADVENT.

Even thus amid thy pride and luxury, Oh Earth! shall that last coming burst on thee, That secret coming of the Son of Man, When all the earth-shaking clouds shall shine, Irradiate with his bright advancing sign: When that great Husbandman shall wave his fan, Sweeping like chaff thy wealth and pomp away: Still to the moaning of that nightless day, Shalt thou thy wonted doleful course maintain. Along the busy mart and crowded street, The buyer and the seller still shall meet. And marriage feasts bring their joyous strain: Still to the pouring out the cup of woes; Till Earth, a drunkard, reeling to and fro, And mountains molten by his burning fire, And Heaven his presence own, all red with furnace light. The hundred-gated cities then, The towers and temples, named of men, Eternal, and the thrones of Kings; The gilded summer palaces, The courtly hovers of love and ease, Where still the Bird of Pleasure sings; Ask ye the destiny of them? Go gaze on fallen Jerusalem! Yes, mightier names are in the fatal roll, Against Earth and Heaven God's standard is unfurled, The skies are shrouled like a burning scroll, And the vast common doom envelopes the world. Oh! who shall stand and live? Oh! who shall stand and live? When all that hath been is no more; When for the round earth hung in air, With all its constellations fair, In the sky's azure canopy; When for the breathing earth and sparkling sea, Is but a fiery deluge without shore, Heaving along the abyss profound and dark, A fiery deluge, and without an Ark. Lord of all power, when thou art there alone On thy eternal, fiery-wheeled throne, That in its high meridian noon, Needs not the perished sun moon: When thou art there in thy presiding state, Wide-scepter'd monarch of the realm of doom; When from the sea-depths, from earth's darkest tomb; The dead of all that ages round thee wait: And when the tribes of wickedness are strewn Like forest leaves in the autumn of time: Faithful and true! thou wilt save thine own! The saints shall dwell within thy unburning fire, Each white robe spotted, blooming every palm, Even safe as we, by this still fountain's side, So shall the Church, thy bright and mystic bride, Sit on the stormy gulf a haleen of calm. Yes, and you angry and destroying signs, O'er us the rainbow of thy mercy shines, We hail, we bless the covenant of his beam, Almighty to revenge, Almightier to redeem! MILMAN.

THE SOVEREIGN POWER.

(From a Letter to a Friend by the "Great" Marquis of Montrose.)

Civil societies, so pleasing to Almighty God, cannot subsist without government, nor government without a sovereign power, to force obedience to laws and just commands, to dispose and direct private endeavours to public ends, and to unite and incorporate the several members into one body politic, that with joint endeavours and abilities they may the better advance the public good. This sovereignty is a power over the people, whose power there is none upon earth, whose acts cannot be rescinded by any other, instituted by God, for his glory and the temporal and eternal happiness of men. This is it that is recorded so oft, by the wisdom of ancient times, to be sacred and inviolable,—the trust image and representation of the power of Almighty God upon earth,—not to be bounded, disputed, meddled with at all by subjects, who can never handle it, though never so warily, but it is thereby wounded, and the public peace disturbed. Yet it is limited by the laws of God and nature, and some laws of nations, and by the fundamental laws of the country, which are those upon which a sovereign power itself resteth, in prejudice of which a king can do nothing, and those also which secure to the good subject his honour, his life, and the property of his goods. This power (not speaking of those who are kings in name only, and in effect but Princes, Nobilitates or Duces Belli, nor of the arbitrary and despotic power where one is head and all the rest slaves, but of that which is sovereign over free subjects) is still one and the same, in points essential, wherever it be, whether in the person of a monarch, or in a few principal men, or in the estates of the people. The essential points of sovereignty are these:—To make laws, to create principal officers, to make peace and war, to give grace to men condemned by law, and to be the last to whom appealation is made. There be others, too, which are comprehended in those set down, but because majesty doeth not so clearly shine in them they are here omitted.