

THE  
CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE  
AND  
MONTHLY REVIEW.

Vol. II. ]

AUGUST, 1871.

[No. 10.

HAMILTON, ONTARIO:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY LAWSON, McCULLOCH & Co

May be had of H. ROWSELL; ADAM & STEVENSON; and COPP & CLARK, Toronto  
DAWSON & Co., Montreal; and all Booksellers throughout the Dominion

## CONTENTS.

### TALKS, ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.

- 1.—Books and Reading, an Essay.
- 2.—A Practical View of Ritualism.
- 3.—Sacramentarianism and Infidelity.
- 4.—Dr Dollinger, *versus* Dr. Newman.
- 5.—John Wesley and his Followers.

### THE PULPIT AND THE PARISH.

- 6.—God's Covenant with Noah, a Sermon.
- 7.—Marriage with a deceased Wife's Sister, a Scriptural Argument in reply to Mr. Punshon, and others.
- 8.—Germs of Thought.

### RELIGIOUS REVIEWS.

- 9.—Substance of the Address of the Bishop of Toronto, at the Opening of the Toronto Synod.
- 10.—Notices of the Synods.—Ritualistic Proceedings.—Church Schools.—Missions.—Miscellaneous Events.—Convocation in Great Britain. &c., &c.

---

SUNDAY SCHOOL PAPERS.—The Papers which were read at the Sunday School Convention held in Toronto, in November last, have been published in a cheap and complete form, with an Introduction, and a Synopsis of the Results, &c. They may be had on application at this office at 10 cents per copy, or \$1.00 per dozen copies. These valuable Papers should be put into wide circulation among Sunday School Teachers, and all the Members of the Church. It is hoped a large and universal demand will be made for them. Clergymen, recommend them to, and circulate them among your Teachers. All orders must be accompanied with remittances. Apply at once!

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.—In our present number we published a very valuable paper on this important subject in reply to the fallacies of the Rev. Mr. Punshon, Dr. Hodgins and others. It deserves to be very widely circulated and read, for the information it contains, and the able refutation it furnishes of a most pernicious error. We shall, therefore, reprint this paper in a separate form for general distribution. It will be sold at 5 cents per copy, or at the rate of 50 cents per dozen. Orders should be sent to this office without delay, that we know how large an edition to strike off. All orders must be accompanied with remittances. We ask the clergy to aid in giving publicity to this most useful paper. Mr. Punshon's letter has been widely published in the Newspapers. This is an effectual antidote to his poison, and should have a correspondingly wide circulation. It touches a question of biblical truth, and public morality. Brethren of the Clergy and laity, help us, therefore, in the diffusion of this paper!

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.—We request all our Subscribers who are in arrears to forward their subscriptions *at once*. This is absolutely necessary to enable us to meet our engagements. We have several times repeated this request, and are anxious to avoid a resort to legal measures. Many of our subscribers have paid within the last fortnight; but a large sum of money is still due which must be paid. Your subscription unpaid amounts to \$ \_\_\_\_\_, which please remit by return of mail.

TO OUR READERS.—Our LITERARY REVIEW, and other important articles are unavoidably crowded out. Correspondents must have patience.

THE PROPRIETOR, EDITOR, AND PUBLISHER.

# CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE,

AND

## MONTHLY REVIEW.

VOL. II.]

AUGUST, 1871.

[No. 10.]

### TALES, ESSAYS, AND REVIEWS.

#### "BOOKS AND READING."\*

##### A REVIEW.

Any one who takes up this volume with the idea that Professor Porter would write instructively and well on such a subject will not when he has finished it, lay it down disappointed. It gives abundant evidence not only of wide and careful reading, but of independent thought, and of views that are, in the best sense of the word, broad and liberal. The criticisms,—which are among the best things in the volume,—are given in fresh, unworn language. Some of them are marvels of condensation. And they commend themselves, almost without exception, as incisive, discriminating, and remarkably just.

The book would be better, we are inclined to think, if there were less of it. It appeared as a series of articles in the *Hours at Home*, and grew, as its author tells us, out of a lecture which had been often repeated. In accomplishing the perilous task of expanding a lecture to a book, there were difficulties enough without adding to them those which are peculiar to a serial publication of the chapters.

The book is full of life. It is crowded with information. One is amazed at the enormous list of books of all kinds which the author has devoured and digested, or has tasted enough to discern the flavor of them, and rejected. We have somewhat of the wonder one might experience when looking at a well-filled honey-comb if he knew every flower that the bees had visited. It is a wise, genial, and most instructive talk about all sorts of books, admirably classified, by a cultivated, scholarly man whose mind has been kept wide-awake while reading. But it begins heavily. There is a tedious knocking out of wedges, and a slow greasing of the ways before the good ship moves, and you get the pleasure of the launch. Too many things are proved which might rest on assertion. The approaches are made so formally and carefully, and with such evident anxiety to guard against attacks, that the learned author seems to be acting under the conviction that instead of writing for a host of friendly minds glad to be instructed by him, he is entering a land of enemies who are ready to fall upon him the moment he is guilty of any carelessness. The truth is, just such a thoughtful and wise counsellor in regard to this matter of "Books and Readings" is

\* Books and Reading, a series of Papers by Professor Porter.

desired by large numbers, and he may be confident of a cordial welcome.

The life and vigor of the author's own untrammelled style are seen when he actually gets to work, as in the criticism on Gibbon, and Hume, and the Reviews in chapter VI. Here, indeed, the book really begins. The first five chapters we think might, with great advantage to the volume, be condensed into a briskly moving introduction.

The volume begins to put out its tendrils and take hold upon us when it enters upon the subject of "The influence of books and reading on the opinions and principles." The discussion of this is carried through four interesting and very earnest chapters. When he speaks of reading fiction the author strikes, we judge, the golden mean. He puts into convincing form the reasons against the old-fashioned sweeping condemnation of it, while he reprobates, in most energetic and pungent words, the pernicious trash which the "dime novels," the "yellow-covered literature," and many of the serials thrust upon the public.

"Next to falling in love with one who is worthy of the first and best affections of the lover," he genially says, "should be ranked in its influence for good, the first really good novel or poem which takes a strong and permanent hold of the heart and character. There is a charm investing this ideal world for the first time unveiled to view, and a superhuman elevation in the beings who live and move in it, a purity in their tones, and a weight and sacredness in their words which hold the young reader as by a spell and lead him a delighted captive." He accepts this influence, wisely qualified, as a powerful auxiliary in waking up the minds and the hearts of the young, quickening their aspirations, and inspiring them with enthusiasm for that which is noblest and best in human life. The discriminating remarks in regard to what novels and poems should be rejected as pernicious, are replete with Christian wisdom: There is a temptation to quote offered by almost every page. And apart from the judicious advice which is given much scholarly and admirably worded criticism of prominent authors is incidentally brought into the discussion.

When he turns to speak, in passing, of the so-called "low-priced literature," he seems to hit with some hard blows others than the dime novelists and sensational tale writers. Perhaps even the popular Bret Harte might wince a little when reading some sentences among such true words as these: "Writings of this class lead men to believe that they can be rich without toil or saving; that they can be amiable and attractive, and yet be intensely hypocritical and selfish; that they can have exquisite moral sensibilities and lofty moral aspirations, that they can be profanely blasphemous, and yet fervently religious; in short that they can be successful for the present and the future life without complying with a single condition of success for either." In discussing the value of "a Christian literature" further on, the author aims a hearty blow or two in the same spirit at those pantheistic and skeptical writers who yet assert their claims to be called Christian. "The literature alone is Christian," he affirms, "which recognizes Christ as the object of trust and reverence," as "Master and Lord." It is a necessity, and no discourtesy to exclude others, and "If it is true as they insist," he sharply writes, "that those who adhere to the old faith in Christ's personality, are blind to argument and ignorant of history, that they know nothing of criticism, and are unacquainted with philosophy, it would be a matter of humanity at least to leave such to the quiet

enjoyment of their own ignorance and want of thought. If it is not discourteous to dishonor what they revere, and satirize what they respect, it is at least inhuman to make them uncomfortable. It may be condemned under the laws against cruelty to the ignorant and imbecile."

It will be seen by these extracts that the subtle infiltration of an author's own views and spirit, prevailing, perhaps unconsciously to himself, whatever work he may be engaged upon, is not resisted by the present writer. But, at least so far as his facts and his arguments go, he generally carries his readers with him.

Did the reasonable limits of such an article as this permit we should be glad to follow the professor, gleaming extracts here and there from his well-covered fields, into his discussion of "historical reading," with its trenchant criticism and its instructive direction in respect to the methods and aids by which to pursue the study of history with the greatest pleasure, and abiding advantage. We must but glance and go by. He is merciless, where he thinks it just to be so. He sympathizes thoroughly, with those who have been discouraged as historical students by their vain attempts to read the "wooden volumes," of Prideaux, "one of the dreariest and most matter-of-fact books;" or Shuckford's work—"if possible even more dreary and forbidding." He scourges soundly,—yet with a trace of sympathy which he cannot conceal,—those professed historians who have indulged in romancing. Macaulay, in his efforts "to make history minute, vivid, and effective," describing and narrating "like an impassioned advocate, with the most unsparing expenditure of contrast and epithets." Carlyle sketching "in chalk and charcoal, exhibiting his saints in ghastly white, and his demons in most appalling blackness; caricatures, bold and grotesque; but drawn with the hand of an artist. Froude, "by research, eloquence, and audacity, attempting to reverse settled historic judgments, and succeeding rather in astonishing than convincing his readers." Bancroft, whose democracy "sometimes became so emphatic and extreme as to recall to us the wretched rants of the Reds, of Paris," and whose "superficial philosophy and profound research sometimes remind us equally of the pendant and pedagogue;" and Motley, "picturing historical characters so much to the life that the impression is made of a painting for which there never was a reality;" and these he contrasts to their disadvantage with the philosophical historians, of whom Niebuhr is the father, beloved and revered.

