

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

THE
CANADIAN PRESBYTER.

MARCH, 1858.

CANADA—EAST AND WEST.

There is no subject which claims a larger share of public attention at present than the relation of the two parts of the United Province of Canada to one another. A suspicion is abroad in both sections that the interests of the one are not identical with those of the other. Like the Frog in the fable, each is disposed alternately to say to the other, "What is sport to you is death to me." Such a state of things is certainly to be regretted, and must be a source of anxiety to every patriot. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that in almost every department of our polity the East and the West are at present in unfortunate rivalry. In matters of commerce, public works and navigation, this is very evident. The West cannot get a handful of the public money for works of general utility or for the development of its vast resources, but the East must, whether it needs it or not, claim a proportionate share, and so on *vice versa*. In politics, as well as in matters material, we find the same intense rivalry between West and East. The expansive and progressive spirit of the West chafes at the contracting and conservative spirit of the East. The principles which are thought suitable for the regulation of the public administration in the West are all but repudiated in the East. The great political question of the day, namely, that of "Representation by Population," is one that will undoubtedly give rise to a prolonged and acrimonious conflict. On this matter the West is unanimous, whereas the East, so far as the power and influence of the priests are concerned, will give a strenuous opposition to such a concession. That the East must yield to the unanimous determination of the West is very likely. If it were wise it would do so gracefully as an act of justice and not of compulsion. This great question once settled, it is obvious that the vigour and intelligence of the West will exert a greater influence on the general legislation of the country than they have yet done. We may then expect the inauguration of a more liberal and patriotic policy than has been hitherto possible with the existing legislative arrangements of the two sections of the country. We may further note as rivalries in our public affairs the local and sectional interests

which bristle like thorns throughout the Province. Have we not constantly under political discussion the special interests and exigencies of Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton and London? So warmly and keenly do the partisans of each enforce its special claims that a stranger amongst us would be tempted to think that unless these were instantly conceded the whole colony would go to ruin. But no one need be alarmed at these honest ebullitions of zeal for local advantages. They indicate the commercial and political life of our people. We may be sure that as population increases and the waste places which lie between important centres of commerce are filled up with intelligent settlers, a process of nationalization will go on that will almost if not altogether efface these local rivalries and conflicts. But it is not our object to discuss at large these political questions; we simply and by way of introduction to another subject note them as phenomena of the present time. There is another antagonism, far more potent than any we have mentioned as existing between the East and the West, and which, unless its influence in this section be promptly arrested, bids fair to embroil us in serious conflicts for ages. To this we would invite the special attention of our readers.

The antagonism to which we refer is that between the Roman Catholicism of the East and the Protestantism of the West. It is evident that in this matter both sections are pulling in opposite directions. The East wants to bring the West, if possible, under the mesmeric influence of the Papal priesthood, while the West is (may it ever continue to be) equally determined not to be holden by any such witchery. The Eastern Papacy wants two things—one of which is the *status quo* in its own section of the Province; the other, that as much public countenance and support as possible may be obtained for the "Roman Ceremonies" in the West. For the success of these two objects the whole political policy of the priesthood will be shaped. For these reasons they successfully defeated the General Corporation Act of last session. For the same ends they are prepared to sell their political influence to any party. A government supported by the influence of the priests in this country is not one to which the liberties of this free people can be safely entrusted. For some years having nothing to trouble them in their own quarters, the priests have been working and intriguing with all their zeal and craft to obtain a share of the public funds for the establishment of their religious schools in the West. It is felt by them that unless separate, or rather sectarian schools are obtained for their special benefit in the West, they may bid farewell to the progress of their Church. Their religion cannot stand the light of a liberal education any more than it can the light of an open Bible. Such being the certain result of the common school system of the West, our friends there need not wonder that the priests regard the question of separate school as one of life or death to their faith. Were the common schools of the West designed for the teaching of the Protestant religion then it would be reasonable that the Roman Catholic should not be taxed for their maintenance, or that his children should not be compelled to attend them. But such is not the case. Their object is to make intelligent citizens by imparting to the young a knowledge of letters and figures, without

reference to any religious dogma. This may not be the best possible system of education, but in the present divided state of religious parties it is the only one on which national education can be conducted. If the Roman Catholic thinks this a godless system he is under no compulsion to patronise it; he is at liberty to institute schools to his own liking, none making him afraid. But it comes to be a different question when he demands a large share of the public tax to maintain his own *religious* institutions. It is not another literature he wishes to teach but a *religion*. This is the true state of the case. This is claiming for Popery the position of an established church, a thing which the West utterly repudiates both in principle and practice. If the Roman Catholic is permitted to teach his religion at the public expense, with what justice can the same claim be refused to the Presbyterian, Episcopalian, or Methodist? Are there any reasons of justice and right that can be urged by the former which may not equally be urged by the latter? To grant, therefore, to the Romanist the *kind* of separate schools which he demands is virtually to destroy the noble common school system of Canada West, of which her people are so justly proud. This is a result to which we trust they will never consent. If they do, they will betray the cause of true liberty and progress equally in the East and in the West.

Why is it that our western brethren are leaving their adversaries in the East in peaceful possession of their special immunities and usurped powers? Why is not a demand made that the common schools of the East shall no longer be nurseries of the Roman Catholic religion? It is a great delusion for our western brethren to suppose that there is no State religion or State Church in this part of the Province. Let them but come and look over our land, and upon every School with few Protestant exceptions, they will find the Cross and not unfrequently the Virgin and child, the symbols of Popery, conspicuously enshrined. The teachers in these institutions are chiefly priests, friars and nuns. The whole system of the popish idolatry is taught to the pupils. The books used are all of them of a papistical character. In the peculiar dogmas of their church the children are carefully trained, every means being used to prejudice their minds against what the priest considers the pernicious protestant faith. Into these nunneries and popish institutions the priests and the religious order avow their willingness to receive the children of protestants, promising not to interfere with their religion, but in every instance which has come under our observation in which protestant children have been sent to popish institutions, insidious and plausible means have been skilfully used to seduce them into the practices of the Roman idolatry. In many cases such efforts have been too successful, and in all the effect of contact with the system has been according to the proverb which says "Evil communications corrupt good manners." This State establishment of Roman Catholicism is an evil of which Protestants have good reason to complain. It pertains not only to the Schools, but it extends to the Churches as well. In this part of the Province the priests have power to tax the adherents of their religion in their parishes for the erection of splendid parish Churches. They have also legal powers to levy a tithe on all the grain that is grown by their people, for the support of the priests; even beans and peas are not exempt-

ed. This impost hangs we believe like a weight upon the necks of the French speaking people. It has the effect of stifling their agricultural enterprise. It leads them to hoard and conceal their wealth instead of using it in industrial pursuits. No greater boon could be conferred upon the people of Lower Canada than the abolition of this ecclesiastical impost. Why should not the Roman Catholic Church be placed on the same footing for its support as the other Churches of the Province? Protestants trust to the liberality of their people for the maintenance of their pastors. Why should it be otherwise with the Roman Church? Treaty rights entered into at the time of the conquest may perhaps be pleaded for these special immunities. For such a reason we can conceive that Britain, so long as she was the absolute governor of the Province, might feel it incumbent upon her not to abolish these practices. But now that the people have taken the government upon themselves they surely may relinquish or modify at will, without foreign intervention, whatever rights they may possess in virtue of ancient treaties. There is surely no reason why our Legislature may not prohibit the priests of the Roman Church from supporting their religion by the compulsory taxation of their people. Let then the West carry the war into the enemy's camp. There is, we trust, some Protestant in our Legislature bold enough to bring in a Bill annually till the object is gained. In such an endeavour he would meet with much sympathy and encouragement from multitudes of the French speaking people and from all uncorrupted Protestants in the East.

We further require the vigilance of our Protestant legislators in the West to protect our Christian privileges from legal invasion. In the matter of ecclesiastical corporations we trust they will never consent to permit any such, much less those got up in the interest of Rome, to hold lands in mortmain for purposes of revenue. We have far too much of this already. It is time that all corporations should be prohibited from holding land for any other purpose than that of direct *use*. It is cheering to find that the legislature has made a stand on this question; it is to be hoped that nothing will induce it to resile from its position.

There is only one other matter in which we certainly need the aid of our western brethren, and that is the preservation of our Holy Sabbath. The Jesuits teach their pupils deliberately to violate the sanctity of that day to an extent that will scarcely be credited. Games and sports of all kinds are indulged in, and bands of music perambulate their play grounds, to the great annoyance of their Protestant neighbours. Even theatrical entertainments are practised with the sanction of the priests. In these respects matters are becoming worse instead of better. Legislation it is true has already done something to check Sabbath profanation in the East. By the persistency of an honorable eastern member of the Council, an Act was obtained a few years ago abolishing the practice of Sheriff sales at Church doors on the Sabbath day. So far this was good, but it would appear that something more is yet wanted. A kind of Sabbath desecration akin to the other has recently been authorised by law in the East. In the "Agricultural Association Act," for example, 20 Vict., sect. 42,

chap. 40, it is enacted "That whosoever shall have to give public notice shall after having signed or attested it in the presence of two witnesses cause it to be read and posted for two consecutive Sundays at the principal door of the parish Church or chapel or other place of public worship in the parish or township, at the issue of Divine service in the morning." Nearly the same words are used in the "Municipal and Road Act," 18 Vict., sect. 8, chap. 100, and in sect. 76 it is enacted that a penalty of £2 shall be inflicted on those who shall tear down or efface those secular notices so offensively posted on Church doors. The same law applies to intimations of Sheriff's sales. The evil of these obnoxious practices is not felt by Protestants in those places in which there are Roman Catholic parish Churches. But in the townships, where there are no such Churches, such public profanation of the Lord's day is felt by both ministers and people to be an intolerable nuisance. One minister in the East says that on two occasions lately intimations of Sheriff's sales, in French and English, were made at our Church door on the Sabbath morning as the congregation dismissed. The posting of bills upon church doors is a desecration of the sanctuary bad enough, but to make the assembling of God's worshipping people on the Sabbath day an occasion for intruding upon them by law, notices of a kind that are in themselves sometimes offensive, and at such a time always contrary to the command of God, this is surely "framing iniquity by a law," and interfering with the sacred liberty of worship. All this we suffer from our contact with Popery. The sanctity of the Sabbath has no place in its doctrines or practices. After morning mass the Romanists may spend the Sabbath as they please. Buying and selling on that day do not appear to them violations of God's law. Hence it is that under the influence of French lawyers and legislators, practices obnoxious to Protestant feelings and to the liberty of Protestant worship find a place in our laws. We want some eagle-eyed Protestant representative in Parliament, who will make it his special business to scrutinize every bill for the East and see that it contains nothing derogatory to Protestant interests. We trust also that during the coming Session a successful effort will be made to obtain the repeal of those obnoxious clauses to which we have referred. For this and kindred purposes we are confident that we shall not invoke the aid of our Western brethren in vain.

Whatever be the present issue of these conflicts which we have noted, we trust that the idea of a repeal of the Union will not for a moment be entertained by the people of the West. A dispensation of Providence is committed to them as regards the East from which they are not at liberty to shrink. Whatever may be the difficulties of their alliance with this Popish section of the country, it is their part to battle with them, confident that ere long they will triumph. The maintenance of the Union or annexation to the United States are the probable alternatives upon which the liberties and progress of Canada East depend. The latter would be regarded by most of us as a calamity, but yet greatly preferable to that of being handed over to the tender mercies of Popish tyranny. Our liberties, civil and religious, together with the future prosperity and greatness of our country depend under Providence, on the political union of the East and West, and the gradual assimilation of both into one free nationality.

MODERN RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.