—These set down are inalienable, indivisible, incommunicable, and belong to the sovereign power primitively in all sorts of governments. They cannot subsist in a body composed of individuals; and if they be divided amongst several bodies, there is no government (as if there were many kings in one kingdom there should be none at all,) for whosoever should have one of all the rest; for the having them negatived and prohibitive in that part to him belonging, might render the acts of all the others invalid, and there would be a superiority to the supreme, and an equality to the sovereign power, which cannot fall in any man's conceit that hath common sense; in speech it is incongruity, and to attempt it in act is pernicious. Having in some measure expressed the nature of supreme power, it shall be better known by the actual practice of all nations, in all the several sorts of government, as well republics as monarchies. The people of ROME (who were masters of policy, and war too, and to this day are made patterns of both) being an estate popular, did exercise without controlment or opposition all the fore-named points essential to supreme power. No law was made but by the people; and though the senate did propose and advise a law to be made, it was the people that gave it sanction; and it received the force of law from their command, and authority, as may appear by the respective phrases of the propounder, quod fons-tain Felique sit, volis populus Romano velitis jubeat. The people used these impetitive words, esto senatus; and if they were refused, the Tribune of the people expressed it with a veto. The propounder or adviser of the law was said rogare legem, and the people jubeere legem. The election of officers was only made by the people, as appears by the ambitious buying and begging of suffrages so frequent among them upon the occasions. War and peace were ever concluded by them, and never denounced but by their Fetiales, with commission from them. They only gave grace and pardon, and for the last refuge, delinquents, and they who were wronged by the sentence of judges and officers provocabant ad populum. So it was in ATHENS, and to this day among the SWISSERS and GIBSONS, the estate of HOLLAND, and all estates popular. In VENICE, which is a pure aristocracy, war, peace, election of officers, pardon and appealation are all concluded and done in concilio Maggioris, which consisted of principal men who have the sovereignty. As for the prelati, and concilia diocesi, they were but officers and executors of their power, and the duke is nothing but the filio to whom ceremonies and compliments are addressed, without the least part of sovereignty. So it was in SPARTA, so it is in LUCCA, GENOVA, and AGUGA, and

all other aristocracies, and, indeed, cannot be otherwise without the subversion of the present government. If the Lords in republics have that power essential to sovereignty, by what reason can it be denied to a prince in whose person only and primitively resteth the sovereign power, and from whom all lawful subaltern power, as from the fountain, is derived? This power is strong and durable when it is temperate, and it is temperate when it is possessed (with the essential parts foresaid) with moderation, and limited by the laws of God, of nature, and the fundamental laws of the country. It is weak also when it is extended beyond the laws whereby it is bounded; which could never be any time endured by the people of the western part of the world, and by those of Scotland as little as any. For that which Galba said of his Romans is the humour of them all, nec totam libertatem nec totam servitutum pati possunt but a temper of both. Unwise princes endeavour the extension of it,—rebelling and turbulent subjects the restraint. Wise princes use it moderately, but most desire to extend it, and that humour is fostered by advice of courtiers and bad councillors, who are of a hasty ambition, and cannot abide the slow progress of riches and preferments in a temperate government. They persuade the arbitrary with reflection on their own ends, knowing that the exercise thereof shall be put upon them, whereby they shall be able quickly to compass their ends, robbing thereby the people of their wealth, the king of the people's love due to him, and of the honour and reputation of wisdom. The effects of a moderate government are religion, justice, and peace,—flourishing love of the subjects towards their prince in whose heart he reigns,—durableness and strength against foreign invasions, and intestine sedition,—happiness and security to king and people. The effect of a prince's power too far extended is tyranny; from the king if he be ill,—if he be good, tyranny or a fear of it from them to whom he hath intrusted the management of public affairs. The effect of the royal power restrained is the oppression and tyranny of subjects,—the most fierce, insatiable, and insupportable tyranny in the world,—where every man of power oppresseth his neighbour, without any hope of redress from a prince despoiled of his power to punish oppressors. The people under an extended power are miserable, but most miserable under the restrained power. The effects of the former may be cured by good advice, civility in the prince, or fear of infamy, or the pains of writers, or by some event which may bring a prince to the sense of his errors, and when nothing else can do it, seeing the prince is mortal, patience in the subject is a sovereign and dangerous remedy, who in wisdom and duty is obliged to tolerate the vices of his prince, as they do storms and tempests, and other natural evils which are compensated with better times succeeding. It had been better for Germany to have endured the encroachments of Ferdinand, and after his death rectified them, before they had made a new election, than to have brought it to desolation, and shed so much Christian blood by unseasonable remedies and opposition.