In reading history the author advises, of course, to read with the map and a good geography at hand, and to keep the imagination at work in regard to the actors and the scenes around them. He commends the Oxford Tables, and those prepared by Dr. H. B. Smith as convenient and accurate manuals of dates, and remarks that "The Races of the Old World," by C. L. Brace, is an excellent companion in all historical studies."

In the thirteenth chapter an extended "course of historical reading" is given—the evident result of much study and careful thought. This is followed by three most readable chapters—one on Biographers, one on Novels, (he reverts to these with an evident affection), and the third on Poetry and Poets.

Two instructive chapters are devoted to "The Criticism and History of Literature"—on the book *about* books; the first general, and the other restricted to English literature. These are preceded by remarks

on "Books of Science and Duty," with an enumeration which shows how expansively these terms are used. Then comes an admirable chapter on "Religious Books and Sunday Reading;" in the course of which, among other good things, he says, "An important point will be gained when a conventional and factitious religious dialect is discarded by all good writers." And he advises buyers and readers to make it a test of the probable worth of such books that they are "free from technical or canting phraseology." "A book that does not ennoble us by aspirations of duty, and does not aid us toward God, is not a good religious book, however pious its tone." We find among the books recommended, books which relate to Theism and Christian history—a list that is "up with the times," and about some of which one is tempted to turn aside and speak his mind. Hints are given in regard to reading the Scriptures, and to aid in studying them; and the chapter closes with some wise words about books of edification and devotion. We must quote this one wholesome paragraph:

"Every reader should make a business and a conscience of having his Sunday reading intellectually profitable and stimulating as well as spiritually devout. Laziness and dawdling have no affinity with true worship, or the girding up of the inner man for the moral and religious conflicts of the coming week-days. Mysticism, pietism, and asceticism all weaken the manhood, and so bring insidious poison into the ethical and religious life. The exercise of the intellect on some question in theology, some Scriptural exposition, or Christian history, some quickening biography, or Christian poem—and doing this earnestly and systematically, is greatly to be recommended in place of the desultory meditation, the reading of goodish books, and the sometimes not even goodish religious newspapers which use up and degrade so many bright hours of so many Sundays."

After a sketchy and animated chapter on "Periodicals and Newspapers," the volume closes with some valuable suggestions in regard to collecting and arranging a library.

In the chapter on newspapers he thus draws the *Bohemian*; and had it not been written before that vivacious and dashing fellow was introduced to the world, one might think that "Jim Fellows" himself had stood for part of the picture.

"He is a person of no mean qualifications, but smart rather than solid, and apt rather than trustworthy. He has received an education more or less accomplished, from the finished classical culture of the English University, down to the scanty but stimulating curriculum of the printing and editorial rooms. He has a facile command of the pen, a good memory, a ready wit, and infinite volubility. His assurance is unbounded, and his principles and his sense of consistency never stand in the way of an engagement. He does not hesitate to write leaders at the same time in the organs of two opposing parties—for and against protection, or whatever question divides the parties of the day. He is ready for hire to applaud and to defame any man, and to extol and and depress the same man in two successive weeks, according to his engagement. He is, of course, thoroughly insincere, and he has no convictions upon a single point, and that is, that those who pretend to have any are either weakly self-deceived, or are self-conscious knaves. And yet no class of writers use the vocabulary of earnestness more fervently and impressively than he."

He acknowledges that this describes an extreme type, and a rather

perfect specimen; but some one has evidently taken both Mrs. Stowe and Professor Porter behind the same scenes.

The plan of a book-club, given on page 373, we have known to be tried with great success; and it has the advantage over a public library, in smaller places, that it can be formed of those whose literary tastes agree; that either few or many can sustain it; and that it involves the smallest possible expense over the price of the books themselves.

In closing our imperfect review of this valuable book we turn back a few pages to read some sympathetic words,—which only a lover of books could have written,—in regard to the scholar's attachment to his library. He speaks of the multiplied associations and memories which bind his heart to the familiar volumes, of the delight they have given him, and of the changes they have wrought on his mind and heart. "In an hour of musing he can read upon them the successive passages that make up the history of his life." "Many a student," he somewhat sadly writes, "will understand the desire of Prescott, that when arrayed for the grave he might be left alone in the library which has been so long the scene of his labors and the object of his zealous care."

G. A. H.

#### A PRACTICAL VIEW OF RITUALISM.

I may at once calm both hopes and fears in the breast of any eager reader by saying that I do not intend to meddle with the vexed question of what is now known as Ritualism—the extensive development of ceremonial in public worship. My humble aim is to explain simply the ceremonies or rites about which there is no dispute in the Church, for the edification of such readers as may not be versed in Ritual studies. If Churchmen had been duly instructed in such matters as well as in doctrine, it is not to be believed that all the excesses and agitations of late years would have been possible. With a mind exercised in the religious meaning of familiar ceremonial, and steadied by knowledge of fixed principles Churchmen, would not suddenly run into unmeaning excess of Ritual, nor be startled with an irrational horror at the very name, as if it were in itself an evil thing.

It would not be at all unprofitable if I were to show the deep grounds in nature on which the use of symbolical acts in God's service rests; the authority which they derive from the practice of the Christian Church; the venerable sanction which the sacred Scriptures, Old and New, give them; and the strength which they derive from all the analogies of ordered communities in civilized secular life. For the present it is enough to suggest such points to any thoughtful reader. One thing is plain—that if by rites in public worship Ritualism is meant, then the English Church is undoubtedly Ritualistic; nay, all communities of Christians. It cannot be otherwise, constituted as we are; and, for all we know, it is not otherwise even with Angels.

The question then is, not whether we shall have Ritual or not—for we can't help it; but how much are we to have? We know how variously this is answered. Some say, Let us have as much as we can; others, Let us have as little as possible: both may well be regarded as wrong; and a discreet man would say, Let us have as much as will prove a *help* to our devotion,—what may bar our sluggishness, awe our spirits, suggest right frames, raise up our minds to God, stir within us

religious affections,—but let us not have as much as shall occupy our minds, materialize our thoughts, and crush our devotional aspirations.

This principle is set out in the truly wise and admirable words of the Preface “of Ceremonies,” in the Prayer Book: “Christ’s Gospel, is a religion . . . content only with those Ceremonies which do serve to a decent order and godly discipline, and such as be apt [fitted] to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification, whereby he might be edified.

In the light of these words—too little considered—I propose explaining the meaning traditionally maintained in the Church, of such every-day common symbolism as may be seen in Churches where “Ritualism” controversially so-called is wholly unknown. First in regard to the Church, the material building.

1. Its body or main part is called the *Nave*, from “*Navis*” a ship. The Church is Christ’s ship, in which He is, though to dim eyes and fearful hearts He seems sometimes asleep on the pillow, in the hinder part of the ship, not caring that His crew are perishing. In this ship we ride over the stormy waves of this world to the land of everlasting rest. In the Church the Bishop is seen as the captain, the clergy his officers, the people as passengers.

2. The Eastern part of the Church is called the *Chancel*—so-called from “*cancelli*,” the lattice work by which, or by similar means, it was (and is in elaborate Churches) separated from the main body or nave.

In the Churches of the East the distinction is strictly kept up; in the West the ancient seclusion has been largely broken down, mainly through the instrumentality of the Jesuits, for their convenience in performing a function or service called Benediction, which was obstructed by the Rood-Screens, as these *Cancelli* came to be called. The space inside the Rood-Screen is called the *Choir*—appropriated to the singers, and to the Communicants alone of all the people at the time of reception.

The Chancel is always raised above the nave, both for convenience and dignity. It is no small honor to assist in leading the praises of the Church, and offering them to God; “while to draw near in faith, and take the Holy Sacrament,” is an honor we cannot overvalue.

3. The Easternmost part of the Chancel is called the *Sacrarium* or *Sanctuary*, though in small churches which have no regular chancel it usurps the name. This pertains to the clergy exclusively and the celebration of the Holy Eucharist—the highest act of worship.

Thus our Churches correspond to the three divisions of the Jewish Temple—the Court of the People, the Holy place for the priests, and the Holy of Holies where was the Ark, and to which the High Priest alone had access. I may also observe that in regularly constructed churches the proportions of the Temple are also observed: as the Holy of Holies was one-third of the whole length of the Temple, so is the Chancel now one-third of the whole length of the Church—or one-half the length of the nave. None can be ignorant how pleasing and effective, artistically, are such proportions.

4. I have already intimated that our chancels are built to the *East*. The antiquity and meaning of this, as well as of some other things previously mentioned, will appear by a short extract from the Apostolical Constitutions, (of the probable date A. D. 250). Bk. 2. c. 57. “When thou (the Bishop) callest an assembly of the Church, as one that is commander of a great ship, appoint the assemblies to be made with all



possible skill; charging the Deacons, as mariners, to prepare places for the brethren, as for passengers, with all due care and decorum. And first let the building be long, with its head to the East, with its vestries on both sides at the East End; and so will it be like a ship."