We live in an age of associations. Almost every one we know is a president, or vice-president, or secretary, or manager of a society—or at the very least, a member of committee. Business and pleasure, science and art, nationality and philanthropy, all have their organizations and institutions. It is not strange that religious zeal should adopt the same modes of manifestation. Accordingly a marked feature of Protestant Christendom is the multiplication of societies for religious as well as educational and charitable objects. The most popular of these are the associations which unite in their membership and management Christian men connected with various denominations or departments of the Visible Church. In Canada these associations attract so much attention, and wield so great an influence, that we feel it a duty to watch their tendencies, and form an estimate of their value and work.

The union aimed at in the societies to which we refer is manifestly a reaction against the denominational disunion of the Church. Pious men, impatient of sectarian confinement, and sometimes disposed to undervalue all ecclesiastical distinctions, have rejoiced to meet one another, and freely co-operate in Bible, Tract, and Missionary Societies. Joyfully these organizations are hailed as unifiers of the Churches, and their committee-rooms and platforms are celebrated as the meeting-ground of all evangelical Christians.

It must also be obvious to the candid inquirer, that many of the societies in question have taken rise from the defective organization of various Protestant Churches. It pertains to the Church to conduct missions at home and abroad; and churches scripturally constituted and governed, as those which follow the Presbyterian model, find no difficulty in carrying forward all their missionary work, without recourse to special societies for the purpose. It is not so with the Prelatic, and Independent Churches. They cannot, in their church capacity, undertake and manage missionary enterprises—and therefore form societies, either on a denominational, or on a general basis. Of the former class are the Church Missionary Society, the Society for the propagation of the Gospel, and the Colonial Missionary Society—of the latter are (in theory at least) the London Missionary Society, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Everywhere the Societies will be found especial favorites with evangelical Episcopalians, and Independents—including Congregationalists and Baptists—for they are especially useful to these denominations, because of the defective character of their ecclesiastical machinery.

From whatever causes they have originated, the general or Catholic Societies have unquestionably done a good and great work in the present age. They have induced much inter-denominational intercourse and friendship. They have nourished that disposition to magnify agreements rather than differences, and to recognize the christian faith and labors of those who do not in all particulars 'follow with us'—of which the Evangelical Alliance has been the formal public expression. They have also accomplished many things for the name of the Lord Jesus. By societies so constituted, the Bible has been translated into many languages, and circulated in millions of copies over the world; an immense supply of sound religious literature in books and tracts has been provided in many tongues; and home and foreign missions have been greatly multiplied and enlarged. We need enter into no proof of these statements. They are perfectly well known to all who have any acquaintance with evangelical movements of the present century.

It has thus become the mode to pour out on these societies the warmest eulogiums, and to hold them up as the greatest and brightest hopes of Christendom. We see a danger of excess in this direction, and are of opinion that the

Societies, while duly supported and encouraged, should never be exempt from the review of friendly criticism. With all their merits, they appear to us fairly open to such strictures as the following :

1. As guardians and publishers of truth, they are not reliable, unless carefully watched. It appears to us an arrangement involving no small risk, that the preservation of the English Bible, and the translation of the scriptures into almost all the languages of men, should be entrusted to the committees of the two great Bible Societies in London and New York. We know that the Apocryphal books would have been published to any extent in the sacred volume, by the British and Foreign Society, if the Scottish Presbyterians had not raised an agitation against them. And we also know, that the American Society has only been prevented by a similar step on the part of American Presbyterians, from assuming to alter and amend the authorized version of the scriptures. The Bible Societies have become more than publishers: they are extensive translators, and have ventured to be editors of the Word of God. And this great, almost irresponsible power is confided to their committees by the Protestant Church, without any guarantee of the competency of the committees to manage such momentous interests. At present, perhaps, no great risk is incurred; but at any moment difficulties may arise. For example, the British and Colonial Churches may see ground to favour a careful revision of the present English version by a commission of great Biblical scholars; but such a measure would be stoutly resisted and perhaps prevented by the officers of the Bible Society, because they are unwilling to depreciate in value their large stock in hand of the present version, and because they have required all versions into foreign languages, prepared and published at the Society's expense, to be conformed to the authorized English Bible as a standard. The wisdom of this last measure is very questionable; and whether it has been well or ill judged, it serves to illustrate the formidable power wielded by the Bible Society, and to show the necessity for a watchful inspection of their proceedings by the Protestant Churches.

The London Tract Society, so far as we are aware, has been faithful to its trust, and has published a sound and edifying literature. But the American Tract Society, placed in circumstances of much greater difficulty, has been proved guilty of altering and garbling valuable works, in order to maintain silence on the subject of slavery; and has lost the confidence of those who think that a great national Religious Society should not be afraid to name the great national scandal and sin.

2. As missionary organisations, the so-called 'Catholic Societies' are inevitable promoters of sectarianism. This may appear to some a hazardous assertion, but it is borne out everywhere by facts. Home and city mission work, prosecuted by societies of the character referred to, almost always falls into the hands of agents connected with the smaller and more isolated sects, and results not in reinforcing and augmenting any of the principal Protestant Churches, but in forming, apart from them, new centres of sectarian influence. It may sound very liberal to cry—"No matter what denominational influence or system such 'union' missions extend, if the Gospel is preached to the neglected and poor!" But this liberal cry is really shallow and unwise. The interests of the Gospel, and the cause of human salvation, are bound up in no small measure with a right ecclesiastical and doctrinal organisation: and we have both a right and a duty to take heed, that, in supporting Catholic Missionary Societies, we are not involved in promoting those very tendencies which our Presbyterian Church is bound to counteract and resist.

Foreign mission work, conducted by a 'Catholic Society,' follows the same course, and promotes Independency. The London Missionary Society, organised on this basis, and offering to employ missionaries of various denominational

views, has long been, to all intents and purposes, a 'Congregational' Institution. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions has strongly developed similar proclivities, and is in the hands of the Congregationalists and a portion of the New School Presbyterians. The writer of this article has been assured by an eminent Foreign Missionary, who long served under the American Board, that the Secretary, Dr. Anderson, quietly shaped and governed the various missions, so as to further the interests of Independency. When the Dutch Reformed Missionaries, in a district of India, proposed to set up their Presbyterian government, and form themselves into a 'classis,' this 'Catholic' Society hindered them. The Dutch Reformed Church has accordingly resolved to support and manage its own Foreign Missions, as every Presbyterian or other well-governed Church should do.

3. Multiplied as the religious Societies now are, they tend in some respects to weaken the Church. When one begins to take a decidedly religious position, and to show a desire to make himself useful in the community, he is placed on the committees of two or three Societies, and so drawn away from his first and proper sphere of activity in the Church. Complaint is sometimes most unjustly made that the Churches are unenterprising and inactive; merely because the energies of so many are called off from their duties as Church-officers and Church-members, to manage the religious societies. Let the same thought and prayer and zeal be given to religious objects within the Church, and the work aimed at, will, we are confident, be more thoroughly done, and results of a far more permanent and satisfactory character reached, than under the present system of forming a new Society for every department of Christian usefulness.

We may have expressed ourselves very imperfectly, but we are confident that we have mooted several points that require the attention of enlightened Christian men. We mean not at all to imply, that the Catholic Societies are unworthy of confidence and support; but we perceive a great and growing necessity that they should not be so multiplied as to cripple the proper movements of the Church, and that they should be confined in their objects to those departments of religious usefulness which experience has shown them to be best fitted to occupy. We must also venture to recommend that a watchful eye be kept on these Societies, and a constant influence exerted over them, by those Churches whose sympathy and support and implied approval are essential to their continued existence. The absence of this leaves room for the operation of sectarian influences, which are constantly degrading and weakening the evangelical Protestant Church.

AN ESTIMATE OF PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

The internal life of every God-fearing man from the beginning of the world has been that of self-denial and holiness. For this the first converts to the Christian faith were conspicuous. The sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper were regarded by them as covenants to abstain from every vice and to cultivate every virtue. The younger Pliny bears testimony that they bound themselves by mutual obligation not to commit *theft, robbery, adultery or fraud*. Their mutual love was the admiration of the heathen, "behold," said they, "how these Christian love one another." They were equally well known for their works of charity. Everywhere throughout the empire in apostolic times, they made collections for the poor saint, during the famine which prevailed in Judea. Their hospitality was unbounded. The house of a Christian was the home of his brethren. The care of providing for the stranger, the poor, the sick, the old, the widow, the orphan, and those imprisoned for their faith,

devolved upon the whole members of the Church. The Christian matron especially was expected to discharge much of this work. "What heathen" says Tertullian, "will suffer his wife to go about from one street to another to the houses of strangers, and to the meanest hovels to visit the brethren!" He accounts it among the felicities of a marriage between Christians, "that the wife is at liberty to visit the sick, and relieve the needy, and is never straitened or perplexed in the bestowment of charity." Large sums too were contributed by the Churches for the ransom of brethren who had been carried captive by barbarians.

And not only towards one another were these charities shown, the heathen, even their persecutors, were also the objects of their Christian solicitude. Eusebius relates that "during a contagious sickness at Alexandria, while the heathen fled from their dearest friends, cast the half-dead into the streets, and left them unburied, the Christian regarded it as a special trial and exercise of their faith. They waited on the sick without thinking of themselves, readily ministering to their wants, for Christ sake cheerfully giving up their own lives."

In Carthage "we are informed by Cyprian" that the Christians distinguished themselves by their disinterested conduct during the pestilence which ravaged North Africa in the reign of Gallus. The Pagans deserted the sick and dying. The streets were covered with dead bodies which none dared to touch. Animated by the fatherly counsels of Cyprian, their pastor, the members of the Church quickly divided the work among them. The rich gave of their substance, the poor contributed their labour, and in a short time the bodies which filled the streets were buried, and the city delivered from the danger of further infection.

Christianity both mitigated and abolished the curse of slavery. It restored the equality of man which heathenism had destroyed. The Christian slave was recognised as free in Christ, and no longer regarded as a servant, but a brother in Christian fellowship. Not that the mutual relations of master and servant were destroyed and their relative duties abrogated; these remained the same as before, only they became sanctified, but the idea that slaves were goods and chattels, was that which Christianity could not and would not tolerate. The masters looked upon their servants no longer as slaves, but as their beloved brethren; they prayed and sang in company, they could sit at each other's side, at the feast of brotherly love, and receive together the sacrament of the Lord. In this respect the first and second centuries were much in advance of the nineteenth. Such aspects of slavery as are familiar to us, as for example, the forcible sale, the dissolution of the marriage tie or the breaking up of families, would have been regarded with indignation and visited with excommunication by the Christian Church of those ages.

It is true that Christianity did not require outward revolutions or changes in the constitutions of government or society, but it gave birth to new convictions of personal duty and human equality, which in their development destroyed every custom or principle that was hostile to justice, truth or love, and consequently destroyed slavery. One of the imperial slaves, Euphrestus by name, who was arraigned with Justin Martyr, conscious of the new position to which he had been raised by the renewing powers of Christianity, said to the magistrate, "I too am a Christian, I have obtained my freedom from Christ, and through the grace of Christ I am a sharer of the same hope."

The Christians cheerfully abandoned employments that were in any way connected with idolatry. The theatre, the circus, and the gladiatorial shows they would not frequent. From festivals of revelry and riot they carefully kept aloof. On this account they were regarded then as they ever have been, as unsocial and sour, haters of pleasure, and lovers of melancholy and gloom. But all these

reproaches they cheerfully bore for Christ's sake, knowing that in His service there were joys of a higher order than those in which the ungodly delighted.

Let us not, however, imagine that the Christian life of those primitive times was perfect. It was far from it. Times of persecution and trial are not the most favorable for perfecting Christian virtue. True it is said that the "*blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church,*" and that *fiery trials purify the faith*. Such, we grant, has frequently been the case, but it has as frequently been otherwise. Martyrdom was good in the case of the Neronian martyrs. Christianity was by their means dragged into public notice. It was good in the instances of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, in Germany; Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer in England; Hamilton and Wishart in Scotland. The martyrdom of these men lighted a flame which could not and cannot be extinguished. But persecution has not at all times been good for the Church. It has not been good for it in France, Italy, Spain, Hungary or Poland. The fire *consumed*, in these instances, both precious stones and stubble. Like the aroma from the leaves of dead flowers it is yet possible that in the developments of Providence a salutary influence may arise to Christianity from its all but fatal extinction in these lands; but so far as the past two hundred years are concerned, persecution has been to these nations an unmitigated evil.