—But when a king's lawful power is restrained, the politic body is in such desperate estate that it can neither endure the disease nor the remedy, which is force only. For princes, lawful power is only restrained by violence, and never repaired but by violence on the other side, which can produce nothing but ruin to prince or people, or rather to both. Patience in the subject is the best remedy against the effects of a prince's power too far extended; but when it is too far restrained, patience, in the prince, is so far from being a remedy that it formeth and increaseth the disease, for patience, tract of time, and possession, makes that which was at first robbery, by a body that never dies, at last a good title, and so the government comes at last to be changed. To procure a temperate and moderate government, there is much in the king and not a little in the people, for a prince never command so well, if there be not a correspondent obedience there is no temper. It is not the people's part, towards that end, to take upon them to limit and circumscribe royal power—it is Jupiter's thunder which never subject handled well yet,—not to determine what is due to a prince, what to his people. It requires more than human sufficiency to go so even a way betwixt the prince's prerogative, and the subject's privilege, as to content both, or be just in itself, for they can never agree upon the matter, and where it hath been attempted, as in some places it hath, the sword did ever determine the question, which is to be avoided by all possible means. But there is a fair and justifiable way for subjects to procure a moderate government, incumbent to them in duty, which is to endeavour the security of religion and just liberties (the matter on which the exorbitancy of a prince's power doth work,) which being secured, his power, must needs be temperate and run in the even channel. "But," it may be demanded, "how shall the people's just liberties be preserved if they be not known, and how known if they be not determined to be such?" It is answered, the laws contain them, and the parliaments (which ever have been the bulwarks of subjects' liberties in monarchies) may revive new laws, against emergent occasions which prejudice their liberties; and so leave it to occasion, and not prevent it by foolish haste in parliaments, which of a subject's liberty, knowing he must answer it at the peril of his head and estate at the next ensuing parliament, and that he shall put the king to an hard choice for him, either to abandon him to justice, or by protecting him displease the estates of his kingdom; and if the king should be so ill-advised as to protect him, yet he doth not escape punishment that is branded with a mark of public infamy, declared enemy to the state, and incapable of any good amongst them. The perpetual cause of the controversies, between the prince and his subjects, is the ambitious desire of rule in great men, veiled under the specious pretext of religion and the subjects' liberties, seconded with the arguments and false positions of seditious preachers. 1st, That the king is ordained for the people, and the end is more noble than the mean; 2d, That the constituent is superior to the constituent; 3d, That the king and people are two contraries, like the two scales of a balance, when the one goes up the other goes down; 4th, That the prince's prerogative, and the people's privilege are incompatible; 5th, That power is taken from the king is added to the estates of the people. This is the language of the spirits of division that walk betwixt the king and his people, to separate them whom God hath conjoined, (which must pass without some answer,) to slide upon which sandy grounds these giants, who war against the gods, have builded their Babel. To the 1st, It is true that the true and utmost end of men's actions (which is the glory of God and felicity of men) are to be preferred to all means directed thereto. But there is not that order of dignity among the means themselves, or mid instruments compounded together. If it were so, and a man appointed to keep sheep, or a nobleman to be tutor-in-law to a pupil of meaner quality, the sheep should be preferred to the man, and the pupil to his tutor. To the 2d, He that constituteth so as he still retaineth the power to reverse his constitution, is superior to the constituted in that respect; but if his donation and constitution is absolute and without condition, develop-

ing all his power in the person constituted, and his successors, what before was voluntary becomes necessary. It is voluntary to a woman to choose such one for her husband, and to a people what king they will at first; both being once done, neither can the woman nor the people free themselves, from obedience and subjection to the husband and the prince, when they please. To the 3d, In a politic consideration, the king and his people are not two, but one body politic, whereof the king is the head; and so far are they from contrariety, and opposite motions, that there is nothing good or ill for the one which is not just so for the other; if their ends and endeavours be diverse, and never so little eccentric, either that king inclineth to tyranny, or that people to disloyalty,—if they be contrary, it is mere tyranny or mere disloyalty. To the 4th, The king's prerogative and the subjects' privilege are so far from incompatibility that the one can never stand unless supported by the other. For the sovereign being strong, and in full possession of his lawful power and prerogative, is able to protect his subjects from oppression, and maintain their liberties entire, otherwise not. On the other side, a people, enjoying freely their just liberties and privileges, maintaineth the prince's honour and prerogative out of the great affection they carry towards him, which is the greatest strength against foreign invasion, or intestine insurrection, that a prince can possibly be possessed with. To the 5th, It is a mere fallacy, for what is essential to one thing cannot be given to another.