Describing the Holy Communion, they say: "Let all rise with one consent, and, looking towards the East, after the Catechumens and the Penitents are gone out, pray to God *Eastward*," who assended up to heaven of heavens to the East; remembering also the ancient situation of Paradise in the East, whence the first man, when he had yielded to the persuasion of the Serpent, and disobeyed the commandment of God, was expelled"—implying, apparently, that we now, by turning to the East, express our hope of restoration to it. Hence the custom which still largely survives in our church, of saying the Creed towards the East, and the General practice of burying the dead looking towards the East—all expressive of the same belief in Christ the "*Sun of Righteousness*," "the man whose Name is the East," (as it is in the Greek and Latin versions of Zech. vi. 12, where English Branch). There can be no more beautiful or vivid reminder of a supreme truth than this simple practice, and surely every stone that may serve to buttress this citadel of our religion should be sacred by preserved. Compared with this what are the trivialities about which contending factions make so much ado.

Amongst ourselves the departures from the Eastward position of Chancels are very rare, as throughout Western Christendom. The only intentional exceptions is made by the Jesuits, who always put their Chancels to the West. The reason I have not been able to discover—the fact I believe is undoubted.

5. Churches are sometimes built with *Transepts i. e.* with wings, making the ground plan cruciform. Hereby is figured Christ on the Cross—the chancel representing the Head, the transepts the arms.

6. The Sanctuary is found generally raised *three steps*, symbolizing the Trinity, which it is the aim of church architecture everywhere to stamp on the visible structure, as it is everywhere in the worship of the Church.

7. The *lofty pointed style* of architecture employed in church-building is no mere accident—a whim or fashion in use to-day and despised to-morrow. It is essentially Christian and can never be reasonably deposed from its place of honor. It is the very opposite of that heaviness and indolence, so to say, which characterize the Ancient Assyrian and Egyptian style, and of the earthliness which belongs even to the Grecian in common with them. The Gothic, now sacred specially to church building, is light and airy in its aspect, while its upward tendency points the Christian's thoughts *heaven-ward*.

8.—As on all that pertains to the crown the Royal Arms are blazoned, speaking to every eye of the ownership; so in the church should the Cross meet the eye everywhere—the Great King's mark on all that pertains to him. Each several brick of the mighty mounds of Babylon and Nineveh had the imperial name or mark stamped on it; and so the "living stones" of the City of God are each one "signed with the sign of the cross" as they are built into its "ageless walls." The Books, Font, Altar, and Vessels of the Sanctuary are appropriately stamped with this regal "sign of the Son of Man"—all teaching that "Christ Crucified" is the sum of christian faith.

9.—As our churches are surmounted by the cross, so do we often see

the *Cock* or the *Fish* on our spires. These too are christian symbols, speaking their enduring truths or their solemn warnings. The fish is the symbol of Christ, originating among the Greek christians, from I. CH. TH. U. S., the Greek word for fish, formed from the initial letters of *Jesus Christos Theou Uios Soter*, "Jesus Christ God's Son the Saviour"—to whom we are conformed by being born "of water." It was a very favourite symbol in the early ages, and constantly engraved on rings, gems, seals, &c., The *Cock* is the symbol of watchfulness and repentance—particularly the Priest's memento. The story of St. Petir explains it sufficiently.—

10.—The *Altar* or *Ho y Table* (which really mean the same thing—though some are afraid of Altar and others are afraid of Table) is made of wood, symbolizing the cross on which the great Sacrifice was slain. The Christian Church has ever said with St. Paul, "we have an altar." In every church there is one—and only one; to represent the unity of the baptized who all partake of the one Altar.

11.—The ordinary colour of the Altar-covering is properly *Crimson*, reminding us of the bloody sacrifice.

12.—The "*fair linen cloth*" with which it overlaid at the celebration of the Communion is very absurdly, in common use, like a "table-cloth," suggesting the idea of a meal. How modern linen "table-cloths" may be I don't know, but we are very sure they were not known in the days of primitive christianity. The "fair linen" should not suggest a meal, as do the customary cloths which envelope the whole Altar. The real christian meaning of this vesture it at once suggested by the name given it in the Greek liturgies, *Heileton*, the "Wrapper"; by which we see that is the memento of the "fine linen" in which Joseph of Armathda piously *wrapped* the Lord's Body in preparing it for the tomb. The same idea is represented by the Latin word for the same thing—*Corporale*. A long narrow strip, therefore, lying on the top of table, and hanging down at both ends, but not in front, is the correct and proper form. The whole ceremony serves to make us "consider the dignity of this holy mystery," and the reverence which is due to that Sacred Body which is mystically present.

13.—As the Altar is in the East, the place of special honor, so the *Font* is properly placed near the Western entrance—showing us that Baptism is the door of access to the Christian Church.

14.—The very form of the Font, which is almost universally *Octagonal*, has its deep and beautiful lesson.

The number *eight* in Scripture denotes a change to a higher state; e. g., Circumcision on the eighth day, a passing from a state of alienation into covenant with God: the Resurrection on the first or eighth day, the change from mortality into unchangeable life. In a word, eight is the number of Regeneration or New Birth; and the Font which is the appointed instrument of this typifies as much by its eight sides.

15.—In most carefully appointed churches the *Prayer Desks* do not face the people, while the *Lectern* and *Pulpit* do. The reason is on the surface: we address devotional acts and words to God, and therefore do not look at one another. Minister and people should look the same way, as engaged in the same act, the minister as the leader: but lessons and sermons are directly addressed to the people, and convenience and propriety alike demand that reader and people should face each other.

All these particulars thus named are to be found every where in our Diocese. They are the universal ritual of our Diocese.

But there is a SECOND class of subjects which also claims mention—the vestments, or technically the “Ornaments,” of the ministers or persons who officiate.

16. The *Surplice* etymologically means the garment put on over the pelisse or the garments of *skin*, which point to the Northern clime of the wearers, among whom alone the word could have originated. I say nothing now of the antiquity of the vestment. It teaches us (1) *that the individual is sunk in his office*: he may wear ermine or shoddy, but he is a Minister of God in his office, and nothing else. It teaches us (2) the *purity* which is required of those who draw near to God in holy acts. This is the symbolic meaning of white in Holy Scripture. The Elders, the Martyrs, the Redeemed, are all so arrayed “They have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb”

17. The *Stole* is the symbol of Christ’s Yoke taken upon him by the priest; and hence Deacons often wear it only over one shoulder, to show that they have not yet fully received that yoke. It is usually, though unmeaningly, black, about which there is no authoritative rule at all; and yet colored Stoles are regarded with suspicion. The Privy Council’s latest feat is to pronounce Stoles altogether illegal, though every priest in Canada wears one. Fortunately *we* need not care what that Court decrees.

18. The *Hood*, which is worn now as a mark of University distinction, was once worn chiefly on the head, corresponding to the “bonnet” of the Jewish priest. Its religious meaning is lost, and it would be rightly excluded from the house and service of God, where distinctions of learning should have no more place than any other worldly distinctions.

19. A *Black Gown* is sometimes worn in preaching, though never having any authority beyond a limited custom. It, too, is pronounced illegal by the latest judgment; but those who like it may with a quiet conscience go on using it. To them it symbolizes the difference between the work of a priest, ministering directly to God in the Church’s words, and the work of a teacher speaking in his own judgment.—(Black, however, for themselves is not a pleasant or a “attering suggestion.)

20. *Bands* are an anachronism—they are nothing but a degenerate shirt-collar, as may be seen by examining a series of old portraits in chronological order. They are of no authority, and are extensively disused among the clergy, having really nothing religious about them, and are now more worn by lawyers than the clergy.

I have now gone through just a score of points in our common Canadian Ritual; and I trust that hereby some of my readers may find their thoughts directed on future Sundays into edifying channels, and our simple Ritual made more interesting and profitable to them. It would be easy to enlarge on every topic, but I have aimed at simplicity verging on baldness, for the sake of more perspicuity and easier remembrance.

J. C.

#### SACRAMENTARIANISM AND INFIDELITY.

The notorious Baptist preacher, Spurgeon, in a sermon on the eve of the day set apart by the Baptists of London for special prayer, thus delivers his verdict upon the state of the Church and Non-conformity, respectively, in England:—“*The Church of England seems to be eaten through and through with SACRAMENTARIANISM; but Non-conformity seems to be almost as badly riddled with philosophical INFIDELITY. Those, of whom*

we thought better, are turning aside one by one from the FUNDAMENTALS of the faith. Through and through, I believe the very heart of England is HONEY-COMBED with a damnable infidelity which dares still to go into the pulpit and call itself Christian."

Whenever Mr. Spurgeon is thrown off his guard, and forgets his slavery to the ideas of Dissent, his opinion is valuable: for, upon such occasions he is able to perceive the true state of affairs, and couches the statement of his observations in singularly telling and effective language. Most of us, no doubt, remember the impulsive indignation of his rejoinder in the *American Independent*, to those who had insinuated that he was building up around him an "*imperium in imperio*,"—a sect of Spurgeonites within the sect of Baptists; for he characterized the invention of new sects as pre-eminently "the Devil's work," and declared that he would do none of it. Again, with what forcible, though somewhat rough, terms did he a few years ago inveigh against the whole evangelical party in the Church as a pack of liars and dissemblers, intruding upon the precincts of that which was the true home only of the High Churchmen—the Church of England. In a similar manner, now he dashes aside the trammels of his sect and position; and, gazing earnestly upon the field of English religious life from an impartial stand-point, perceives in the two contending sections an *absorbing movement*, different in each case, steadily and rapidly gaining the supremacy—Sacramentarianism in the Church, Infidelity in the sects.