In the first ages we cannot doubt that while it purified and tried many, it also greatly hindered and corrupted others. For one thing, it early introduced a spurious piety and fanaticism, which led eager crowds to solicit martyrdom and act before the heathen with imprudent zeal. It also tempted many to be unfaithful to the profession of their faith. Some saved themselves by sacrificing to the Gods, and were hence called, *thurificati, sacrificati*; some by purchasing certificates from the magistrates falsely testifying that they had sacrificed, were styled *libellatici*; others again surrendered the sacred books to the magistrates to be destroyed, and these were called *traditores*. The question as to the restoration of these fallen brethren into the communion of the Church gave rise to a painful controversy and a disastrous schism. On one side we find Cyprian of Carthage recommending that under no condition should the lapsed be admitted until the Church had peace and rest calmly to consider their case. In this he was opposed by many of the martyrs and by Felicissimus, and Novatus. Thus the community was divided. In Rome again, Felix the Bishop and the Church freely admitted the *lapsed* on their sincere repentance, into Christian fellowship. In this he was opposed by a distinguished and highly honored Christian philosopher, named Novatian, who afterwards became the Bishop of a party called after his name. These were not good things. They give indications of a monkish asceticism on the one hand and a laxity of morals on the other, the opposing and corrupting influences of which we can trace in Christianity down to the present day.

We find, too, at this time that the celibacy of the clergy, looked upon as a necessity during times of persecution, began to be reckoned a grace and virtue. The pompous celebration of the anniversaries of the martyrs almost insensibly degenerated into prayers for the dead and the worship of saints. The Bishop from being at first a minister, teacher, or pastor of a single Church, began about the middle of the second century to assume princely and apostolical prerogatives and powers, and thus were sown the germs of that hierarchical system which dominates at Rome and exercises a fatal influence on the liberty and independence of many Protestant Churches. Again, we find that the celebration of worship and of the sacrament in secret places and often in the dead of night, and the highly wrought feelings which this engendered, led to a superstitious multiplication of ceremonies—to surround the simple festivals of the Church with an awful mystery—and ultimately to the idea of baptismal regeneration and the

idolatrour sacrifice of the mass. Finally, in the whole system of the Roman Catholic Church we find the full-grown fruit-bearing tree, whose roots we can trace to the unscriptural practices introduced into the Christian Church during the perilous times of the first three centuries. Satan finding that he could not destroy, corrupted the Church of Christ. These corruptions, of which we have sufficient evidence, must have gathered strength as time rolled on. Hence we cannot wonder that when the last persecution, that of Dioclesian, fell upon the church, it found multitudes of mere professors of the Christian name, who, when the time of trial came by and bye, became offended and denied the Lord who bought them.

We cannot therefore say that the Church of the first ages was without spot or blemish. "We readily acknowledge," says Neander, "that among those who called themselves Christians at this time there were some whose lives contradicted the essential character of Christianity, and gave occasion to the heathen to blaspheme." Tertullian says, "If you assert that the Christians are in avarice, in riotousness, in dishonesty, the worst of men, we shall not deny that some are so. In the purest bodies some freckles doubtless may be discovered." "But we should not be led away by these blemishes that attach themselves to the surface of the Christian life, to overlook the heavenly beauty which shines through it all. When the eye is fixed exclusively on the blemishes or perfections, the picture may be easily colored to an ideal perfection or sunk to a distorted caricature. An unbiassed observation will shun both extremes."

It is certain that the *faith* of the early Christians was most vivid and vigorous. It fixed itself upon the living person of the Saviour. His life and death were near to them—the veil of ages and centuries did not obscure to their minds the living personality of Jesus, or give his acts and words the appearance of cunningly devised fables. Intense and vigorous personal faith is a marked characteristic of the Church of the first three centuries.

The *doctrines* of Divine truth were not however so well understood then as they are now. Although they were as fully revealed, and needed in this respect no development, yet mankind newly awakened from a dream of centuries, could not all at once look upon the truth unveiled. The spiritual eye had to become accustomed to the blaze of light which Christ brought into the world. Hence we find in the opinions of this period many that are crude, erroneous and fantastical. To build therefore our faith upon the writings of the first three centuries is to build upon a foundation containing many puerilities and contradictions. They doubtless contain much that is true, beautiful and good; but it is a fact that in the history of Christian doctrines truth finds no sure resting place, till it reaches back to the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself the chief corner stone. This reminds us of a saying of Dr. Chalmers, who on one occasion when discoursing to his students about the Fathers, said in his own expressive way, "Some people talk a great deal about the Fathers, but recommend me to the Grandfathers." Apart from the Bible there is thus no certainty for our faith, no security for our immortal souls.

There is after all much to admire in the saints of those days. But while we admire the past, let us not disparage the present as if it was inferior to that which went before. A careful scrutiny of facts will, we are persuaded, lead to the conviction that the Church of the present day, with all its imperfections, is greatly in advance of the Church of the first three centuries, in faith, knowledge, and virtue. Neither the world nor the Church is, let us thank God, growing worse. On the contrary, every new generation of mankind is rising higher than the last in the scale of Christian perfection. We are making a steady progress towards that glorious Millennial age in which Christ shall by his Word reign over a regenerate world, and in which mankind shall regain a paradise of greater beauty and felicity than that which has been lost.

Nevertheless, we have in the first three centuries a noble band of faithful witnesses for Christ. With a heroism and fortitude more illustrious than any that the world had seen before, they followed their Lord in the face of cruelest tortures and deaths. The Church will have become sadly degenerate when she shall cease to hold in the highest honor *the Christian life of the first three centuries.*

CREEDS AND CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

Some time ago, in reading a work wherein a very bitter assault was made on all formal creeds and confessions of faith, we found the most triumphant argument against them embodied in a spirited wood-cut. It was a representation of a pair of balances. On the one scale were heaped, in a great pile, a multitude of books bearing the titles of creed, catechism, or confession of faith: on the opposite scale lay one small Bible, which, most decisively, weighed down the great pile of creeds and confessions. As a pictorial, or symbolical argument, it was very good, better to my mind than any of the prose arguments in the book; and had the thing symbolised been really represented in the symbol, the sight of it should have been enough to consign all creeds and confessions to well merited condemnation. Yet after all we are inclined to think that not a little may be said on the side of formal creeds and confessions of faith.

The first authority in the Church is Christ—the Lord and Head of the Church. The authority that comes next is that of conscience. And then, as next in order, there is the authority of the Church herself—acting through her office-bearers. And we affirm that the exercise of the authority of the Church, in the institution of formal creeds and confessions of faith, is a lawful authority.

The history of the Church, as recorded in the page of inspiration, seems to establish this point, viz:—The necessity for enumerating the truth in new forms, and in more precise phraseology, to combat new errors as they arise. As examples of this, we see those passages in the epistles of John which are directed against the Gnostic heresy; or the discourse of Paul to the Corinthians concerning the resurrection; or the decrees of the council at Jerusalem with respect to the errors taught by the Jewish converts. It may be objected that these were all inspired men, and that their procedure can be no justification of the uninspired creeds and confessions of the modern Church. But there seems to be a presumption that these things were for the guidance of the Church in the time to come, that they were for our example. For it is to be noted, that, in none of these instances was there any new doctrine set forth—there was simply a *declaration of the ancient doctrine in a form to meet the new error.* And accordingly, as examples to be followed do they seem to have been regarded by the church in all subsequent ages—as the numerous confessions of faith we find mentioned in her history, abundantly testify.

Moreover the nature and the office of the Church seem to require a confession of faith. It is the duty of the Church, by a formal and public declaration of her faith, to give an assurance of the soundness of her profession. The members have a right to demand this of her hand, for their own satisfaction in their connection with her as members. And not less is it required to enable the Church to receive from her members a like satisfactory assurance of their soundness in the faith. Such a power as this belongs to every voluntary association—and it would be hard to deny this right only to the Church. The Church of Rome only requires an implicit faith, or submission to her authority from her members. She neither gives nor requires an explicit confession of faith, and for many ages she had none. It was not until compelled by the Reformation, that she addressed herself to this work. In a body such as the Church of Christ, however,

when the bond that unites the different members is mutual faith in the same truths, a confession of faith is a necessity. Even our Independent brethren, in the oral confession of ministers when admitted to office, and of members when admitted to fellowship, which they require, recognise this necessity. The question as between them and us does not seem to touch the point of the *need* of some such confession—that is recognised by both—but rather bears upon the *form* of it—whether an informal, oral confession, or a well digested form of sound words adopted as a confession of faith, is the better way to secure the end desired. We, of course with all charity for those who differ from us, prefer the latter.

The objections to creed and confessions of faith may be reduced to these two heads:—

First.—They are objected to as setting aside the authority of Scripture as the sole rule of faith, and as militating against the sufficiency and perfection of Scripture as a rule of faith. If, indeed, they denied or superseded scripture, or if they added to scripture, or if they are inconsistent with scripture, then the objection might be sustained, but not otherwise.

Now with respect to the first supposition we do not deny that creeds and confessions of faith may be made virtually to deny or supersede Scripture,—as for example, in the Romish standards that now, since the Council of Trent, exist. Under them no appeal to Scripture is allowed to the members of that Church. But this charge does not lie against Protestant standards. These are *subordinate, not supreme*; subordinate to the Word of God, not above, or superseding it. If the Church has a right to say on what terms a member is to be received, or a pastor admitted to office,—and who would deny such a right? then has she a right to institute such standards. The former right includes the latter; but these standards being subordinate are not set forth as infallible, nor as so perfect or complete as that they may not undergo some change.

With respect to the second supposition, a creed may contain things that are not in Scripture, as we see in that of the Church of Rome, and so may be inconsistent with and opposed to the Word of God. But the charge of adding to the scripture does not lie against our confessions of faith; for Protestant standards claim to be *declaratory* merely,—a formal setting forth of those truths revealed in the Word of God. Our confession or creed, if it is so called, is not the adding of our own articles of faith to the Word, but only *our declaring from the Word what our faith is*; and against that there can be no true charge of adding to the Word.

With respect to the third supposition, that creeds and confessions of faith are inconsistent, *per se*—with the scripture—we may just remark that the Bible has light enough to guide those who love the light; but it has darkness enough for those who love the darkness. Had the Bible been meant as a formal exposition of doctrine, then it would have been unlawful to have instituted any other, or to have required adherence to any other as a term of communion. But seeing that the Bible is not such a formal exposition of doctrine, this supposition, which with many is a conclusion, does not follow.

Second.—Confessions of faith are objected to, as an assumption on the part of the Church of authority that does not belong to her, and as the imposition of an unlawful restriction on the freedom of her members. This is the second great head of objection.

If indeed the Church imposed as a new creed on her members articles of faith not previously binding, then this objection might be sustained. But if the creed or confession is according to the Word of God, then there is no exposition or restriction laid upon the members by it; there is nothing, in fact, laid upon them by that confession of faith, to which they are not already bound. Of course it remains a question how far such standards ought to be used as terms of com-

munion, and how far they should lay down minute rules and doctrines. But yet if they are in the matter of them, according to scripture, they cannot be opposed to christian liberty.

Moreover to deny the right of the Church to institute such standards militates against true liberty. This is a right enjoyed by every voluntary society—a right conservative of their liberty, and of their very existence. And to deny it to the Church would assuredly be to deprive her of all true liberty, and to compel her to receive any one into her communion, or into office, without any satisfactory proof of fitness. The Church without that right would be like a garden without its fence. And thus there does seem to be some reason wherefore creeds and confessions of faith should be maintained.