—The eye may lose its sight, the ear its hearing, but can never be given to the hand, or foot, or any other member; and as the head of the natural body may be deprived of invention, judgment, or memory, and the rest of the members receive no part thereof, so subjects, not being capable of the essential parts of government properly and primitively belonging to the prince, being taken from him, they can never be imparted to them, without change of the [monarchical] government, and the essence and being of the same. When a king is restrained from the lawful use of his power, and subjects can make no use of it, as under a king they cannot, what can follow but a subversion of government,—anarchy and confusion? Now, to any man that understands these things only, the proceedings of these times may seem strange, and he may expostulate with us thus:—"Noblemen and gentlemen of good quality what do you mean?—Will you teach the people to put down the Lord's anointed, and lay violent hands on his authority to whom both you and they owe subjection, and assistance with your goods, lives, and fortunes, by all the laws of God and man? Do ye think to stand and dominate over the people, in an arduous way,—the people who owe you small or no obligation? It is you, under your natural prince, that get all employment pregnant of honour or profit, in peace or war. You are the subjects of his liberality; your houses decayed, either by merit or his grace and favour, are repaired, without which you fall in contempt; the people, jealous of their liberty, when ye deserve best, to shelter themselves, will make you shorter by the head, or serve you with an ostracism. If their first act be against his authority, their next act will be against you; for if the people be of a fierce nature, they will cut your throats (as the Switzers did of old), you shall be contemptible (as some of ancient houses are in Holland, their very burghmaster is the better man); your honours—life—fortunes stand at the discretion of a seditious preacher. And you, ye meaner people of Scotland, who are not capable of a republic for many grave reasons, why are you induced by specious pretences, to your own heavy prejudice and detriment, to be instruments of others' ambition? Do ye not know, when the monarchical government is shaken, the great ones strive for the garland with your blood and your fortunes? whereby you gain nothing, but, instead of a race of kings who have governed you two thousand years with peace and justice, and have preserved your liberties against all domineering nations, shall purchase to yourselves vultures and tigers to reign over your posterity, and yourselves shall endure all those miseries, massacres, and proscriptions of the triumvirate of Rome,—the kingdom fall again into the hands of our, who of necessity must, and for reason of state will, tyrannize over you. For kingdoms acquired by blood and violence are by the same means entertained. And you great men (if any such be among you so blinded with ambition), who aim so high as the crown, do you think we are so far degenerate from the virtue, valour, and fidelity to our true and lawful sovereign, so constantly entertained by our ancestors, as to suffer you, with all your policy, to reign over us? Take heed you be not Zephor's dog, and lose the cheese for the shadow in the well. And thou, seditious preacher, who studies to put the sovereignty in the people's hands for thy own ambitious ends, as being able, by thy wicked eloquence and hypocrisy, to infuse into them what thou pleasest, know this, that this people is more incapable of sovereignty than any other known: Thou art abused like a pedant by the nimble-witted noblemen—go, along with them to shake the present government,—not for thy ends to possess the people with it,—but like [as] a cunning tennis-player lets the ball go to the wall, where it cannot stay, that he may take it at the bound with more ease." And whereas a durable peace with England (which is the wish and desire of all honest men) is pretended, surely it is a great solecism in us to aim at an end of peace with them, and overthrow the only means for that end. It is the king's majesty's sovereignty over both that unites us in affection, and is only able to reconcile questions among us when they fall. To endeavour the dissolution of that bond of our union, is nowise to establish a durable peace, but rather to procure enmity and war betwixt bordering nations, where occasions of quarrel are never wanting, nor men ever ready to take hold of them.