Now, let us bear in mind that "Sacramentarianism" is the term which was originally applied to the following of Wesley in his Oxford movement, and that it was used synonymously with "Methodism," because that movement had for its principle the *exact and regular* compliance with the requirements of Sacramental life in the Church—the *methodical* observance of the rites and ceremonies of the Church; and we have the basis for comparison of those two movements. We perceive them at once to be directly antagonistic and subversive of one another. The system of Sacramentarianism has for its essential ground, *faith in the unseen*: Infidelity has faith only in the visible,—believes only so far as the senses of the body can reach and feel. Sacramentarianism is the very intensification of Christianity, the most exalted and perfected degree of its profession: Infidelity, of course, is the utter subversion of Christianity. The Christian life, then, of the Church, according to Spurgeon's verdict, is becoming intensified; that of Non-conformity is being destroyed. The stiff, dull, dry and stale substance which, fifty years ago, was the *bete noir* of all vital religion, is now permeated with intense life and vigour, while the boneless fabric of Non-conformity is "riddled" and "honey-combed" with the death of Christian thought and feeling.

How natural it should be so! "Evangelicalism" in Church and Non-conformity outside of it were an attempt at *moral purification*, "Methodism" in the Church and afterwards outside of it was an attempt at *exact-performance* of religious duties and *systematic regulation* of practical Christian life: but the former in order to be complete required the *Sacramentarianism* of the latter, and the latter in order to be complete required a natural and normal *development* in its proper sphere of action. The former lies withered and helpless within the Church and riddled with Infidelity outside the Church, the latter has thrown itself out of the Church and assumed a hard formality as devoid of vital force as the other. Meantime, there has gone on the movement to

which these others had given impetus and the Church has gained by experience what the sectarian principle has lost for want of its permanency and abiding strength. The present propagators of Sacramentarianism in the Church are equal to the leaders of the Evangelical and Methodist movements in their best points, and have gathered up into their system all the excellence of the other two, while careful of avoiding errors and making up their deficiencies. The first movement took a low view of the nature and obligation of the sacraments as of lifeless and graceless ceremonies, and laid all its stress upon the inner principle of faith, actually (though very absurdly and unnaturally) neglecting and contemning 'God's works' for fear of eclipsing by them and their energetic exercise the paramount importance of faith: and the system very naturally and properly withered away and dried up, as the limb for want of proper exercise, their faith itself becoming a lifeless residuum at last. The second system rejoicing in the bare and simple performance of religious duties in their external form, has forgotten the necessity of faith to enliven their works, and is becoming hardened into a mere petrification. While the third movement starting from the grand principle of faith in the invisible develops and embodies this faith in the exercise of Sacramentals and other good works of a Sacramental nature, *fixing the colours*, so to speak, meanwhile by the full employment of all the senses in the harmonious Service of God: Thus have been brought into the temple of worship as appropriate manifestations and expressions of *faith* all that is lovely and of good report,—the love of music, the love of painting and sculpture, the love of beauty's unerring shape, have been harnessed in the Chariot of the Soul, and with boundless exultation and exuberant vitality the movement progresses.

Whilst reviewing and using the testimony of Spurgeon, we must remember that it is the testimony of an adversary, who does not at all approve of "Sacramentarianism," because as a sectarian bigot he has been accustomed to look upon *all* outward forms and expressions as *mere* forms and expressions—the natural effect of blind prejudice.—Spurgeon and all the other heterogeneous crowd of anti-sacramentarians are, without realizing it, so many imitators of S. Symeon Stylites who have a fancy for standing motionless, emotionless and expressionless, on their several pillars, with no more indication or exercise of life or feeling than a statue or a machine. It is no wonder that the human mind should revolt against such unnatural restraint, and plunge headlong into infidelity for relief and relaxation; so that Spurgeon's verdict is sadly true that "Nonconformity seems to be almost as badly riddled with infidelity" as the Church (on the other hand) is thoroughly pervaded with Sacramental life and energy.

Further, should we leave out of sight altogether for the nonce, this testimony from the enemy, we have abundant evidence of the essential antagonism between the Sacramentarians and Infidels in England. No fact lies more upon the surface and patent to observation in England to day than this: That while the residue of the old "Evangelical" party in England, with all the power of Sectarianism to help it, is making a persistent onset against the Sacramentarians in the "Ritualistic prosecution," &c., the Sacramentarians have penetrated into the very depths of English social life, and there are contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints! The lowest strata of English society are composed of the natural sediments from those classes where, hereto-

fore, Evangelicalism as the "vital religion" of its day, had full sway: and there amongst the working and indigent classes infidelity runs riot perhaps even more than in those classes where *philosophical* infidelity of a more abstruse kind is cultivated. Whilst Sacramentarianism is, with superhuman energy and heroic self-sacrifice, stemming the tide of irreligion amongst the masses, of all grades of society, and whilst those who advocate and practice it are carrying on a crusade of unexampled importance and difficulty with concentration of all their powers—the miserable cynics to whose stupid perversion of Christian principles all these fearful evils are owing, persecute the crusade with merciless malignity, as if conscious that the attack might more properly, and may yet, be made upon the cause *rather* than the effect, upon the *loose principles* of nonconformity, whether within or without the Church, rather than upon the "damnable infidelity" which finds a congenial climate in the matrix of that system, burrows there as a worm in a hotbed, and, as Spurgeon puts it, "honeycombs the heart of England."

Surely when the blindest "leaders of the blind" begin to perceive the precipices and pit-falls of their own invention and choice, those whose eyes have mercifully been opened may fearlessly go on with their work of making straight in the desert a highway for our God, lest when He cometh He should not find faith on the earth. R. H.

#### DR. DOLLINGER vs. DR. NEWMAN.

The University of Oxford, on Tuesday, the 6th of June, conferred the degree of D. C. L. on Dr. DOLLINGER. It had been previously ascertained that this mark of honor would be acceptable to the eminent theologian who is now under the ban of his Church. We learn from the *Guardian* that it was impracticable for Dr. DOLLINGER to visit England and receive the degree in person at Oxford. He is now engaged in finishing a work on Papal Infabillibility; and he also considers it a solemn duty to remain at Munich during the struggle which his excommunication has occasioned throughout the Roman Catholic portion of the German empire. The same paper draws a striking contrast between the German Professor who braved the shock of Papal hostility, and the Anglican pervert whose voice has been so strangely silent during this last year of momentous strife.

The development of Ultramontanism has caused Dr. Dollinger to modify his views on several points of ecclesiastical importance, and among these points is the position of the Church of England. His opinion on Anglican orders, for example, is very different from that published three years ago, in a somewhat querulous manner, by Dr. Newman. We have heard, indeed, that Dr. Dollinger expressed his amazement at the kind of argument with which Dr. Newman sought to bow the validity of Anglican orders out of court; and that he even went so far as to declare that, tested by that argument, Dr. Newman's Anglican orders were a good deal safer than his Roman. This is an instance of that fearless assertion of what he believes to be the truth, regardless of all consequences to any preconceived theory, which is so grand a feature in Dr. Dollinger's character. His faith in the omnipotence of Divine Truth, and in the promise of Christ to defend His Church against the gates of hell, is so firm and unflinching that he has

no fear of any test which science may apply. This is one characteristic distinction between himself and Dr. Newman. The latter's love of truth is as unquestionable as Dr. Dollinger's; but his faith is much weaker. He is ever distrusting his own hold on the truth, and is always fencing himself round with safeguards against the possible inroad of doubts. His mind is essentially rationalistic, and it was by a purely rationalistic process, not by an act of faith, that he became a Roman Catholic. He committed himself to the guidance of a subjective theory, and made up his mind beforehand to follow whithersoever that theory might lead him. While he remained in our Communion he was restlessly inventing one theory after another by way of logical basis for the English Church, and whenever he discovered any flaw in his argument his mind became tortured with doubts, not as to the validity of his theory, but as to the Catholicity of the Church of England: "As soon as I saw the hitch in the Anglican argument, during my course of reading in the Summer of 1839, I began to look about for some ground which might supply a controversial basis for my need" Confessions like this are strewn thickly over the pages of the *Apologia*, and they go far to explain the comparative failure of one of the finest intellects of our generation. What he said in his early Oxford days of St. Gregory Nazianzen is eminently true of himself: "Thou couldst a people raise, but couldst not rule." Few men have been so well fitted as he to kindle into life a great movement, and it must be added that few men have been so ill adapted to guide them to success. A man who is always casting about him for reasons to justify his position; is sure to sow doubts in the minds of his followers; and so it happened that Dr. Newman; without in the least intending it, unsettled a great many of the noblest minds which he himself had trained; so that some have taken refuge in the lowest depth of Ultramontanism, while the others have drifted away on the broad waste of a blank and cheerless skepticism. This disposition to take a thoroughly subjective and rationalistic view of great theological questions has deprived Dr. Newman of all influence in the controversy which has been agitating the Roman Communion so fiercely during the last couple of years. Our readers will remember Dr. Newman's letter to Bishop Ullathorne, last Summer. In that letter Dr. Newman stigmatized the promoters of Papal Infallibility "as an insolent and aggressive faction," and did not hesitate to express his conviction that if they succeeded in getting the question defined as an article of faith, it would be because God saw fit "to delay the triumph of His Church for centuries." And yet he rested his opposition to the dogma, not on its objective falsity, but on the difficulties which he, John Henry Newman, would have subjectively in reconciling it with some awkward facts of ecclesiastical history.

And so it came to pass that the voice which would have commanded universal and respectful attention in England, has been silent in a controversy the most important that has occupied the minds of men for generations; and Dr. Dollinger has occupied in England, not less than in Germany, the place which all men expected Dr. Newman to fill. The temptation of the one, all through his life, has been to spin out theories, and then look out for facts and illustrations to support them. Dr. Dollinger, on the other hand, started with a firm grasp of truth and an unshaken faith in the Catholic Church, and he reads history without the smallest misgiving that either his own subjective faith or the objective truth on which it gazes will suffer from anything that history may chance to unfold.