“THE PRESBYTERIAN.”

(*Canadian Church of Scotland.*)

We have been favoured by an editorial writer in this paper with a notice of a short extract from an *article* in our January number, in which we touched upon the question of Union with the representatives of the Church of Scotland in Canada. In said extract we intimated our fear that the feeling in respect to Union was, for the most part, all the other way in that community. We noted also the use for the purposes of aggressive extension which that Church was making of the Home and Clergy Reserve Funds which were at its disposal. We further expressed a conviction that the time was coming when it would see it to be for its own interest to unite on just and equitable principles with the other Presbyterian Churches of this land.

These sentiments of ours are regarded by the “Presbyterian” as very bad. They are supposed by the writer to show that the Free Church has no good will to Union with his Church in Canada. He discovers in them a “want of confidence,” a “distrust” and a “suspicion.” The writer goes on further to taunt the Free Church for leaving his Church for no reason that he can see, and intimates that we are welcome to return to the *old* quarters. He tells us besides that we are very ignorant of the arrangement anent the Clergy Reserves to speak of them as we do. We are also informed that the Free Church has been poaching upon the preserves of his Church. He casts in our teeth too the usual stale pun about being “free;” politely informing us that we are a set of *beggars* and *drudges*, and that such has been the urgency of our necessities that we have even “thankfully received the profits of traffic in slaves.” The “Presbyterian” further enlarges about the Free Church holding property, by legal quibbling, to which it has no just claim. Finally it winds up by saying “that connection with the Free Church has a wonderful effect in transforming the character of things—in making that which is material spiritual, and that which is dishonest perfectly fair.”

We have not hitherto noticed any article in the “Presbyterian;” but now we think it well to let our readers know and see something of the *animus* which it exhibits towards those who favour the principles of the Free Church. This editorial article, it is evident, fully justifies all that we said about the feeling of hostility to union which we noted as a feature in the Church which the “Presbyterian” represents. The man who can write of us in the terms of that article must undergo an entire transformation of *his* feelings before we can enter into Church fellowship with *him*. That article is, we believe, purposely intended to be as offensive as possible. It is of a piece with several others which have appeared in the same paper for the past twelve months. We thought at one time

that the "Presbyterian" was conducted by laymen of Christian temper and prudence, and from whom, at least, we might always expect to be treated as gentlemen—must we think otherwise in future? Our readers have no conception of the silly stories which from time to time through a Scotch Correspondent have been wantonly retailed by that Journal about the Free Church. When anything, too, was said about the proceedings of the Church of Scotland in any of our papers straightway we find a bitter reply full of personalities; but not content in such cases with reply, the tempting opportunity is also taken, in long and weary columns to vilify the Free Church and her labours. No opportunity has been allowed to escape of holding her up to the contempt of its readers. In the article referred to there is a repetition of the same offence. If the party who writes this review of our statements thinks them unfounded let him reply in a manly way; but instead of this we have here over and above words of reply a tirade of simple abuse. Doubtless the writer thinks it very smart and very weighty, and imagines that he has settled both the "Presbyter" and the "Free Church" at one stroke. We can afford to smile at his simplicity. He speaks somewhat boastingly of the strength of his Church and the weakness of ours. Every one knows that the Free Church in this Province is, at least, twice as strong in ministers, members and means as the representative of the Church of Scotland. We wish this latter Church were strong for then it could afford to be magnanimous. At present the Presbyterian faith and polity are more likely to suffer from its weakness than benefit by its strength.

Notwithstanding the denial by the "Presbyterian" of the accuracy of our statement about the Clergy Reserves, we beg to reassert that his Church has the reversion of the commutation money at its absolute disposal for the purposes of aggressive extension, and for this purpose, we believe, it has already been used, and so far it has been a weapon of an unspiritual and unhallowed kind.

We further beg to say, that we know the reasons for which we have left the communion of the Church of Scotland as by law established, although the "Presbyterian" remains in "utter ignorance" of all that has been said on the subject. The question with us is not, as the "Presbyterian" insinuates, simply the position of his Church in this Province. To put the matter in debate in this form is to throw dust in the eyes of the people. We have to consider not only the character of his Church, but its complicity with the State Church at home. Our reviewer and others may boast of the freedom of their Church in this country, and claim for it all the attributes of a free community, and none will object; but in this they have no choice. They cannot barter the liberties of Christ's people here, as is done at home, for the sake of State connection. They know that not one of their Congregations would for a day submit to the yoke which their brethren bear at home. We do not, therefore, wonder at ministers of the State Church of Scotland in this Province being so solicitous to make known to every one that there is no difference between them and the Free Church. This is an unconscious homage to the truth of our principles and the rectitude of our procedure. But the comparison is not between us and the Church of Scotland in Canada; it is with the State Church of Scotland which it represents. Will the reviewer tell us that there is no difference between the position of that Church and the Free Church of Scotland? We trow not. The State Church at home, with which he claims connection, does not, it is well known, permit her people to elect their own ministers, but subjects them to the caprice of irresponsible patrons. If a presentee be ever so unsuitable and acceptable, as in the humiliating case of Kilmalcolm now pending, the only right which the people possess in the case is the right of unlimited grumbling. Lord Aberdeen's Act permits objections to be stated at the expense of a long, harassing, and costly process of law sufficient to ruin any parish; even then

it leaves the people at the mercy of the Church Courts for any relief; and finally the decisions of the Church Courts may be reviewed or reversed by the Court of Session or the House of Lords. This is an unvarnished statement of the fettered position into which the State Church of Scotland has of late years brought herself. She has virtually admitted the supremacy of the Crown in all causes ecclesiastical, against which our glorious forefathers contended to the death. Let the people of free Canada know that this is what the State Church of Scotland has to submit to, and we are persuaded that they will not ally themselves to such a fettered institution. Now, it is because we cannot in conscience have any connection with a Church that has thus proved unfaithful to her spiritual calling, and to the supremacy of the Lord Jesus Christ in his kingdom, that we have withdrawn from the communion of the State Church of Scotland. As long, too, as this Church at home remains in this, as we conceive, unscriptural position, we can have no alliance with it; and as long as the Church here which the "Presbyterian" represents identifies itself with a Church so fettered, union between us and it is, in our judgment, a thing impracticable. We have, however, hope that our countrymen at home, when the fever of past conflicts has abated and a new generation has arisen, will not be satisfied to lag behind in the march of religious progress. We trust to see an earnest movement in our day for the repeal of the iniquitous "Act" of Queen Anne, and the no less-iniquitous so called "declaratory act of Lord Aberdeen." Let the people of the State Church of Scotland emancipate their Church from these bonds and re-assert their ancient spiritual independence, and none will more readily hail such a consummation than the members of the Free Church. We have also hope that in this country a Canadian party will arise in the "Presbyterian's" Church, who will not consent to take upon them the responsibilities and burdens of the State Church of Scotland. The new generation in this country have, we are persuaded, no sympathy with State Churchism in any form, or with the disabilities of the State Church at home. To them we look for a better spirit and a more liberal policy than we find at present to prevail in the Canadian Church of Scotland. Through their agency a union on equitable terms may be possible in the lapse of a few years.

We would further say that the writer in the "Presbyterian" is not satisfied with making a sweeping charge against the Free Church, for holding property to which he alleges it has no just claim; he also particularly refers to the Church and Manse of St. Gabriel Street, Montreal. In regard to the general question we say that the legal quibbling is all on the other side. Our people built most of the Churches which have been wrested from them by invoking the rigid interpretation of the law. The Church of Scotland has pounced upon Churches both here and at home to which it had no claim in equity, which it cannot use, and never, to all human appearance, will be able to use. As for St. Gabriel Street Church and Manse, the "Presbyterian" shows by its statements great ignorance of the whole question. The matter is at present *sub judice*, and at the proper tribunal it will ere long be decided to whom of right the Manse belongs. Meanwhile the proprietors of St. Gabriel Street Church think that the Church is theirs, and the minister thinks that the Manse is his. They assert that the Church was never intended to be put for all time in connection with the Church of Scotland as by law established, much less with the Canadian Church of Scotland. A rule of the proprietors put it once in connection with the former Church, but never with the latter; but that rule was simply a by-law revocable at pleasure. The rule has been revoked and the proprietors maintain their right to possess their own property, and to govern it as they please, without the interference of the Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. The administration of the property is the same as it has been from the beginning. The proprietors have violated no obligation and no usage, and

have maintained intact the original intention of the founders. That the old usages or the worship of the Church have ever been altered, cannot be and has not been alleged. There never was a time when they were more strictly maintained than at present. The "Presbyterian" is evidently not aware that St. Gabriel St. Church was organized by a Presbytery in the United States, under whose care it continued for some time after the building was erected. Its first minister was ordained and appointed to the Church by said Presbytery. The "Presbyterian" seems also unaware of the fact that the second minister was a licentiate of the Old Relief Church, and that he never was recognised by the Church of Scotland. He was ordained by only two ministers—not a Presbytery. While this conferred upon him in the emergency *ministerial functions or orders*, no one at all acquainted with the civil or ecclesiastical law of Scotland, will say that such an informal act made him a minister in legal standing of the State Church of Scotland. Mr. Somerville, the minister referred to, and by whose benevolence the Manse was built, was thus never a member of the Church of Scotland nor of the Synod of the Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. The terms of the General Assembly's "declaratory act in regard to the Church of Canada" excluded him from such connection. His *will* was made before any connection at all was recognised with, and it does not contain one word about the "Church of Scotland." We assert and maintain that the quibbling is all on the side of our adversaries; and it comes from them with a bad enough grace, considering that they have profited largely by the possession of the Old St. Andrew's Church which every one knows was not built, and was never intended by its original founders for the benefit of the State Church. The proprietors of St. Gabriel St. Church claim the same right as the old proprietors of St. Andrew's Church, namely, to connect themselves with such Presbyterian Church as their conscience approves. How our adversaries can reconcile their appropriation of old St. Andrew's for the erection of the new and more splendid St. Andrew's, with their rage against us for doing that with our own which conscience dictates and approves, passes our comprehension. However the matter will be decided soon; in the meantime we would only say to the "Presbyterian" that for one party to accuse another of dishonesty in the maintenance of what they conceive to be their just rights is not the practice of gentlemen.

We did not intend to trouble ourselves with this matter, but as we have been so often taunted by the "Presbyterian" with folly and dishonesty, we have judged the occasion not inopportune to let our cotemporary know that we intend to submit to such contumely no longer.

THE QUAKER VIEW OF THE SACRAMENTS. (JOHN iv. 24.)

BY THE REV. DR. BOARDMAN.

No sentence in the New Testament has been more relied upon to show that the New Dispensation discountenances and even forbids "all typical rites in the worship of God," the reference being especially to Baptism and the Lord's Supper. With these ordinances the customary services of the Sanctuary, regarded as stated or habitual services, are associated, as being in alleged contravention of the whole spirit of the Gospel. Because God requires a spiritual worship, no baptism is to be recognized except the baptism of the Spirit. The Lord's Supper is spiritual communion with Christ. An official ministry, with a fixed routine of services, consisting of prayer and the reading of the Scriptures and preaching, is incompatible with the true design of the Gospel, which precludes some of these exercises altogether, and allows the rest only on occasions when they are prompted by a distinct impulse of the Holy Spirit. "No verbal administrations

properly consist with worship, but those which spring simply and immediately from the influence of the Holy Spirit."

These few points may suffice to indicate the ground assumed by those who repudiate all religious rites. That such views should be promulgated by any society professing to acknowledge the authority of the New Testament is even more remarkable than that efforts should be made to reimpose Levitical ceremonies upon the Church.