THE CHURCH AND THE UNIVERSITIES IN FRANCE. (From the London Times.) France, as every body knows, has long since had its "Education Bill," and that after a fashion a good deal more liberal than has ever been proposed—at least, with any chance of acceptance—in our country. There the secular and the religious instructions are wholly separated from each other, the professors taking exclusive charge of one, the almoners (in the case of those who are of the established religion) of the other. Everybody also knows that the religious aspect of that country has undergone a most material change since these public colleges were placed upon their present footing. The zeal and the success of the French clergy in recalling their country from the career of irreligion to which it seemed committed, is observed upon by friend and enemy. It shows itself at every turn and in every shape, from the fashionable chapel to the village church, from the lately formed bishopric of Algeria to the French prints which any longer may be seen in Messrs. Ackermann's or Colnaghi's windows. An impression appears to be making upon the French mind—a movement in progress—a transition begun; and that Christianity must indeed be of a narrow and exclusive school which does not frankly and heartily rejoice at the fact. As might be expected, rising Catholicism and established Liberalism have soon found a point of conflict. And, as might also have been predicted, that point has been found in the educational institutions of the country. A Canon of Lyons, M. Desgarets in a publication called the *Monopole Universitaire*, with much labour, and it would appear, with some warmth of tone, has attempted to show that the course of secular instruction pursued in the public colleges involves a systematic though indirect attack on the Catholic religion. The Archbishop of Paris, a peaceable prelate, and anxious for a quiet life, publishes some "observations" upon the subject, in which he reminds M. Desgarets that "an abusive tone is not a very Christian way of defending Christianity," and accuses him of making "quotations, which the verbal accuracy is not always a pledge for their substantial truth." The French Prime, however, finds little sympathy from the bench in his reproach of M. Desgarets. Three of his right reverend brethren are already in arms against him. The Bishop of Chartres, an energetic and apparently an able adversary, with every sentiment "of respect and affection," interposes his shield before the author—tells the "defenders of his monopoly" that they overvalue the judgment of the "pious and learned Archbishop"—that "an honorary pre-eminence involves no superiority of teaching, that the church of France knows no dictator or patriarch, and the doctrinal authority of all her first pastors is absolutely the same." "I have traced," he adds, in a somewhat equivocal tone of consolation, "I have traced with sorrow these concluding lines, 'but my grief is mitigated by the recollection that St. Peter bore to be reproved by his inferior, and that this condescension did but add to his glory.'" The Archbishop of Lyons and Bishop of Belley range themselves on the same side; the latter prelate describes these institutions *totum tantum* as "schools of pestilence." *Per contra*, the Liberal press flies out against the exclusiveness, malice, presumption, and indiscretion of the clergy, and loudly warns young France that these pretensions tend to close the avenues to professorships against all who are not Roman Catholics—"to exclude from the benefit of the existing law," as one of them complains, "Protestants and Jews, Freethinkers and Philosophers." Finally, the *Journal des Debats*, representing, we presume, the Government view of the matter, snubs the combatants all around—the Archbishop gently for meddling in what does not concern him—the Bishop of Chartres, to the best of its strength, for flying in the face of his ecclesiastical superior, and for helping to stir questions which the Government would have preferred to manage by itself into way, and at its own time. So stand matters at present. The educational institutions of France, hitherto acquiesced in with so much equanimity, will probably have their strength tried by a pretty severe struggle, and, as it appears to us, not without plausible reason. The very expression which we have quoted from a French contemporary suggests forcibly the probability that the French clergy are not without just cause of dissatisfaction.—We need not point out to our readers—the context sufficiently shows it—the sense which that insinuating word "philosophers" is intended to bear. The French "philosopher" is indicated by the contrast as one who is neither Protestant, Catholic, Jew, nor Free-thinker, but something less believing than any of these—shall we call them all—religionists? And certainly a professional board of Dr. Jeyes, Free-thinkers, and (such) philosophers" is not precisely one to whose care an earnest believer in the Christian revelation, would very willingly, or could very securely, intrust the minds of his children. History, poetry, ethics, metaphysics,—nay, even what is commonly called science, as in the present day made the vehicles of religion and irreligion. It is so, it will be so, and it must be so, till religion is either so wholly dominant that she has nothing to fear from her enemies, or so wholly extinguished that they have nothing to fear from her. While she retains a spark of vitality she will struggle for the mastery over the will of mankind with that principle