## JOHN WESLEY AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

The *Church Times* thus discourses upon a subject which we commend to our reader's attention.

The gross unfaithfulness of modern Wesleyans to their founder, is singularly illustrated in the very copy of *The Watchman* from which we have borrowed the statistics. Thus in a notice of a work by Mr. Enoch Mellor, on Baptismal Regeneration, the editor says, that the writer has well vindicated his claim to the title of Dr. in Divinity, which he has just received; and that he has fairly grappled with the leading writers on the High Church side—adding:

"We cannot but regard," says Dr. Mellor, "with undissembled sorrow and apprehension, the diffusion of such a theology in our country, as a retrogression towards the darkness and bondage from which the Reformation delivered us;" and he is right.

Now, as the theology in question—at all events so far as Baptism is concerned—is identical with that of John Wesley, minister and editor alike regard the spread of their own genuine creed with grief and alarm! A still more remarkable passage occurs in a notice of Mr. Dutton's reprint of *The Eucharistic Manuals of John and Charles Wesley*.

"We can have no conceivable objection to the re-publication of those hymns; nor indeed to the reprinting of extracts from Thomas a Kempis and Dr. Brevint, if it shall so please the editor and publisher. But we protest against this being done in the interest of the High Church party (!) When Mr. Dutton declares that, had Wesley "lived in our time, there can be no reasonable doubt that he would have been, if not in the vanguard of the Catholic movement, at least an earnest worker for the restoration of all Catholic privileges," we take serious objection; and declare our belief that he would have been the stout and uncompromising opponent of the unscriptural pretensions of the priestly party in the Church of England. He would have maintained more strenuously than ever a *spiritual* in opposition to a *ritual* Christianity. The Ritualist must keep his hands off John Wesley."

But why? If John Wesley declares himself in his writings to be a High Churchman, a member of the "priestly party," a Ritualist, and so forth, why must the evidence be suppressed, and why should his memory be defamed by people who affect to be his "sons?" Really, the Conference seem to consider the original Wesleyans in the light of wax-work puppets, and themselves as their proprietors with a right to dress them up in any character they choose. Certainly John Wesley figuring in the character of a Dissenter is a more outrageous metamorphosis than any that was undergone by that famous and versatile American statue which did duty for Wm. Penn, Napoleon Bonaparte, the Duke of Wellington, the Benicia Boy, Mrs. Cunningham, the Pirate Hicks, and various other noted persons.

But the policy of the Conference and of *The Watchman* daring as it is, and successful as audacity commonly proves, will not do. Messrs. Holden, Urlin and Dutton have ample reason to be satisfied with the success of their reprints; and we hope our readers will feel it a religious duty to circulate those works. It would not be a bad thing if Mr. Holden would prepare a short tract, setting forth the general results of his book, *John Wesley in Company with High Churchmen*, for wholesale distribution amongst rulers of the sect. Common honesty and reverence for the memory of a really great and good man, demand one of two things



—either that the Wesleyan societies should be restored to their original character, or that they should cease to call themselves either “Wesleyans” or “Methodist.” If they want a new name, that of “Connexionalists” would be appropriate and inoffensive. Above all things it would not involve a libel on the name they pretend to honour.

## THE PULPIT AND THE PARISH.

### THE TOKEN OF GOD'S COVENANT WITH NOAH.

“I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token,”—Gen: IX-13.  
“A faithful witness in heaven.”—Ps. LXXIX-37.

Since then, and from what has been stated in a former number of this magazine, it appears from the definitions and general accounts which we have in scripture of the several covenants made by God with man, that there are, strictly speaking, no more than two; the first made with Adam before he fell, and the second made with him after his fall, the question arises, What position does the covenant which God made with the children of Israel at Mount Sinai, hold with respect to these two main covenants, since it appears to be spoken of in many parts of Scripture, in such terms and so applied to the second covenant, as if it were not only the first covenant, but that it was then first made? To meet this enquiry, it must be borne in mind that what is called the covenant which the Lord made with the children of Israel in the wilderness, is, properly speaking, no distinct covenant, being neither the first nor the second, but compounded of both, but chiefly of the first. It was in reality given to the Jews rather as a law than as a covenant; the statute part or law itself with the sentence of death against every wilful offender, continuing in full force to condemn the guilty as criminals and rebels, without any clause of mercy and grace to save and forgive the penitent, for so the sanction of the law of Moses runs, “burned be he that confirmeth not all the words of the law to do them,” Deut. xxvii, Gal. iii, 10. Wherever, then, we find in the writings of the prophets or in any other books of the Old Testament, any offers of mercy or any promises of pardon, as tendered to the Jews on their repentance, *this* we are to look upon as a clause borrowed from the second or gospel covenant, in order to mitigate the severity of the *first*, or covenant of works. Hence, when we say, that the covenant given to the Jews was the first, in its full vigor, according to the words of the law, but mitigated elsewhere to a milder sense, we are naturally led to the conclusion, that God did not revive the first covenant, the covenant of works, for the purpose of condemning them for not performing what man, in his state of perfection, had not been able to do, and what, therefore, in his present fallen condition, was become much more impossible to perform; but we are rather to infer that it was to drive men, by a sense and conviction of such inability, to take hold of

the second or gospel covenant, which had before been offered to us, on and through the mediation of our Redeemer and Saviour Jesus Christ. Viewed in this light, the law served only as a schoolmaster to lead us to Christ, not so much to condemn, as to compel us to fly to him for refuge from the rigor of the law, or first covenant, to the second or Christian covenant, according to its full extent and peculiar privileges.

Hence it is evident that the second covenant here renewed with Noah, is from the beginning the very same, and no other than that which was made with our common head and ancestor after his violation of the first, and so extends to all mankind as a standing act of grace and indemnity against the pains and penalties incurred by the infraction of the first, that is therefore, the only ground of our hopes, and the common charter of our peace and salvation—the very title deed, by which the grant and purchase of our heavenly inheritance is secured to us. Hence it is plainly seen that this covenant with Noah and his posterity contains not only an unspeakable comfort but suggests instructions of infinite use and importance, whether we consider it with respect to him who speaks, or with respect to Noah and his family spoken to; for it leads us to and unfolds some of the chief principles of the doctrine of Christ, as well as the constitution of his Church, together with the inestimable benefits thereby entailed on all mankind.

As to the person speaking, it is no other than the Messiah, or Son of God; the same who made the covenant of peace with Adam, and here renews it with Noah. His calling it *his* covenant shows plainly that it was not the first, but the second covenant—not the covenant of works made with him at the creation, but the covenant of grace made with Adam after the fall, and by which we are now saved, even the gospel of salvation—for strictly and properly speaking, this second covenant is the covenant of the Son, because, by his mediation, it was obtained of God the Father, on the behalf of men, and is here renewed by him; whereas the first was that of the Father, being founded in the nature and essential properties of God and man, and their mutual relation to each other—of God as the Creator and sovereign lord—of man as a dependent creature—but the second covenant is founded solely on the free grace and mercy of God towards fallen man, that is on the mediatorial scheme of our redemption by Jesus Christ. Wherever in Scripture, therefore, we find it called the Lord's covenant, or as the Lord here calls it, *my* covenant, it has an immediate reference to God as the author, and mediator of this better covenant, by which life and immortality are brought to light. We are also to consider Noah, the person spoken to, but not in his private capacity only, but in his public character, as a second Adam, the head and representative of all mankind; and so becoming the typical figure of Christ, the new man, who was to restore that life to the world, which had been lost by the first—consequently Noah is appointed the depository of the second covenant by

which the great reconciliation is conveyed and secured to him, and his posterity. In that respect he became the type of the ministers of Christ, to whose custody the sacred covenant is committed, both for the saving of their own souls, and the souls of others. That the benefit of this act of grace, thus renewed and continued, was to extend to his posterity appears evident. First, by God's admitting his whole family into the ark, and thereby preserving their lives; and in the next place, to prevent any doubt of the divine favor to his whole posterity, the clause of preservation is enlarged "to him, and his sons, and his seed after him." Wherefore, as the grant is general, and without any limitation or reservation, except what necessarily results from the terms of the covenant itself, that is the terms and conditions on our part, and as God, under the gospel, has likewise declared "that he would have all men to be saved," no one can justly impute to him the failure of his salvation. On his part of the covenant God has never failed, nor ever will; the default is wholly on the side of man. Some when the holy sacrament is offered to them, reject it, and so forsake their own mercy. Others enter into it, but neglect the terms, and so forfeit their right and title to all the benefits of it. With respect to those who never had the opportunity of having it proposed, even they perish by their own fault, for they are not excluded from all share in the divine goodness in certain cases. To charge, therefore, the final loss of any man on any secret decree, or exception on God's part, must be, not only groundless, but highly impious, and a profane impeachment of the veracity, as well as the goodness of God, who has here and in many places of Holy Scripture, published his act of grace, and good will to men in the most unlimited and comprehensive manner.

Now, as faith is absolutely necessary to entitle us to the benefit of God's promises, and the only means by which we can take hold of the covenant of grace, so, in condescension to our own weakness, and to confirm the general grounds of our belief that "our faith fail not," he did not leave mankind to his mere promise of mercy when he renewed his covenant with Noah and Abraham; neither are succeeding generations, who have an interest in it, but were not present at the making of it, left to the sole authority of his written word in this important and general transaction. He added a sacramental sign—a visible, and perpetual token to be a standing pledge and assurance of his mercy, and to attest his promise. For this reason, we may presume that, by what the scriptures call his testimonies, are meant visible tokens of a similar kind. For, we find it has ever been God's ordinary method when he has either promised or conferred on men any conspicuous blessing, to confirm his gift by the addition of some sign or visible testimony. Thus at one time the rainbow, at other times a bush, a furnace, a fleece, the cloud, the ark, &c., and more especially the two sacraments of the passover and circumcision to the Jewish, and of baptism and the Lord's Supper in the Christian Church.