It is surely most inconclusive reasoning, to argue that God will not sanction *any* rites in the public worship offered him, because he will be worshipped *in spirit and in truth*; and to contend that inasmuch as he abolished the Jewish ritual, he thereby forbade *all* forms in the Christian Church. Where has he presented it as the only alternative, "an imposing ceremonial like that of the Hebrews, or a purely spiritual worship?" The theory that we are examining, virtually assumes that there could have been no spiritual worship under the Mosaic economy. But no serious-minded person would utter so injurious a charge against the ancient saints.

That the old system, as distinguished from the new, was characteristically a ceremonial system, is conceded on all hands. Equally certain is it that that system has been "done away." But on what authority is it asserted that, in abrogating the Levitical rites, the Saviour determined to organize the Church without *any* rites?

It has been alleged, that baptism was practised among the Jews before the Advent, and also that the breaking of bread and the pouring forth of wine, with the giving of thanks, was a part of their ritual order in celebrating the Passover; and hence the inference has been drawn, that Baptism and the Eucharist were actually *included in that Levitical scheme* which the Saviour annulled. It is difficult to speak of a representation like this without using strong expressions. For one can hardly conceive how an ingenuous person, intent only upon learning the truth, could seriously propound a speculation so probably at variance with the facts. On the same night on which he was betrayed, Jesus instituted the Supper with the utmost solemnity, and enjoined upon his disciples the *perpetual* observance of it. "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death *till he come*." (1 Cor. xi. 26.) This was not the paschal service. It was after that service. He ordained it now for the first time. His disciples had never celebrated it before. He bids them to celebrate it till he should return. And yet, on the very slender pretext that there was a somewhat similar use of bread and wine in the Passover ceremonial, the Lord's Supper is claimed to have been one of the Levitical rites, which the Saviour himself abolished! So, again, as to baptism. The last command he gave to his disciples as they stood around him upon Mount Olivet at the moment of his ascension, was to "go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And yet, because the Jews had been in the habit of baptizing proselytes, baptism with water (it is alleged) was essentially a Mosaic rite, and as such the Saviour designed to abrogate it.

Such opinions have their refutation in the simple narrative of the evangelists.

If the attempt to show that water baptism was a purely *Levitical rite* has failed, no better success has attended the effort to prove that the only baptism recognized in the New Testament is *the baptism of the Spirit*. Of course we all hold to the reality and the necessity of *this* baptism. But we cannot admit that it was simply this baptism the Saviour had in view when he uttered the parting command just quoted. Nor did his Apostles so understand him. They certainly may be supposed, after they themselves had been baptized with the Holy Ghost, to have been qualified to put a proper interpretation upon his words,

and it is clear to demonstration that they understood him as directing them to baptize their converts with water. Not to enter into the discussion of this question at large, look at the case of Cornelius (Acts. x). While Peter is preaching to him and his household, the *Holy Ghost* falls on them. This, according to the system I am controverting, was all they required—all that the new dispensation admits—the baptism of the Spirit. But how did the Apostle judge? “Then answered Peter, Can any man *forbid water* that these should not be baptized, which have received the *Holy Ghost*, as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.” In other words, perceiving that they had been baptized with the Spirit, he makes this a reason for baptizing them with water. They gave evidence of being born again; therefore, they were entitled to be baptized, and so, formally admitted into the visible church.

Again, when Philip and the Ethiopian treasurer were studying the Scriptures together in the chariot, the latter said to Philip: “See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?” How would a “Friend” have answered this question? How *must* he have answered it in consistency with his principles? “Thou needest no baptism with water; all thou requirest is to be baptized with the Spirit.” But what was Philip’s answer? “If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest”—which was equivalent to his saying: “If thou hast received the baptism of the Spirit, thou mayest be baptized with water.” He instantly professed his faith in Christ, and thereupon the chariot was stopped, and “they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him.” (Acts 8.)

These and other cases of the kind are so unequivocally stated in the New Testament, that there is only one method in which the argument they supply can be met, viz., by denying that the example of the Apostle is binding upon us. This ground is boldly taken. The Apostles, it is argued, continued to be infected with Jewish prejudices; they retained various Levitical customs; and having been familiar with circumcision and with baptism prior to their conversion, “baptism,” says Gurney, “was very naturally considered by them as appropriate to the specific purposes of their own ministry,” and “they would, as a matter of course, persevere in the practice of baptizing their converts in water.” To this it is added, by way of depreciating this ordinance still further, and showing that it is of no binding force upon us, that the Saviour himself did not baptize; and that Paul avows that *he* was sent “not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.”

In respect to this last argument, the practice of the Saviour is altogether foreign from the question at issue. The inquiry is not, whether he baptized, but whether he commanded his followers to baptize. It would be easy to suggest reasons which may have led him to abstain from administering the ordinance, if it were worth while to discuss a point which does not properly belong to the subject in hand.

The example of Paul may be fairly quoted as against those who magnify baptism above the preaching of the Word and prayer, and who even make it the specific and exclusive instrument of regeneration. It is quite conclusive in dealing with these parties to quote his declaration; “Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the Gospel.” But it can avail nothing to those who object to water baptism altogether, for it is certain that he did sometimes administer this ordinance (1 Cor. 1: 14-16), and equally certain that where he did not baptize his converts, they were baptized by other ministers under his sanction.

The other argument, that the example of the Apostles is not binding upon us, proceeds upon very dangerous ground. The question is, “*Did the Saviour*

institute baptism with water as a permanent ordinance in his Church?" In support of the affirmative of this question, we cite his last command to his Apostles, and show by their practice how they understood it. On the opposite side it is contended, that when he directed the twelve to baptize the nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, he had no reference to water baptism, but simply to the baptism of the Spirit. That it must require some nerve even to suggest a construction of these words, which does so much violence to them, will be conceded by all who are accustomed to read the Saviour's teachings without considering how they are to tell upon favourite theories. Allowing that the whole Jewish ritual was now to be replaced by a spiritual worship; that the word baptism, with its derivatives, frequently occurs in the New Testament in a sense purely metaphorical; that there is no mention made of water in this passage; and that Jesus had himself contrasted the baptism of the Spirit, the privilege of his own followers, with the water baptism of John: of what weight are these considerations, to set aside the clear, obvious import of this command? The simple meaning of baptize is to wash with water. There is not the slightest intimation that the Saviour used the word here in a figurative sense. The presumption that he did so use it, is a sheer gratuity, proceeding upon principles of interpretation, which, if generally applied, must destroy the Bible as a rule of faith and practice, by making it the oracle of whatever sentiments it may suit the interests of individuals and sects to have it utter.

The example here presented is, indeed, a very significant one. For we not only have the Saviour's language, but the interpretation his Apostles put upon it. It is not denied that they understood him to refer to water baptism; and that they went forth in every direction, baptizing all their converts with water. The adverse scheme, then is loaded with these *four assumptions*.

1. It assumes that our Saviour did not intend that his disciples should baptize with water, although he gave them no hint that he referred to any other baptism.

2. It assumes that his disciples and followers *were clothed with power to baptize with the Holy Ghost*. If he did not command them to baptize with water, of course he commanded them to baptize with the Holy Ghost. It is the common faith of the readers of the New Testament—certainly of all evangelical Christians, of whatever name—that it is a DIVINE prerogative to dispense the Holy Ghost. It was the grand distinction between the baptism of Christ and that of John the Baptist as stated by the latter, "I indeed baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the *Holy Ghost* and with fire" And accordingly, he said to the Apostles after his resurrection, "Ye shall be *baptized with the Holy Ghost*, not many days hence." Where is the scriptural proof that this baptism could be conferred by one mortal upon another? The very idea is revolting to every sentiment of the renewed heart. And among all the flagrant impieties of those corrupt churches which have lorded it over the consciences of men, there are few things more odious than the claim that they are empowered to confer the Holy Ghost.

To elude this difficulty, it is urged that the followers of Christ are here instructed to baptize with the Holy Ghost, since it would be through their *mediation or instrumentality* that this baptism should be administered, even as they would be the *instruments* of converting sinners by the preaching of the Gospel. But this will not avail. There is a wide palpable difference between preaching the word or using any mere means, and bestowing the Holy Ghost. The one must, from the nature of the case, be performed by a creature, except, in those rare instances, where Jehovah may see fit to become himself a messenger to one of his creatures. The other, no less from the nature of the case *must* proceed directly from the Deity. The Holy Spirit is, by pre-eminence, his gift. And

when we consider *who the Spirit is*, the incongruity of a sinful creature being clothed with the prerogative of bestowing him upon other sinners, cannot but strike every mind imbued with the least reverence for the Supreme Being. It is, therefore a fatal objection to the doctrine that we are examining, that it assumes that the disciples of Christ were clothed with power to baptize with the Holy Ghost.

3. A third assumption chargeable upon this doctrine is, that the Apostles, to whom the last commission was addressed, and who received it immediately from their Master's lips, *were not so competent to understand its import as persons living eighteen centuries afterward*, and that they did actually mistake its meaning. For it is not denied that they understood him to refer to water baptism. And this was their interpretation of his language subsequent to the day of Pentecost, and when they were anointed with the Holy Spirit. It was after the "Spirit of Truth" had come upon them, who was to "guide them into all truth," that they fell into this grave error, and set up water-baptism as the initiatory rite of the Christian Church. Is not this dangerous ground? Is it not impeaching the inspiration of the Apostles, or impugning the accuracy of the New Testament writers? Can those who espouse these views seriously believe that the twelve were "filled with the Holy Ghost" when they so grievously mistook their Master's teaching on a point of great and lasting moment to the Church? If they erred here, why may they not have erred elsewhere? What is Divine in the New Testament, and what human? By what tests are we to discriminate between the true and the false? What certainty attaches to anything pertaining to the Gospel of Christ?

It is with a painful reluctance I give utterance to these sentiments. I have every reason which personal friendships and even hereditary descent can supply, to cherish an unfeigned respect for a society which bears on its roll of members names like those of William Penn. and Elizabeth Fry, and Joseph John Gurney. But in studying the Sacred Scriptures, I can know no man after the flesh. Men, it is well known, are often better than their speculative opinions; and what is still more apposite here, serious, useful, devout men may adopt erroneous and hurtful principles of interpreting the Bible, without flowing out those principles to their legitimate consequences. With every disposition to come to a different conclusion, I find myself shut up to the conviction that the method of interpreting the word of God, of which specimens have just been presented, is adapted to strip it of all certainty and all authority. If we may assume that the Apostles erred in explaining their Master's doctrines, what confidence can we place in their competency? And of what value are their writings to us?

Nor is this all. If *they* erred, who amongst *us* can possibly attain to any certainty in religion? We have, it is true, the promise of the Spirit to illuminate us. But we have surer evidence that *they* were "filled with the Holy Ghost" than we can have, in any given case, that *we* are under his plenary guidance. If he left them to mistake the meaning of a simple command, couched in the plainest terms, and relating to a point of great practical importance, with what reason or modesty can we hope to be preserved from error?

In truth, is there not something strangely presuming and visionary in the assumption, that we are better qualified to expound such a command—addressed, let it be remembered, directly to them—than they were themselves? Suppose it were possible to recall Peter, and John, and Paul (who, though not with them on Olivet, received a similar commission from the Saviour's lips); if we could bring these three illustrious men back to the world again for a little, can you imagine a scene more curious than that of a man of this nineteenth century, no matter of what country, tongue, or sect, standing up before them and saying: "You entirely misapprehend the meaning of your Master in his parting injunc-

tion to you. You understood him to send you forth to disciple the nations and baptize them with *water*; whereas, what he meant was, that you should not use water at all, but baptize them with the Holy Ghost." Can you imagine, I say, anything more curious, I might almost say more ludicrous, than a scene like this? And yet we have the substance of the thing whenever the claim is advanced by any set of men and for whatever end, that *they* understand the utterances of Christ better than the Apostles did.