which is thus falsely dignified by the name of philosophy. As long as it holds a spot of ground in the human mind, it will ever strive to vilify, supplant, or cripple her. Men of talent, even though they be professors, will take one or the other side in a question which, as man and as society is constituted, comes home to all—and will infuse a religious or an irreligious life into the subjects which they handle—will habituate the hearts of their pupils, to glow into zeal, or to harden into a sneer at the great, but ambiguous spectacle which history, which nature, which philosophy presents. A few strange minds there doubtless are, who can deal with all the usual subjects of education as drily as with the differential calculus. But they are few. Your ordinary "philosopher"—your Byron, Shelly, Gibbon, or Voltaire—cannot be quiet. "Erasez l'infame" was the cry, not of a mere splenic misanthrope, but of all who see before them in the Christian Church a phenomenon which, if it be not a divine truth, is a monstrous and overbearing imposture—who will not recognize it as the first, and therefore think themselves privileged, as they feel themselves inclined, to hare it as the latter character. Knowing, therefore, that this "philosophy" is now a recognised element of the national character of France, we cannot wonder that the educational institutions formed on the express notion of admitting its influence, should have roused at length the protest of the unphilosophical clergy. It is rather extraordinary that they should have been so late in their assault, than that they should have now at last ventured upon it. In spite of the venerable authority of the French Prime, we cannot help suspecting that their cry is well grounded. And, if so, we must add, that in the present tone of the French mind it is not likely to be soon suppressed with ease. The history of the struggle, if it prove one, may be instructive to those who think it practicable (not to say desirable) to secure a peaceful and uniform education of a professedly Christian country by omitting what they are pleased to call "points of difference."

THE CHURCH. COBOURG, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1843. CONTENTS OF THE OUTSIDE. First Page. Poetry.—The Second Advent. The Sovereign Power. The Church and the Universities in France. The Church of England. Editorial. French Page. The Shadow of the Cross.—Chapter IV. Proposed University Bill.—(Continued.) We have been favoured by a friend with the perusal of a new religious paper started in New York, entitled the "Protestant Churchman;" a periodical, we understand, got up in opposition to the "Churchman" of that city, from alleged disapprobation of the principles inculcated in the latter journal. Individual Christians, professing adherence to the same communion and worshipping at the same altars, are liable to differences of opinion,—as we must believe, however, upon subordinate and unessential points; and where these differences of opinion exist, they have a perfect right freely, but yet calmly, to express them. The quiet and unstrained discussion of such points of difference is, perhaps, the best way to remove their cause and bring about uniformity of sentiment, and oneness of feeling. Yet we question much whether the gentlemen dissenting from the views of doctrine or discipline promulgated by the "Churchman," have adopted the wisest method of effecting the object they professedly have in view,—namely, correcting what they judge to be erroneous opinions, and bringing about an uniformity of adherence to the principles of truth. The starting of an opposition or rival paper always wears a ludicrous appearance, while it is sure to augment and perpetuate, if it does not actually engender, a spirit of party. The imputed want of earnestness might be just as successfully combated by the quiet exercise of public opinion; for where we have fixed principles to rest upon, and acknowledged criteria of truth to which to appeal, in cases of doubt and dispute, public opinion, amongst the large class of the intelligent and sober-minded, will uniformly evince the might and at last the success of its influence. The effect of an antagonist journal, in such a case, is to give to that influence not its whole and legitimate direction, but to warp, embitter and pervert it. The spirit, in short, which prompts to the establishment of a religious journal, in opposition to the one which has for years existed under the countenance and support of the Bishop of the Diocese and the great body of the Clergy, is, we are free to say, in close affinity with the spirit which begets the sin and the calamity of schism. But what we are called upon more directly to regret in the number of the "Protestant Churchman" before us, (viz. of Nov. 18th), is the citation of extracts from English papers, the obvious tendency of which is to bring discredit upon a portion of the Clergy of the Church in the mother country. To be sure, these passages are adduced in order to augment the public horror of "Puseyism," as it is termed; but the conductors of the "Protestant Churchman" should be so far acquainted with passing events, as to know that the sources from which their authority, in these cases, is drawn, are by no means such as a sound Church paper should apply to. The *Oxford Chronicle*, from which one disparaging extract is made, is notoriously a Radical paper, and consequently all its articles in reference to the Church are deeply tinged with that dislike to the Established Religion, which papers of that order of politics are at little pains to disguise.