If the rainbow is a beautiful object to the bodily eye, how much more must it be to the eye of faith which contemplates the exceeding great and precious promises of that blessed covenant of which it is the seal and token. This is the covenant by which we are now saved, not only from the deluge of waters, but from eternal death—it is the charter of all our blessings and privileges—it extends to this world and to the next—to the happiness of this life and that which is to come. This sacred covenant as has been already observed, has had three seals set to it at different times. Its first seal, the rainbow, was affixed to it when renewed to Noah; that of circumcision when it was re-established with Abraham; the last, of baptism, by Christ himself when he perfected and fully executed this divine instrument in his own person. The first denotes its most comprehensive latitude, extending its salutary and beneficent effects to every creature, as far as any creature is an object capable of the divine mercy, and we may, with certainty conclude, that no man, much less any number of men, were excluded, as predestinarians, maintain, from the benefit of this heavenly act of grace, since the very animals, and “every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth,” and even the very earth itself, are entitled to this benefit according to their respective natures. As they all shared in the curse, and suffered by the fall of man, they are now made partakers of his blessing in virtue of this covenant of reconciliation. For this reason, the seal of the rainbow has never since been broken, nor destroyed; but remains to this day, and ever will stand as “a faithful witness in heaven,” that “the Lord preserveth both man and beast,” and that his tender mercies are over all his works. And to express this in the most extensive and conspicuous manner, it still continues to appear when “the Lord bringeth a cloud over the earth.” Though the thick, and dark cloud may seem to represent his anger and menace our sins with punishment, as it did the old world before the flood, yet his bow, which he sets therein is intended to assure us that “in the midst of judgement he remembers mercy”—that he still remembers the covenant between him and every living creature of all flesh.” And it is worthy of our observation that wherever the bow is spoken of in Scripture, it is always in the way suggested by this transaction by Noah, as a token of returning grace after floods of judgment. Thus the prophet Ezekiel, when he describes the coming of the Lord in a time of great backsliding and apostacy, though accompanied by many circumstances to terrify and alarm, yet, at the same time, to inspire confidence, tells us that there was “the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain.” It was an assurance that the judgements, however severe they might be, were not to be of an exterminating kind, but would terminate in a state of peace and tranquility. Thus also the rainbow round about the throne, seen by St. John, carried along with it the same gracious import. It mitigated, as it were, the severity of the thunder and lightnings that

proceeded from the throne, and foretold a reign of peace when the storm of indignation should be past.

To lead us to a more practical consideration of this token of Noachian covenant, the wise man suggests, that its admirable form and composition suddenly emerging from the dark cloud, and spanning the distance between heaven and earth, ought, not only naturally, to excite curiosity, but to carry us beyond the material or natural cause to the final, and induce us to praise the Maker of it. "Look," he says, "upon the rainbow, and praise him that made it; very beautiful it is in the brightness thereof. It compasseth the heavens about with a glorious circle, and the hands of the Most High have bended it." *Eccles* xliiii-ii. Its very appearance calls upon us, not only with profound veneration to admire this glorious work of God, but with the most devout sentiments of gratitude and love, to adore and praise the goodness of the Most High for his condescension to the frailty and febleness of our fallen nature in thus confirming his word and blessing to us by a visible testimony. Though obliged to live by faith, and not by sight, yet we are more apt to live by sight, than by faith, more affected with what we see with our bodily eyes, than what we read or hear—more touched with gross and carnal things, than with those of the spirit. The sacraments, then, which are the pledges and tokens of his covenant are the remedies which his wisdom has provided for our infirmity. And though our pride may reject the aids which our weakness stands so much in need of for its cure and support, though we, like froward children may refuse, or despise the assistance we require, and think it unnecessary to accept the pledge, and receive the earnest of his love; and even, go so far as to reject the very means he has appointed for begetting and strengthening our faith, by which alone we can apprehend and savour of his love, yet we are assured that Almighty God remains fixed and unalterable in all his designs of grace towards us. "For this," saith he, *Isaiah* liv, 9, "is as the waters of Noah unto me; for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah shall no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I will not be wrath with thee, nor rebuke thee; for the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord, that hath mercy on thee." Above all, this token of the covenant of God's peace with the earth calls upon us to admire, and adore the goodness of our great Redeemer, for that legacy of infinite love which he has left us in the Holy Eucharist. His institution of that blessed sacrament was his last will and testament by which he bequeathed to all believers the inestimable benefits of this second covenant. "This covenant of grace and mercy he had made with Adam, renewed with Noah, Abraham and the patriarchs, confirmed by types and very solemn rites to Moses, and the children of Israel; and now he executes the same in person. At his last supper he signed it with his hand, his disciples being witnesses present; on the cross he sealed it with his blood, and to all believers who are duly admitted into this holy covenant, he delivers it as his own act, and deed at his holy table as often as they approach it with true faith and humble penitence.

M. B.

## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

A BIBLE ARGUMENT, WITH IMPORTANT FACTS LONG OBSCURED.

BY A CLERGYMAN.

It is the fate of truth as well as of morality to be opposed in an evil world, and this not altogether without advantage to both. For as purity becomes purer and more beautiful through conflict, so it is also with truth. What St. Paul says of persons is equally applicable to doctrines: "There must be also heresies amongst you, that *they* which are approved may be made manifest among you." (1 Cor. xi-19). So must there be erroneous teachings, that God's truth may be made manifest—clearer to the intellectual and spiritual apprehension, and more illustrious and attractive too. Such indeed has been the history of many essential articles of the Christian creed.

It is only of late years, however, that the present subject has been brought into the region of controversy. Few points of doctrine or morality have enjoyed such undisturbed repose for eighteen centuries; and now that the enemy would unsettle the rule in which Christians have hitherto so calmly acquiesced, we may be assured that the Great Head of the Church will overrule the attempt for good, will bring out into stronger relief the antagonism of His holy truth to the sensuality of the world, and will give new point and force to the Church's testimony. Happily, therefore, the movement in the mother country, as is well known, has been the work of a very small but very wealthy clique, who have literally lavished gold in furtherance of their selfish object. But, thank God, they meet with a very determined front. The great bulk of English Churchmen are against any alteration of what is and has been the law of the Church and the law of the land, and which forbids a man to marry his deceased wife's sister. The Presbyterian bodies are all pledged against it. The Roman Catholics are immovably opposed to it; and only a certain portion of English Nonconformists, with some loose and worldly-minded Churchmen, are to be found to give it any shadow of religious support.

Some confident boasting is occasionally heard of the favour accorded to the proposed change by the popular voice, as expressed in the Imperial Legislature. The following useful history of the Marriage Bill is given by the *Saturday Review*:

"The measure first reached the Lords in 1850, when it was rejected without a division. In 1851 it was introduced in the Lords and lost by 50 to 16. In 1856 the Peers rejected it by 43 to 24. In 1858 it was refused by the same House by a majority of 46 to 22, and again in 1859 by 49 to 39. In 1870 the Lords were taken by surprise, and it was thrown out by 77 to 73. And this year it was rejected by a majority of 26, so constituted that if every one of the Bishops who voted against the Bill had given it their support they could not have saved it. This alone must show the irrational nature of the present agitation. Nor has the history of the measure in its House of Commons been more intelligently significant of a mature opinion in its favour. It was first proposed in 1842, but rejected by 123 to 100. In 1849 it was read a second time by 177 to 143, but lost in Committee. In 1850 it was again read a second time by 182 to 136. In 1855, the majority on the second reading was 164 to 157. In 1858, the majority on the second reading was 176 to 134. In 1859, the numbers were 135 to 77. In 1861 the second reading was lost by 177 to 172. In 1862 it passed by 144 to 133, but was rejected on the motion that the Speaker do leave the chair by 148 to 116. In 1866 it was rejected by 174 to 154. In 1869 it passed the second reading by 243 to 144. but was afterwards lost in Committee. In

1870 it passed into Committee by 184 to 114. This year the majority in the Commons was 125 to 84, or only 41, and on the proposal to abolish the retrospective clause, for which the promoters principally care, the majority was only 35. It is therefore without the slightest foundation in fact that the advocates of the measure speak of its rejection by the Lords as "in the face of increasing majorities in the Commons."

The first sounds of the conflict at Home, whose history is thus summarized, have at length reached us. The notes of opposition have been heard in our Synod; the glove has been thrown down in even a Church Newspaper, which has strangely admitted a series of arguments against the Church's law by the principle breaker of that law in this country—no less a person than the President of the Wesleyan Conference! while not a word of reply has appeared since. The general contempt for religious as opposed to secular law which characterizes the looseness of Colonial populations, and our familiarity with the tremendous laxness of the Marriage Laws of the United States, must, in the nature of things, precipitate a struggle between the Church and the World at no distant day: while it is to be deeply deplored that the law of Ontario appears so very dubious as to invite wilful persons to contract alliances which not even it, any more than the Divine Law, approves. The case seems to be this, according to the fullest judgment of our Courts: The marriage of a man with a deceased wife's sister stands good, and the issue legitimate, if no objection is made *ab extra*, by a third party, during their life-time: otherwise, that is, in case of objection, the union is invalid, the issue illegitimate. Of course, too, the will of either of the parties dissolves the union.\* And we are told that this is a marriage? and that the law of the Church is against the law of the land! Surely it is utterly ridiculous to call that union a *marriage*, either from a legal or a Christian point of view, which depends on the mere forbearance of non-objectors, or which either of the two parties may dissolve at their own bare will! At the utmost the law simply *connives* at such unions, and it may be too surely conjectured that that connivance will be largely abused.