4. The fourth assumption alluded to as involved in the scheme is, that *the example of the Apostles in this matter is not of necessity binding upon us*; and the fact of their baptizing with water, does not establish our obligation to conform to this usage. That the Apostles might have observed some customs which are not obligatory upon us, may be conceded without affecting the present question. This question is as specific as it is important. Our Saviour gave a command respecting baptism, which, it is admitted by all, is of perpetual obligation. Did he, in this command, contemplate water baptism? We examine, in the first place, the proper meaning of the words and phrases he employs, and are satisfied that what he enjoined was water baptism. We turn, then, to those upon whom he laid the command, and who had a deeper stake in ascertaining its import than any other human beings; and we find that they and their contemporaries, without exception (in so far as the annals of that day have come down to us), interpreted his words of water baptism. Under these circumstances, and contemplating their example in this aspect, we maintain that we are bound to conform to the usage they initiated, that we must interpret and obey the command as they did.

And here we rest the argument, to show that our Saviour instituted baptism with water as an ordinance of perpetual obligation in his Church; and that no man nor sect may lawfully annul, disparage, or neglect it, on the ground that the present is a spiritual dispensation, and that God will be worshipped "in spirit and in truth."

The same train of argument so obviously applies to the command respecting the *Eucharist*, that it would be superfluous to traverse the ground a second time in presenting it. There is one fact, however, of too much significance to be omitted here. These two ordinances, it is claimed, were part and parcel of the Mosaic economy, and, as such, were not designed to be perpetuated under the Christian dispensation. And yet, the institution of the Lord's Supper was made the subject of a special revelation to the Apostle Paul, *after the Saviour's ascension*. (See 1 Cor. 11: 23.) "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread," &c. It will not be denied that the new dispensation had commenced some time before this communication was made. How inexplicable, then, on the theory we are opposing, that the Saviour should have revealed to his apostle all these particulars respecting the institution of a rite which was not intended to be handed down to after-times; and how mysterious that this very apostle should have been left under the *illusion* that the churches were on no account to neglect the due observance of this ordinance; and that he must carefully instruct them to celebrate it. Can any one believe that this was an "illusion?" and if so, can you assign any motive for the revelation?

To urge, in reply to all this, that living as we do under a spiritual dispensation, we do not need the aid of these ordinances, is a plea altogether inadmissible. Where God has spoken, as He has in this case, there is an end to argument and speculation. However undesigned, there is great presumption in saying that we do not require rites which He has seen fit to prescribe for our observance. We could have no right to take this ground, even though we might not be able to trace the connection between these ordinances and the ends proposed to be

accomplished by them. The veneration we owe to the Deity imposes it upon us as of prime obligation that we should believe all his measures to be dictated by the highest wisdom, however inexplicable they may be to us. In the present case, there is scarcely room to invoke this principle? for the existing arrangement is shrouded in no such mystery. To a few minds peculiarly constituted or trained in a certain way, positive religious ordinances may seem to be a superfluity, having no proper adaptation to promote the spiritual growth and comfort of the soul. It is equally certain that the great mass of the race, in so far as they have been brought under the sway of Christianity, have found these ordinances eminently suited to their moral necessities, and *invaluable* as "means of grace." The allegation, then, that they are "not needful," is open to two grave objections: 1. It assumes that God is less competent than man to pronounce on what may be the best method of training a sinful race for heaven; and 2. It conflicts with the common experience of mankind.

PASTORAL SUPPORT.

Give your pastor a *liberal* support. For this you have made provision in your call should any circumstances arise in the future that may render it desirable that this salary should be increased, and you should become convinced that it ought to be done, let it be done, and that without the asking of your pastor.

We heard a few days ago an interesting incident in relation to a pastor recently settled in one of our cities. A gentleman called at his study who proved to be a prominent man in his congregation, and President of the Board of Trustees. He asked for the call. On looking over it he remarked that with the pastor's consent he would make an alteration. He then took his pen and erased *twenty-five hundred and wrote three thousand*, remarking that the Trustees had concluded, on consultation, to make this alteration, as they had undervalued his services.

This was a grateful change to a pastor with an interesting family around him. It was good news, and all the better because it came without any suggestion of his own. He felt that he need be less anxious about the increasing wants of his family, and that he had a congregation that would always see that his wants were supplied.

On principles of mere political economy, a congregation are the gainers by being liberal to their pastor. To feel well and think well, to read well and write well, (even to eat well and sleep well,) and above all, to preach well, the pastor ought to have his mind at rest on the subject of salary. He ought not to be obliged to inquire with solicitude, what shall I eat and what shall I drink, and whence shall I and my family be clothed? On all these points his mind should be entirely at rest, that he might give himself wholly to the work of the ministry—a work, the great end of which is the glory of God and the salvation of the souls of men.

In our favoured land there is no class of men in professional life who, in proportion to the amount expended in their previous training for the work, the extent of their attainments, and their general character, receive less pecuniary return than the American pastors. This is especially true of those of our own Church. They are a well furnished, well trained body of men. On this point we speak freely. It is a noble sight to behold so large and influential a body of men as the thousands of American pastors constitute, withdrawing themselves from the busy arena of secular life, where the hand of the diligent emphatically maketh rich, and casting themselves for support, nay, for the very bread which they eat, on the providence of God and the voluntary offerings of a free people.

A noble sight indeed! A free land liberally sustaining a free ministry, who, from an open Bible, preach in its purity and simplicity a free gospel—a gospel which, like a trumpet, proclaims liberty to the captive, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound. "If the same shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

Noble army! Boldly battling in the Master's service, and entrenched upon the ramparts of eternal truth. Majestic column! Marching over the field of conflict, following the great Captain of Salvation, bearing aloft in one hand the banner of the cross, and with the other firmly resting on the providence of God, as that providence embodies itself in the free offerings of a disenthralled people.

Rejoice with us, my brethren, in so happy a development of a principle for which the Free Church of Scotland contended when, in the might of her strength, with Chalmers at her head, she walked forth to an enlarged liberty, and burst the chains which for generations had trammelled her energies, and bound her to the Establishment.—*Presbyterian, U. S.*

WORDS OF THE WISE.

THE WINTER AND ITS MORAL ANALOGIES.

By JOHN FOSTER.

The Winter is generally felt an unpleasing and gloomy season of the year; the more desirable is it to make it yield us some special good, by way of compensation. The practicability of doing this, displays the excellence of mind above matter, and the advantage of religion. The sky is gloomy;—the light brief and faint;—the earth torpid, sterile, and deprived of beauty;—the whole system of the elements ungenial;—like a general refusal of nature to please us, or afford us anything. Well, but MIND, with the aid of wisdom and religion, may not only flourish within itself, but may compel the very Winter to afford assistance to its doing so. It may raise a richer produce than what the agriculturist can in spring and summer. And perhaps the truth is, that wisdom and piety might find or make all seasons and scenes nearly equal, in point of yielding the most valuable advantage. There are gratifying examples to this purpose.

Let us consider for a few moments, what the Winter season might offer in aid of instructive reflection. And we may revert to the expression of the text. "Thou hast made—Winter." God's work and wisdom in it are to be regarded. The Almighty Maker has fixed in the order of the world that which is the natural cause of the Winter; a most remarkable adjustment of supreme wisdom and power, appearing at first view, something like irregularity and disorder,—that is, the inclination of the earth's axis. We may note the signal benefits of this adjustment to the whole earth, (stated by Dr. Keill) as contrasted with what the consequences would have been of a position which would have made the seasons always the same. After this, we may observe that the Winter illustrates to us the beneficent principal of distribution acted on by the Divine Providence. We must have our *Winter*, in order that the inhabitants of another part of the world may have their *Summer*. Not but that even we, separately considered, are the better for this order: but see that out of view, and even suppose it were not so,—the people of the southern hemisphere need to have their season of light and warmth, to make their allotted ground productive, and ripen its produce. The sun and the fine season, leave us, to go to them. The Winter, therefore seems to inculcate upon us a great lesson of equity and charity,—that we should be willing to share the benefits of the system with the distant portions of our great wide spread family;—willing to part with a pleasing possession for a season, for their sakes, even if we could retain it. And the lesson might be brought down to matters within a narrower circle.

Again,—the Winter should, by the very circumstance of its unproductiveness, remind us of the care and bounty of Divine Providence, in that, other seasons are granted us which furnish supplies for this, and for the whole year. There is to be a season producing nothing, but therefore there are seasons producing more than their share. The Winter may admonish us, of these colder climates, how entirely we are at the mercy of the Sovereign Lord of nature,—how wholly dependent on the order which he has established. This is less obvious in those regions where they have no Winter, in our sense of the word. But *here*, look at the earth (speaking generally)! look at the trees! an obdurate negation;—an appearance of having ceased to be for us;—under a mighty interdict of Heaven; We might nearly as well go to the graves of the dead, to ask for sympathy and aid. The ground seems not willing to yield us any thing but a grave; and *that* it is yielding every day to numbers to whom it would have yielded nothing else! Striking consideration! that for *this* service the earth is always ready. How many graves for the dying it will afford during these months, in which it will afford no sustenance to the living! Would it not be a

most solemn manifestation, if we could, in the living crowd, discern those to whom the earth (the ground) has but one thing more to supply ?

Another thing worth observing is that Winter discovers, in a somewhat special manner, the dispositions of mankind *thus*;—men are in that season reduced more to their own resources,—are deprived of a delightful scene of varieties, liberties, and entertaining circumstances and occupation;—are much more driven home, as it were, to themselves, and their own means;—and their dispositions are shown in what they will now choose to do;—we mean in such part of their time as is really at their disposal. How pleasing it would be, to see generally a recourse to such expedients for spending that time, as should tend to individual and social improvement. It is so we trust, in many instances. It is generally so in some countries, at least *one*, that is, Iceland. But look at a large portion of *our* community, occupied in vain and dissipating amusements. Some in revels of excessive festivity,—in convivial assemblies for utter trifling and levity—card parties—theatres. Winter thus shows what persons will choose by preference, when the dreary state of the natural world throws them upon their own means. But what will the vain and thoughtless do, when the world, with *all* its seasons, *finally* excludes them ?

“ Say, dreamers of gay dreams !
How will you weather an eternal night
Where such expedients fail ? ”

POETRY.

THE STAR OF THE MAGI.

In those blue skies afar,
I see one single solitary star ;
Its radiant light,
Far from this toilsome world, so calmly, purely bright.

And even so, I dream,
Fell on the wise men's eyes that mystic beam,
Which from their home
Led them through Judah's destined land to roam.

Oft as they journeyed on
Their glance was raised to where serenely shone
That silent star,
Guiding their steps so surely, though so far.

What thoughts, unknown before,
Swelled in those minds so rich in earth's deep lore !
What did they seek ?
A king's new-risen pomp ? An infant Saviour meek.

And when the city spread
Its silent streets before them in the dead
Calm hush of night,
Above what palace roof beamed that celestial light ?

Soon had the star its rest,
Still shone its glittering orb on heaven's pure breath,
But all its rays
Fell on a lowly spot down in that shadowy place.

They passed the humble door,
They bent undoubting gladly to adore
The Virgin's Son ;
They knew the King they sought, they knew their journey done

Thou star of heavenly birth,
So guide us wandering through the dark of earth
Until we rest
Before Thy changeless throne, God for ever blest.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

MEMORIES OF GENNESARET, by the Rev. JOHN R. MACDUFF. *New York*: Robert Carter & Brothers. *Montreal*: B. Dawson. 12mo., pp. 388.

This volume deserves our hearty commendation. It will increase the reputation of its author, who has already won a large circle of admiring readers in Britain and America, by his devotional works—entitled the ‘Morning and Night Watches,’ ‘the Words of Jesus,’ &c., &c. We believe that these little books have been much relished by the people of God. All the writings of Mr. Macduff are marked by tenderness and fervor of spirit, and the present volume is in these respects a true successor of his previous productions. It is also free from that occasional grandiloquence which mars some of the later works from the same pen: such as the ‘Family Prayers’ and the ‘Memories of Bethany.’ With a little more pruning, and an avoidance of *fond* expressions, Mr. Macduff’s style will be the worthy and graceful expression of his cultivated and pious mind.