—Another quotation of a similar character is made from the *Weekly Dispatch*; in regard to which we may merely remind the respectable conductors of the "Protestant Churchman," that the fact of Mr. Alderman Harmer's being a shareholder in such a paper, caused his indignant rejection from the magistracy of London in the autumn of 1840. These facts will suffice to shew to our brethren of the "Protestant Churchman," that they are not dealing fairly by the Church of England in culling from papers which are conducted in avowed hostility to her, and the supporters of which would raze her foundations to the dust, if they could. In regard to the periodical itself, we ought to, and must, wish well to the principles implied in its title; yet, if it be the principles of a *Churchman* which are to be disseminated, we apprehend that the previously established paper, which has the recognition and support of the Bishop of the Diocese, is clear enough in developing the views which a *Churchman*, as such, should entertain. And if they be Protestant principles which are to be defended and diffused,—or rather Catholic principles in opposition to the novelties of Romanism,—we are persuaded that no paper will be found, in the ranks of those who protest against Popery, which has more zealously and more ably contended for such principles, than the "Churchman" of New York. We have received the first number of a paper, styled the "Episcopal Protestant," in regard to which we copy the following from our excellent contemporary, the *Banner of the Cross*:—"We have received the first number of a new paper with this title ['Episcopal Protestant,'] to be published weekly in Charleston, S. C., the editor and proprietor of which is the Rev. W. H. Barnwell, Rector of St. Peter's Church in that city. Upon Ecclesiastical Policy, he justly deems it sufficiently expressive of his views to say, that while regarding the Protestant Episcopal Church's form of government as 'the most accordant with the scriptural model, he does not conceive its preservation any more essential to the existence of a Church, than that of the monarchical system is to the existence of a State; and he questions no more the validity of non-episcopal orders, than of republican magistracy &c.' These are the new-happily they are few—of whom good Bishop White said, with a severity not often found in his meek and saintly spirit, 'It is impossible that this conduct can be vindicated by any professions of piety, supposing them to be sincere. The most favourable interpretation to be put on such cases is, that the parties, perhaps insensibly to themselves, have no preference of our ministry, otherwise than as it is a door to our Churches, not otherwise to be entered.' We are greatly deceived as to the Churchman's can find any support in that diocese. Of course, it is published without the approbation of the Bishop, although the editor has had the modesty to offer it to him, as well as to the Bishop

of Georgia, as 'a medium of official communication with their respective dioceses.' We are happy to observe that not a single clergyman or layman's name appears, as sanctioning the enterprise." In these remarks we regret to be obliged to concur; for an individual avowing such laxity of principle on the great question of ecclesiastical order, may have some vague notions as to what constitutes Protestantism, but his views of Episcopacy are as loose and Eristian as any that we can recollect to have been promulgated by a clergyman lawfully ordained, since the days of Bishop Hoare. We regret to learn from the Philadelphia *Episcopal Recorder*, the death of the Rev. John A. Clark, D.D., Rector of St. Andrew's Church in that city, and one of the editors of the periodical just named. This lamented divine stood deservedly high in the estimation of his fellow-labourers, and of the Church in the United States generally, and was the author of a "Walk about Zion," and other popular and useful works. Our friends of the *Episcopal Recorder* would greatly oblige us by forwarding to us a copy of that number of their journal which contained some remarks on the University of Cambridge in England, under the signature of S. H. T. Our request is made on behalf of a brother-elderly man and friend in this Diocese, a Master of Arts of Cambridge. We perceive, by our English files, that Archdeacon Lonsdale, Principal of King's College, London, and Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, has been appointed to the vacant Bishopric of Lichfield.—The Rev. John Sinclair, Vicar of Kensington, has been appointed to the Archdeaconry of Middlesex, vacated by the promotion of Archdeacon Lonsdale. It is needless to inform our readers at this time of day, that the *Christian Guardian*, and the more prominent of the party whose religious and political views it expresses, bears any thing but good-will to the Church of England; and it is very certain that such good-will never will be conciliated or gained, as long as we of the Church of England are faithful to our own principles, and regard as something more than a formality the petition which, in our admirable Litany, we are directed continually to use against heresy and schism. When we shall arrive at the belief that this petition is ill-founded, and that the Scriptures, from whose express admonitions it is drawn, are erroneous, then may we recede from the position which both we, and our valued predecessor, have ever felt it a duty to maintain. And when, forgetful