These several points being taken into account, we have abundant cause for, (perhaps not alarm, but certainly for), being on our guard; for furbishing our weapons; for awakening Clergy and Laity to the importance of the crisis, and seeing that all are alike furnished with the knowledge of those grounds on which we must defend one of the most important citadels of Christian morality.

The divine authority of the One Law-giver is that to which Christians must mainly defer; while we thankfully feel that there are man, subsidiary considerations of the very greatest weight, and which might

\*Vid. the decision of V.C. Esten, Chancery Reports: (Grant's) Vol. ix. p. 305. The Law, as I have since observed, is not dubious, and gives very little encouragement to these incestuous unions. The reason why a marriage "void," "unlawful," and "voidable" at the time of its contracting and during the lives of both parties to it, could not be "avoided" after the death of either, is thus stated by the Y.C.: "After the death of either of the parties the temporal courts, which have no jurisdiction themselves, will not regard every marriage *de facto*, as good until it is declared void by the ecclesiastical courts, and must permit them to declare the marriage void after the death of one of the parties, when their sentence can have no effect on the marriage itself, it being already dissolved by death, and its only effect will be to bastardize the issue. The result is, that after the death of the parties, the marriage is valid and the issue legitimate *de facto*, but not *de jure*." This is said as to England and Scotland; but as to the case before the V.C., he goes on to say, "It must be recognized as a marriage *de facto*, by the temporal courts until annulled by sentence of the Ecclesiastical courts, which could only be done during the life-time of both parties to it. But this is clearly the law of this province. It cannot be doubted that the marriage in question in this case was unlawful and void at the time of its celebration, and could have been annulled by the sentence of the Ecclesiastical court been so annulled, it has become indissoluble, and the children springing from it are to all practical purposes absolutely legitimate."

well suffice to restrain us from the exercise of liberty in the present case even supposing such liberty were distinctly not against the Divine Law. All these points, doubtless, will in due course receive ample recognition, as the subject is more and more discussed; but the Divine Law, as ever understood in the Church, must always hold the principal place, and be the sheet anchor of all our arguments. I think, therefore, that it is but logical and reverent to address myself to this part of the subject first, endeavouring, as shall be my aim, to present the Bible argument fairly and without disguise; and more particularly as some very important illustrations lately fell in my way, which I am quite sure are unknown to the bulk of Bible-readers.

It is only too possible that those to whom the subject is unfamiliar may find some little difficulty in following the argument, in spite of my efforts to be plain; but the very fact of wide discussion shows that there must be some difficulty to afford to scope for it. Readers must not be disconcerted at this: the rule stands for soul as well as body, "in the sweat of thy face shall thou eat bread."

I. First, then, I shall clear away an objection which is made the most of at the very threshold. It is generally assumed that Levit. XVIII. 18 specially refers to the marriages in question: "Neither shall thou take a wife to her sister, (*margin*, one wife to another), to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her lifetime." (I add a literal rendering of the Hebrew, as it will be useful for reference: "*And a woman to her sister thou shall not take, to rival, to uncover her nakedness, besides her, in her life.*")

1. It is argued that as the marriage is forbidden with a special restriction, "*in her life,*" therefore it is lawful when that restriction is removed, nay, that it is almost suggested.

To this it may well be replied (1) that such a mode of reasoning is in general highly dangerous and uncertain—to conclude that things are sanctioned or approved by law, if they are only not expressly forbidden! For example, I say to a servant whom I have detected in a theft, "As long as you are in my employ never steal again." May he justly conclude that when *not* in my employ he has my full approbation for theft? So it by no means follows that, because a man *may not* take his wife's sister in marriage while his wife is alive, he may marry his wife's sister when his wife is dead. Hooker exhibits his "judiciousness" in the observation—"It is a mistake to suppose that a thing *denied* with special circumstance doth import an *opposite* affirmation when once that circumstance is expired." (Bk. v, c. xiv). "The manner of Scripture produceth no such inference as that." (Pearson, Art. iii). (2.) There is nothing to *prove* that the restriction, "*her life,*" belongs to the wife—see the literal rendering above. It may and, I hope it will yet appear, does apply to the sister—and it is to be regarded not as a limitation, but as an extension of the prohibition to the whole life, a prohibition thus more stringent than even the nuptial bond, for the latter might be terminated by divorce, while the prohibition has no limit. Besides, there is nothing in Scripture to limit the prohibition of marrying a wife's sister to the period of the wife's life-time, any more than there is to limit the prohibition of marrying the wife's daughter or grand daughter. When Hannah says she will give her expected son unto the Lord "all the days of his life," she might just as well be supposed to intend keeping him for herself after his death, as the



restriction in Leviticus be explained away as merely temporary—contingent on the life of the first wife. But what shall we think of those who in so serious a matter trust so uncertain an argument—for “uncertainty” is the very least we can say of it; and who oppose that uncertainty to the unanimous voice of eighteen centuries of Christianity!

But whether the argument thus far considered is right or wrong, good or bad, it cannot stand, for it is based on a totally wrong translation of the Hebrew text, and an improper division of the context.

2. Mr. Punshon says, “With Dr. McCaul I believe that all criticism must bow before the plain straightforward meaning of the words in Lev. XVIII: 18!” Very well; let us see what that meaning is, and whether Mr. Punshon has bowed before it. It is well known that the words “a woman to her sister” are a Hebrew idiom, an expression peculiar to the language. The corresponding phrase, “a man to his brother,” occurs twenty-five times in the Hebrew Scriptures, and is translated generally as in the following examples, by the *Italic* words:

Gen. 37: 19, “And they said *one to another*.”

Ex. 25: 20, And the faces of the cherubim shall look *one to another*.”

Ex. 37: 9, “The Cherubim stood with their faces *one to another*.”

Jer. 13: 14, “And I will dash them *one against another*.”

Jer. 25: 26, And all the Kings of the North *one with another*.”

Ezek. 24: 23, “And mourn *one towards another*.”

Of the nineteen other examples, some are slightly varied in form. I shall now give *all* the instances of the expression in dispute—“a woman to her sister.”

Ex. 26: 3, “The five curtains shall be coupled together *one to another*; and other five curtains shall be coupled *one to another*.”

Ex. 26: 5, “That the loops may take hold *one of another*.”

Ex. 26: 6, “And couple the curtains *together*.”

Ex. 26: 17, “Two tenons shall be set *one against another*.”

Ez. 1: 9 and 11, “Their wings were joined *one to another*.”

Ez. 1: 23, “And their wings were straight *one towards another*.”

Ez. 3: 10, “The wings of the living creatures touched *one another*.”

Lev. 18: 18. The case in dispute.

Here we have all the instances of the phrase in the Hebrew Bible; and it is observable that our translators have uniformly rendered it, making no marginal gloss, except in Leviticus,—so certain is the force of the idiom. I ask, then,

Can any one not swayed by prejudice believe that a phrase used *thirty-four* times in the Hebrew Bible in the same identical sense, is used the *thirty-fifth* time in a totally different sense? For my own part, if I could see no meaning in the last case, I should feel bound to retain the rendering of all the other cases, leaving the meaning for future illumination. Assuredly we must adhere to the fixed meaning of Bible phrases, unless we would make the Scripture what an irreverent Cardinal called it, “a nose of wax.”

Now before I come to the true exposition of this passage, as I wish to be thorough as far as I go, I shall notice the objection which Mr. Punshon and others make to the marginal rendering, “one wife to the other”—though that is not strictly correct. It would only then be (they say) “a prohibition of bigamy.” Mr. Punshon goes on to say, “I submit this cannot be, because we know for a fact that bigamy was practised to a much later period by those who were bound by these

Levitical laws, and also because in Deut. xxi 15, part of the second giving of the law, and therefore later, bigamy is recognised as existing, and for a certain contingency growing out of it, legislated for."

It would be sufficient to answer, That not all bigamy or polygamy would not be necessarily hereby prohibited; *e.g.* such as Abraham's taking Hagar with Sarah's consent, or Jacob's taking Rachel's and Leah's hand-maids at their desire; as this would not be within the terms of the prohibition, "to rival" them; though such polygamy might be forbidden on other grounds. Surely here again we may observe that a special prohibition is a very unfit ground for a general course of action in a precisely opposite direction.

3. But the truth is that *both* of the preceding explanations are wrong; the text in dispute refers neither to polygamy nor to a deceased wife's sister! It has a reference which removes all the difficulties which would largely cluster about both these views, and it at the same time allows the Hebrew idiom its full, proper and unrestricted force of "*one to another*." The great objection to this rendering in the present instance, in spite of the overwhelming force of idiomatic use, is—that the phrase has a *reciprocal import*; that is, a number of things are said to be so and so *one to another*; that there must be a plural antecedent; while in the present case there is no antecedent, nothing and nobody are mentioned which can have any relation *one to another*.

The conditions are all fulfilled, the difficulties of grammar and morality are at once got rid of, by reading verses 17 and 18 together, as they should be: "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her daughter, neither shalt thou take her son's daughter, or her daughter's daughter, to uncover her nakedness: it is wickedness: and one with the other thou shalt not take, to rival, to uncover her nakedness besides her as long as she liveth."