The “Memories of Gennesaret” consist of a series of chapters on the gospel scenes, events, and miracles connected with that beautiful Lake—the Sea of Galilee. Many of the striking passages in the public life of the Lord Jesus Christ are thus grouped together, and made the topics of consecutive meditation. The matter contained in the volume was obviously prepared in the first instance for the pulpit, and may be taken as a specimen of the lectures which the author is wont to deliver to his congregation in Glasgow. Description, exposition, and practical exhortation are happily combined.

Mr. Macduff makes just and ample acknowledgment of his obligations to previous writers—especially to Stanley for topographical information, and to Stier, Trench, and Alford for expository assistance. We notice this the rather, since Dr. John Cumming has had the effrontery to publish two volumes on the Parables and Miracles of our Lord, which, so far as they are of any value are manufactured out of the ‘Notes’ of Trench, with only a most inadequate reference, in his preface, to that invaluable eclectic expositor. Mr. Macduff, unlike Dr. Cumming, is always honest in his acknowledgments, and correct in his critical observations.

We can safely affirm that this excellent volume is worthy of a place in every family and congregational library in the land. We cannot, by a brief quotation, give any idea of its varied excellencies. The following sentences, however, from the chapter entitled “the Storm on the Lake,” may serve to illustrate the author’s earnest style:

“That ‘Peace, be still’ has been a motto and watchword which these howling winds of Gennesaret have wafted from age to age and from clime to clime sustaining faith in sinking hearts, and producing in many a storm-swept bosom a ‘great calm.’ Oh! happy for us if all the hurricanes that ruffle life’s unquiet sea have the effect of making Jesus more precious. If God has to employ strong trials, severe afflictions, for this end, let us not quarrel with this wise ordination. Better the storm *with* Christ than the smooth water *without* him.

‘Far more the treacherous calm I dread
Than tempests bursting overhead.’

It is the expression, not of the luxurious barrack, but the tented field, the trench and night watch, which makes the better and hardier soldier. It is not the exotic nursed in glass and artificial heat which is the type of strength; but the plant struggling for existence on bleak cliffs, or the pine battling with Alpine gusts, or shivering amid Alpine snows. If there be a sight in the spiritual world more glorious than another, it is when one sees (as may often be seen) a believer growing in strength and trust in God, by reason of his very *trials*—battered down by storm and hail, a great fight of afflictions—enduring loss of substance, loss of health, loss of friends—yet standing by emptied coffers and full graves, and with an aching but a resigned heart, enabled to say ‘heart and flesh do faint and fail, but God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever.’”

ENGLISH HEARTS AND ENGLISH HANDS; OR, THE RAILWAY AND THE TRENCHES, by the Author of Memorials of Capt. H. VICARS. *New York: Robt. Carter & Brothers. Montreal: B. Dawson. 12mo.*

This is a little book of singular interest and peculiar merit. Its purport is to show men and women who are placed in higher positions of life, how much of delicate feeling is to be found amongst that great mass of their countrymen, who eat their bread under the heavier portion of the primeval curse. The writer's purpose is also to suggest to Christian people in the upper ranks of life how much the trials of the lowly may be softened and their labours lightened by kindly interest in their daily toil. The book is a Diary of a warm hearted Christian lady's labours among the navvies who worked at the erection of Sydenham Crystal Palace, and were engaged for the "Army Works Corps" in the Crimea. It contains many beautiful and noble trials of English character. These strong men are shown to possess high susceptibilities of religious affection and culture. Disinterested labours for their welfare are also appreciated by them to an extent unknown among those who occupy more favoured positions in the social scale. The narratives of this volume and the letters from the navvies which it contains have all the marks of genuine truthfulness. There is a freshness and a naiveté about them quite charming. We cannot too strongly recommend this book to the attention of Christian readers, feeling assured that they will rise from its perusal greatly enriched with spiritual thoughts and affections.

The following extract will give an idea of its contents:—

"Few features in the character of the navvies have attracted my admiration, and interested me so warmly, as their power of strong brotherly friendship for each other. Separated, as so often they are in mere boyhood, from the sweet influences of home—as beautiful and binding in the cottage as in the castle—the yearning of the young heart for human affection often finds its response in a friendship formed after the fashion of the unrivalled love which glorified the lives of Jonathan and David. An unselfish regard, and even generous preference for each other's benefit, is no uncommon trait; and many a man have I seen, in time of sickness, supported by his "mate" with a brother's kindness, and nursed with a mother's gentle care.

The friendship between Samuel Bush and Joseph W— was an instance of this. They had wandered about the country together, and had worked side by side, mutually sharing their gains, and nursing each other through illness and accident. Together they had too often joined in the reckless revelry of the public-house; together they had striven against its temptations; had fallen back into them again; and together they had made fresh efforts to live a new life.

It was in the month of February 1854, that Joseph W— first became personally known to me, although Samuel had been in the habit of bringing him to the readings for some time previously.

One morning Joseph came to the Rectory in breathless haste, with a request that I would come and see his landlord, whom he believed to be dying from a sudden attack of inflammation. I promised to go immediately after breakfast; but he would not hear of any delay, urging that it might be too late.

When we reached the cottage we found that the poor man was quite sensible, and anxious for prayer. As I rose from my knees, I heard Joseph going down stairs, sobbing; and as I passed through the kitchen on my way out, he was sitting with his arms on the table and his face hidden. I said, "Joseph, I hope Clarke's sudden illness speaks to you to be ready."

"It do, it do," he said, without looking up; "and I hope it will speak to Sammy, too. Sam is a good boy, if it weren't for the drink; but that has been the ruin of us both."

"But you and Samuel are both trying to live better lives now? Be earnest in asking the Holy Spirit of God to help you to make the change at once, for 'the time is short.'"

"Yes; is it not?" (with his face still hidden.) "Look at Clarke! Oh, I hope he'll be saved!"

"I think you must have had a good mother, Joseph, who taught you something of the value of an undying soul."

"A good mother! Oh, hadn't I!" (looking up brightly through his tears.) "She taught me to pray, and all sorts of good ways"—then, suddenly dropping his head again—"but I broke her heart nine years ago."

"Oh, Joseph! how sad for you to lose so good a mother!"

"Oh, but she's not dead though! only she broke her heart about my taking to the drink, and going away from her on navy work."

"Have you been to see her lately?"

"No, not for nine years."

"You write to her, of course?"

"Well, no, I don't."

"Why, how is that? You can write, can you not?"

"Oh yes; but you see there's so many things to think of in writing—too many for a navy. There's the cover, and the stamp, and the paper, and the seal, and the pen and ink; that's six."

"Well, if you will come with me, I will give you a 'self-sealing' cover with a stamp on it, and the pen and paper, and the ink you can borrow from your landlady."

"Well, I will give you half-a-crown for them."

"No, Joseph; that would be a great deal more than they are worth, and you shall have them as a present. But go to the post-office, and spend your half-crown in stamps, and put them in your letter to your mother, to buy a new cap as a gift from her son."

"Well, that is a good thought."

He was off like an arrow, and arrived at the Rectory shortly afterwards, in great glee, to receive his treasures; and especially appreciated a steel-pen with a brilliant blue pen-holder.

On the next Sunday evening, I asked him if he had received an answer. He said, "No; and so I'll never write again as long as I live."

"Oh, Joseph, think better of it, and write again; if you have taken nine years to write your letter, you may allow your mother more than three days for answering it."

After the next cottage-reading, he said, "Well, I wrote again, and have got no answer. Mother has thrown me over anyhow; so I'll never write no more, to the end of my days."

"But your mother may be ill—too ill to write. What do you think of writing to your sister to inquire about her?"

"Mother ill! Ah! to be sure. I never thought of that, poor dear old soul! Well, I'll try it once again, and see what it'll fetch."

On the next Sunday evening Joseph was early at the cottage, and before the rest had assembled he handed an open letter to me. "There now, please read that, ma'am, and tell me what you think of mother. She *was* ill, bless her!"

The letter was so beautiful, that I read it, with Joseph's proud permission, to the little assembly, at the close of our Scripture reading, and the hearts of other sons responded to that Christian mother's tender and solemn appeal. It had so happened, in the awful providence of God, that the drunkard who had first led Joseph, when a boy of sixteen, to a public-house, had left a beer-shop in a state of intoxication, and had fallen into a reservoir, and was drowned. This took place the same day that Joseph's letter had caused his mother to say, in the gladness of her heart, "This my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found."

GERMAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEWS.

(*English Presbyterian Messenger.*)

EACH German state has its cheap and popular periodicals for general reading. The same necessity for diffusing information and sustaining interest on religious questions is felt there as is experienced here. But, in addition to these, Germany has reviews of long-established character, and deservedly of great influence. In our country, for various though not satisfactory reasons, theological reviews find it difficult to keep their ground. The "Presbyterian Review" and various others went down, after a longer or briefer period of struggling existence. Perhaps one explanation of this may be that such literary publications as the "North British" and the "British Quarterly," admit in every number articles that are of a theological nature; and few ministers can afford to take in more than one review. Theological reviews must look for support chiefly to professional

readers. By the way, the medical quarterlies have, in a good measure, given way in the profession to the weekly "Lancet" and "Medical Times."

The two chief reviews of Germany are the Protestant "Studien u. Kritiken," and the Romanist "Tübingen Quartal Schrift." The former has been established thirty years, the latter thirty-nine. Both are conducted under the editorship of associated divines, and contain in each number original papers on subjects of importance, and reviews of books of merit. Papers are not infrequently reprinted from either in a separate form. The reviews are chiefly of German, but occasionally of French and Italian works; in the volumes for 1857 there is not a single notice of any English book.

German Romanism is a much more respectable thing than either English or French Romanism. Southern and Rhenish Germany have remained Romanist all along. They have retained their old academical institutions, or have had additions made to them. Learning has always been valued, and partisan ultramontanism has never reached the height that it now holds both among French and English priests. The contributions to theological literature of the German Romanists are much more valuable than those of any other class of their co-religionists. No theological library can be considered complete which wants the works of Mohler, Klèe, and Hefele. The last mentioned is one of the editors and chief contributors to the "Quartal Schrift." His great forte is Church history, to which, by his painstaking edition of the "Apostolic Fathers," and his elaborate "History of the Councils," now in course of publication, he has made valuable contributions. In the volume for 1857 the most elaborate articles are from his pen. He writes upon the anathemas pronounced on Pope Honorius; upon the Monothelite controversy, two very long and learned articles, besides reviewing a quantity of publications on historical and archæological subjects. In all the writings of Professor Hefele, there is thorough knowledge of his subject, a calm and academical way of writing, and much fairness of general and incidental remark. He is always referred to by German Protestant theologians, as in Herzog's "Cyclopædia" and the reviews, with much respect. Next in ability and influence to Hefele is Dr. H. Denzinger, professor at Wurtzburg. Aberle, Kühn, and Zukrigl, all professors at Tübingen, are also contributors to the review. Its chief distinction seems to be in the department of Church history; many interesting topics connected with which have been treated during the past year. Compared with anything which either Romish England or France can produce, the "Quartal Schrift" is of high distinction and merit. Taken in connection with the "Kirchen Lexicon" of Wetzer and Welte, it shows a great amount of talent and learning possessed by the Romanists of Germany.