of all these solemn obligations, we shall be counselling enough to affirm that the followers of Wesley are justified in persisting in their separation from the Church, and that the ministry which they have constituted and are perpetuating,—in contravention of apostolic authority and primitive usage,—is lawful and valid; then, and not till then, shall we find this bitter hostility to be mitigated, or laid aside,—not till then shall we be dignified by that party with even the name of Christians. But the marvel of the matter is, that upon this point, we are found in agreement with Mr. Wesley, while his professed followers,—who even call themselves after his name,—are at issue with him. He says,— "In 1774 all the Methodist preachers had their first conference, but none of them dreamed that the being called to preach, gave them any right to administer sacraments. .... Did we ever appoint you to administer sacraments to exercise the priestly office? Such a design never entered into our minds; it was the farthest from our thoughts, and if any preacher had taken such a step, we would have looked upon it as a palpable breach of this rule, and consequently as a renunciation of our commission to preach the Gospel. .... In doing this, you renounce the first principle of Methodism, which was wholly and solely to preach the Gospel. It was several years after our Society was formed, before any attempt of this kind was made. The first was, I apprehend, at Norwich. One of our preachers there yielded to the importunity of a few of the people, and baptized their children; but as soon as it was known, we were informed it must not be, unless he designed to leave our communion. He promised to do it no more; and I suppose he kept his promise. Now as long as Methodism keeps to this plan, they cannot separate from the Church, and this is our peculiar glory." These last emphatic words were uttered only ten months before he died, and are earnest enough of what he meant the body who are called by his name, to be. In another place he says,— "They [the Methodists] are not a sect or party—they do not separate from the religious community to which they are first belonged—they are still members of the Church; they desire to live and to die. And I believe one reason why God is pleased to continue in our communion to confirm them in their present purpose, not to separate from the Church. I wish all of you who are vulgarly termed Methodists would seriously consider what has been said, and particularly you whom God hath commissioned to call sinners to repentance. It does by no means follow from hence, that ye are commissioned to baptize, or to administer the Lord's Supper. Ye never dreamed of this, for ten or twenty years after ye began to preach: ye did not then, like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, seek to prevail also—ye thought that no man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Oh, contain yourself within your own bounds—ye yourselves were first called in the Church of England; and though ye have, and will have, a thousand temptations to leave ye and set up for yourselves, regard them not. *The Church of England men still!*" (Wesley's Works, edited by Jackson, Vol. vii.) The maintenance of the doctrine by members of the Church of England which is here so decidedly and unequivocally announced by Mr. Wesley, is signified by the *Christian Guardian* and his party as "Puseyism" and Popery. If such an application of it be correct, then, by the declared principles of the *Guardian*, John Wesley, their founder, was a "Puseyite" and a Papist! In the prosecution of the ill-concealed dislike and hostility which is borne by the party of the *Christian Guardian* towards the Church of England, we find that its editor gladly presses into his service any ally, however equivocal or disreputable, who can furnish an untold calumny against the Bishop of Toronto and *The Church*. The former, in being spoken of by this degenerate follower of Wesley, is deprived of his lawful title; and an article is inserted in abuse of that prelate from the *Woodstock Herald*, only inferior in vulgar rascality and its tone of blasphemy to one which, about two months ago, we had occasion to notice from the *Kingston Chronicle*. From the latter journal, too, an article has lately been transferred to the columns of the *Christian Guardian*, vituperative of "The Church" and of its principles; an article so wretchedly constructed, and withal so palpably defective in its theology, that we should have thought even the Editor of the *Guardian* might have detected some of the contradictions it expresses to leading tenets of Christian truth. The following extracts will suffice to prove the character of that writer's theology, and the sound judgment at the same time of his advocate of the *Christian Guardian*:—"Piety and religion are acknowledged to consist in private good and personal exertion; and every one understands that as a free agent he ALONE is TO WORK OUT HIS OWN SALVATION." "Christ has taught us that the only way to salvation lies in good deeds and in faithful and personal prayers, and that every man's happiness depends upon himself." To do the *Guardian* justice, he has admitted that the article from which the above sentences are quoted, contained "one or two inadvertent expressions."—We are more disposed to pronounce them the result of downright ignorance,—the effect at least of a defective religious education,—rather than of carelessness or inadvertence; and if the doctrine affirmed in these