But we naturally feel most interested in the Protestant literature of our Teutonic contemporaries. The "Studien u. Kritiken" enjoyed the advantage of aid from Neander, Gieseler, and Lücke in their lifetime; and under the editorship of such men as Uhlmann, Julius Müller, and Nitzsch, it has not degenerated from its former reputation. We find that the excellence of its articles range over a wider scope than of its Romanist contemporary. Exegetical literature occupies an important part of its contents, and not a little light is cast upon difficult verses or passages of the Word of God. Among the most remarkable papers which have lately appeared, are two very elaborate ones from Julius Müller upon the Spirit and the Word; some by Dr. Schmidt of Strasburg on French Church history and kindred topics, and one by Auberlen on Melchizedek's priesthood. There are fewer books noticed each quarter than in the "Quartal Schrift," but the notices are more elaborate and exhaustive. Its theology, of course, is somewhat laxer than that of our incomparable standards, but the evangelical reader will seldom find anything to excite irritation in his mind.

In the enlarged appreciation of excellence under different external forms, and in all ages of the Church, the better German writers surpass all others. The theologian who is ignorant of German, works at a great disadvantage, and it were worth while to acquire the language, were it only to possess the power of reading such a review as the "Studien u. Kritiken," and such a repository of theological information as the "Cyclopaedia" of Herzog.

We may mention that Professor Hagenbach of Basle, well known by his publications on various eras of Church history, is now editing a series of the Calvinistic Reformers of the Continent, in nine volumes, with biographies and portraits, at the subscription price of five shillings a volume. The first volume, Zwingle, has already appeared, a volume of nearly 800 pages. The undertaking is well worthy of support from all German scholars.

SUMMARY OF INTELLIGENCE.

ECCLESIASTICAL AND MISSIONARY.

FREE CHURCH AT MALTA.—On the last Sabbath of the year 1857, a new Free Church was opened on this island. The Rev. George Wisely is the Pastor. The edifice is said to be elegant and commodious, and cost £3500.

SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH.—Much excitement has been awakened in the Scottish Episcopal Church, by the assertion by the Bishop of Brechin, in a charge to his clergy, of his belief in the presence, so as to be objects of adoration, of the body and blood of Christ in the communion elements. Three of the Scotch bishops—Bishops Terrot, Ewing, and Trower—have issued a protest against this view. Much correspondence has taken place among the lay members of the Church, and it is reported that a party are prepared to leave unless the Bishop's Charge be authoritatively condemned.

MISSIONS AMONG THE FRENCH CANADIANS.—It is becoming more evident, day by day, that each Protestant Church in Canada will organise and prosecute a mission among the French Canadian Romanists. The Church of England has the mission of Sabrevois; the Baptists continue their successful labors at Grande Ligne and various other stations on the South Shore of the St. Lawrence; and now the Wesleyan Methodists have intimated their intention to conduct a separate Methodist mission. The French Canadian Missionary Society remains on its general, non-denominational basis, but the movements above mentioned throw it of necessity into the hands of the Congregationalists and Presbyterians.

PRUSSIA.—The Prince of Prussia, the father of Prince Frederick William, has long been the warmest supporter of the idea of a close English alliance on the grounds of broad policy. He is also the determined opponent of that movement Romeward, which has appeared in the Protestant Church of Prussia, as well as in the Church of England. He feels that the true strength of his kingdom is to be found in the maintenance of an evangelical Protestantism, equally opposed to Rationalism, on the one hand, and high Lutheranism on the other. Already, in the short period of his regency, and with only limited powers, he has markedly indicated his tendency. He was understood to be, like the king, most friendly to the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance at Berlin.

EDINBURGH BIBLE SOCIETY.—This Association held its annual meeting on the 19th January. It was largely and influentially attended. The chairman was Mr. Adam Black, M.P. Mr. Black, in speaking of the advantages even of the silent teaching of the Bible, referred to the case of Madagascar, where the Church of God had continued to grow by its means after the banishment of the missionaries. He stated, in regard to the progress of the Society,—"During the last ten years, the circulation of the Bible by the Society has gone on every year exceeding the number of the preceding. Last year shows a larger circulation than any of the former, exceeding that of 1856 by 7466 Bibles and Testaments,—the total number being 61,687. I have only to say in conclusion, that I trust the Society will go on increasing in its labour more and more every year." The Report stated, that of these 61,687, 6489 were Gaelic, and 16,593 were copies of the English Scriptures for distribution in Ireland. A number had been sent to the colonies; 5000 copies of the German School Bible, and 10,000 tracts against the Apocrypha, had been sent to Mr. Oncken of Hamburg. The speakers were Colonel Anderson, the Rev. Dr. Thomson, the Rev. Mr. Rainy, &c.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.—Dr. Daniel Wilson, long known as the evangelical Vicar of Islington, who has occupied the See of Calcutta for a quarter of a Century, has died in a good old age. The selection of his successor will be watched with great anxiety by the friends of India Missions. No common man should be placed in the seat that has been filled by Reginald Heber and Daniel Wilson.

ORDINATION AT ST. EUSTACHE.—On Friday, 26th February, the Rev. A. Allan was ordained to the office of the Holy Ministry by the Presbytery of Montreal, and inducted into the pastoral charge of the three associated stations of St. Eustache, St. Therese de Blainville and Grande Freniere. The services of the day were conducted by the Rev. T. Henry of Lachute, Rev. A. F. Kemp of Montreal, and Rev. H. Campbell of Cornwall. A large congregation was present on this interesting and solemn occasion.

PROGRESS OF THE GOSPEL IN SYRIA.—A recent letter from Beyrout says,—Among the Armenians, the good work goes on steadily and rapidly. I may mention in reference to Antioch and Kessab, that we have the most interesting accounts of God's wonderful works among those simple and sincere minded villagers. You remember the half-dozen Protestants whom we met in Kessab, six years ago. Now, Mr. Morgan writes that there are over 500 souls in the Protestant community, and seventy-six Church members. In all the villages and hamlets around, the Gospel leaven is working powerfully.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN TUNIS.—A remarkable change has taken place in Tunis, Northern Africa, which is nominally tributary to Turkey, brought about by the influence of the British Consul-general. The Bey of Tunis has been induced to revolutionize his government by the introduction of radical reforms in favour of religious, civil and commercial liberty to citizens of every class: and on September 9, in presence of the foreign agents and residents, gave a Constitution to his country, whose provisions he, with his ministers, swore to maintain inviolate. The constitution guarantees religious liberty, with security of life and property, regarding all religious sects and ranks as equal in the eye of the law, and abolishing all exclusive privileges and immunities heretofore enjoyed by Mussulmans. By this act, this kingdom, with a population of two millions, with its fine climate and fertile soil, has taken a step which places it politically, morally and socially, in advance of many of the Christian kingdoms of Europe, and opens it to the commerce of the world.

TYRANNY IN FRANCE—The *Times* (London) has the following on the present expression of religious liberty in France:—The French Protestants are not, it would seem, allowed schools enough to carry on the education of the young members of the communion. The French law provides nominally the amplest liberty on this point; but, as a writer in the *Journal des Debats* observes, French laws take away in one part the liberties which they allow in another. The law of 1850 on primary instruction provides that every French citizen of twenty-one years of age, and furnished with a regular diploma testifying his capacity, can open a school after formally announcing his intention to do so. This is the gift, but now comes the drawback. The rector of the Academic Council of the department, or the Prefect filling the same functions, may object on the ground of "public morals." This proviso, is of course, only legally directed against a bad character in the school-master; but, once inserted in the law, it is interpreted to apply to any bad consequence whatever which may be supposed likely to follow the erection of a Protestant school. It is voted a danger to "public morals" if the Roman Catholic part of a district dislike the erection of this new school, and if therefore discord and therefore discord and irritation can be apprehended. If the priesthood of the district communicate their apprehension of this result to the authorities of the commune,—the authorities of the commune decide against the erection of the school, and the refusal is confirmed by the Academic Council. If the Minister of public instruction is appealed to, he disowns any power in the matter, and pronounces the decision of the Academic Council final. Of course, such a rule of interpretation as this, is simply to say that whatever displeases the priesthood is opposed to "public morals." But not only are the Protestants denied schools, but even places of worship. Churches raised by private subscription, and ready for use, remain unoccupied in many places, for want of the necessary authorization. The Protestants, after building their Church, come to the Mayor for this final legal form, and are told, to their astonishment, that there are no Protestants in the place, or not enough to make a congregation. What is to be done? In one case of this kind the village crier was sent round to beat up the members of the communion by "tuck of drum;" they appeared personally before the Mayor, who, being a liberal gentleman, did not deny the evidence of visible arithmetic, and granted the authorization.

LITERARY.

ARCHDEACON HARE.—A posthumous volume of Sermons preached on public occasions by this eminent English clergyman has just been published. A complete uniform edition of Julius Charles Hare's works is wanted on both sides of the Atlantic.

REPRINTS FROM BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE.—The beautiful "Seaside Studies" by G. H. Lewes which have appeared in Blackwood, are now published in a handsome volume. Mr. Eliot's 'Scenes from Clerical Life,' are also published in a separate form, and have been reprinted in cheap style in New York.

REVISION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.—This subject continues to engage attention among the more scholarly Divines of the Mother Country. A revised version of the Gospel according to John, has been prepared and published by five Clergymen of the Church of England, to show how practicable a general revision would be, with very few alterations, and no loss of simplicity and dignity of style. Other New Testament Books are to be revised in the same way by the same Clergymen, who possess very high qualifications for their task. Among the five are those celebrated Biblical Critics—Dean Alford, and Mr. Ellicott.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW.—The January number of this quarterly contains nine articles selected and original, and is a fair specimen of the Periodical. To our thinking, the best article is that which originally appeared in the Princeton Review on "Old Orthodoxy, new Divinity, and Unitarianism." There is also a long and able original paper in reply to certain remarks of the late Sir William Hamilton on the views held by Dr. Chalmers on the subject of Philosophical necessity. This paper is by the Editor, Principal Cunningham. We should have read it with more pleasure, if it had been couched in more temperate language.

HAVELOCK'S PAPERS.—General Havelock, we (Athenæum) hear, has left behind him valuable papers more or less autobiographical; papers descriptive of his feelings as a religious man engaged in war, of his mode of dealing with his troops, and of his relations to governing officials. We rejoice to hear that these papers are in good hands, and that ere long they will be in every body's hands.

A "Biographical Sketch of Sir Henry Havelock, K.C.B." is announced from the press of James Nisbet & Co. It is prepared by the Rev. William Brock, a well known Baptist Minister in London.

WELLINGTON'S DESPACHES.—The first volume of the "Supplementary Despatches and Memoranda" of the great Duke of Wellington has appeared in London. The papers are edited by the present Duke. They are so issued as to range with the first of the late Col. Gurwood's editions of the Duke of Wellington's Despatches, that being the edition which is most extensively distributed about the world. The new matter relates wholly to the career of Arthur Wellesley in India, and it is of the highest interest, the period over which it extends being that of Lord Mornington's—the Marquess of Wellesley's—Indian administration, and a considerable portion of the new matter consisting of the confidential information and advice furnished by Arthur Wellesley for his brother's use, and now placed within reach of the public by the Marquess Wellesley's executors.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.—The painful controversy in regard to the alterations made by a Committee of this Society in the old English edition of the Holy Scriptures has resulted in a return to the old paths. With the exception of the Rev. Dr. Spring, all the members of the Committee in question resigned their seats. Among these are Dr. Robinson, Dr. Vermilye, and Dr. Storrs.

The following are the resolutions carried by a large majority:—

"Resolved, That the Society's present Standard English Bible be preferred to the Standard Committee on Versions for examination; and in all cases where the same differs in the text or its accessories from the Bibles previously published by the Society, the Committee are directed to correct the same, by conforming it to previous editions printed by this Society, or by the authorised British presses; reference also being had to the original edition of the translators, printed in 1611; and to report such corrections to this Board, to the end that a new edition, thus perfected, may be adopted as the Standard Edition of the Society.

"Resolved, That until the completion and adoption of such new Standard Editions, the English Bibles to be issued by this Society shall be such as conform to the editions of the Society anterior to the late revision, so far as may be practicable, and excepting cases where the persons or auxiliaries applying for Bibles shall prefer to be supplied from copies of the present Standard Edition now on hand or in process of manufacture."