Observe, the conjunction in the Hebrew is copulative, not disjunctive; and it is not placed in connexion with the negative, as in the E. V., but in the order here given.

Now it becomes quite clear that the restriction *in her life* is not a contingency any how removeable, but belongs equally to the whole life of both mother and daughter. It matters not that the daughter and grand-daughter are no blood relations of the man—enough that they are "her near kinswomen." What now becomes of the implied liberty on the removal of the restriction, "as long as she liveth?" Does the point need to be pressed? Do we not now see that all things are not to be concluded as sanctioned by law, which are only not expressly forbidden by it? Does Mr. Punshon "bow" to so clear a meaning?

The only wonder is that verses 17 and 18 should have been so generally read apart—the occasion of so much misapprehension. But, as the Rev. W. B. Galloway, in the pamphlet (Rivingtons, 1870.) to which I am indebted for this, says, "That it has been so construed in ancient times is manifest from the following passage from Philo Judæus. 'For the intermarriages of strangers produce new relationships not short of those which are by blood; for which reason he hath also debarred many other connexions, enjoining a man not to contract marriage with a grand-daughter-in-law, the wife (widow) of a daughter's son or of a son's son; nor with a wife's aunt, whether on her father's or on her mother's side; nor with one who has been the wife of an uncle, or of a son, or of a brother, [observe, no allusion to any imagined exception]: nor again to wed with a step-daughter, whether widow or virgin, in addition to his wife if

she be living, but not even after her death..... Again: he does not permit the same man to marry two sisters, either at the same time or at different times. For while she who cohabited with him still lives, even if divorced, whether she continues single, as in widowhood, or even have been married to another, he deemed it unholy for the sister to come into the lot of her who had been unfortunate." (De Specialibus Legibus. Opp. Ed. Mangey, vol. ii p. 303.) Mr. Galloway justly says, "There is no other part of Scripture, and no other mode of reading this, which could have originated or suggested these words." It is true that Philo seems also (from the latter part of the quotation just given) to have had his eye on the Septuagint rendering which agrees with the English.

The celebrated Rabbi Maimonides took the same view, as will be seen later on. And thus, I hope, is one obstacle to a right understanding of the Scripture on this point wholly swept away.

II. I come now to what is here called "*Parity of Reasoning*:" "a wonderful phrase," says Mr. Punshon—yes, wonderfully inconvenient for him. The phrase is used by excellent scholars on both sides, who, I dare say, think it very good English. The *meaning*, however, is all we are concerned with. It is an argument from the *parallelism* of the cases ruled by the Law of Marriage, and must come home to men's reason and consciences as "wonderfully" just and weighty. Here it is: In Lev. xviii. 6 the general principle is laid down, "None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, [*Marg. Heb.* "remainder of flesh"], to uncover their nakedness." The expression here used, "near of kin" or "remainder of flesh," includes without any controversy whatever two classes of relations—those of consanguinity, or blood relations; and those of affinity, or relations by marriage. Of the former there is no dispute; of the latter, take the example referred to before in ver. 17, where a man is forbidden to marry the *daughter of his wife*, or the *daughter of her son*, or of *her daughter*. They are no blood relations to him; why then are they forbidden? "For they are her near kinswomen (or flesh): it is wickedness." And this is the same expression and the same reason as where blood relations are spoken of; e. g. ver. 12, "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy *father's sister*: she is thy father's near kinswoman, (or flesh)." Quite clear then it is that there may be and are relationships by affinity which preclude marriage according to God's Law, but we most unreasonably expect to find in the Scripture detailed lists of prohibited degrees. It is enough to find great *principles* set down with the utmost perspicuity, and numerous examples enabling us to apply those principles with certainty. Here is such a list.

The Word of God forbids a man to marry "any that is near of kin to him;" and mentions, in the following order, thirteen instances of persons directly or indirectly near of kin, viz:—

His Mother,	his own Grand-daughter,	his own Daughter-in-Law or Son's Wife,
his Stepmother or	his Father's Sister,	his Sister-in-Law or Brother's Wife,
Father's Wife,	his Mother's Sister,	his Wife's Mother,
his Sister,	his Aunt or Father's	his Wife's Daughter,
his Half-Sister,	Brother's Wife,	his Wife's Grand-daughter.

Six of these women are blood-relations; seven (printed in Italics) are relations by marriage only. Yet the whole follow the words "near of kin" without any distinction: except that after the charge not to marry his wife's relations there is added, "for they are her near kinswomen; it is wickedness." This last word is the translation of the

Hebrew word used for the vilest kind of *lewdness*, in Judges xx. 6, Ezek. xvi. 43, and xxii. 11.

We are now in a condition to apply the "parity of reason" argument; but, "Hold!" say some eager partisans; "what right have you to make any inferences at all in this matter? why should you go beyond the express letter of the enactment?" First, because it is only *common sense* to do so; and secondly because we *must* do it, if we would not throw open the gates of incest. If we may not go by "parity of reasoning," that is, regard no moral parallelism, make no inferences, but be bound only by the bare *letter*; than a man marry his own *daughter* or *sister*! for they are not expressly prohibited.

To apply this to the case in hand: Lev. xviii. 16. "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of *thy brother's wife*; it is *thy brother's nakedness*"—repeated in chap. xx. 21 with a special curse. Here a woman is forbidden to marry her *deceased husband's brother*; and the strict parallel is that a man is forbidden to marry his *deceased wife's sister*. To see anything "wonderful" in this except its entire fairness argues a degree of moral obliquity which we may well shudder at. Where is there an unperverted mind which does not feel that the moral relation of two sisters successively to one or the same man as husband, is strictly parallel to that of two brothers to one and the same woman as wife? And *even if* the Law, in spite of this moral identity, did not entirely recognize the practical equality of obligation in both cases, there is no reason why Christians should not do it. The Law aimed at elevating the condition of woman *towards* an equality of moral rights, but, as we know, this was imperfectly accomplished. While slavery and polygamy lasted, the moral rights and, consequently, the moral responsibilities of woman could not be equal. In Christ there is nether bond nor free, neither male nor female. The obligations of holiness are equal, and the propinquity which excludes two brothers from marrying in succession the same woman, must equally exclude two sisters from marrying in succession the same man." (Galloway).

But, it is again objected, the *death* of the person through whose marriage the nearness of kin began, *alters that nearness*. The Rev. W. Abner Brown, no "High Church ascetic," but a friend and biographer of the well-known C. Simeon, answers well: "A step-son may not marry his father's widow; and yet there is no kin between them, except through the woman's former marriage with his father, who is now dead. The death of the person through whose marriage the bond of kindred began, must either dissolve that bond in all cases, or it dissolves it in none. It dissolves it in none." (Quoted by Bp. Wordsworth in Com. Levit.) The ground of the prohibition is the nearness of his step-mother to his father—becoming "one flesh" with him; and as soon as this became a fact, the propinquity was complete. How then could the father's death undo a pre-existent fact, and thereby cause the relation between step-mother and step-son to cease? "Does the maxim admit of controversy that any person with whom, at *any time*, it would have been incest to cohabit, will forever remain forbidden? The question seems unequivocally determined by the principle of affinity arising out of the nature of the marriage union." (Professor Bush). Ah, but this places us in a "dilemma," says Mr. Punshon. Many dilemmas are wonderfully spectral, and frighten more a good deal than they hurt. Levit. xx. 21 threatens "childlessness" for the infraction of this prohibition, and he knows cases where "no such penalty followed. Either then the Scrip-

ture is broken, and its threatenings a dead letter, or, the prohibition does not apply." In a whole lifetime it could hardly fall to one's lot to find any perversion of Scripture so ignorant, so gross, so unspiritual. What! a *Christian* tell us that because God's Law is no longer enforced by temporal penalties, its moral obligation ceases! Is the penalty of "burning with fire" now inflicted for the union forbidden a little before, ver. 14? and has moral obligation therefore lapsed! One cannot but wonder at the blindness and the want of sensibility which has permitted Mr. Punshon to quote in his own defence Lev. xx. 21, of all possible arguments!

But there is another "dilemma"—a very harmless, though a very ugly goblin. "If my wife's sister is still [after the wife's decease] my wife's sister, then logically my wife is still my wife, and so far from restricting my liberty to marry to her own relations, her death—as it does not alter my relations to her—[his own representation]—does not leave me at liberty to marry at all." How very "logical" indeed, where the word "wife" is plainly "equivocal"—made to represent a past and a present relation; an actual relation in the past, a non-existing one in the present. Nor are we responsible for such logic, as doubtless he would object; but it arises wholly from his mistaking or evading the point, at issue,—and that is, *not the relation which a man now bears to one who was his wife, but the relation which he now bears to her surviving sister*. Once, that relation was undoubted: to cohabit with her would not have been simply adultery, but incest. We have before observed, that nothing can abolish a pre-existing fact—and therefore such cohabitation would still be incest. Though "freed from the law of her husband," as Mr. Punshon emphasises it; it does not follow that a widow is free from all law as to his kindred, as he argues, or we might have such mixtures as would rival the incests of ancient Persia. Because, forsooth, I may not marry my sister-in-law, must I cry out with the logic of a petulant will, You insist that she who was once my wife is still my wife in the spirit world! Surely Mr. Punshon, is here guilty of as "ridiculous a stupidity as to dream of midwifery in the grave," as Bishop Pearson phrases it. This is a Sadducean error. Death "departs" a man and his wife—makes a complete separation; but it does not abolish the relations which that marriage effected between the surviving husband or wife and their respective families, till he comes and touches with his icy fingers each separate one.

We will just put Mr. Punshon's objection into the mouth of the parallel relation—a deceased brother's wife. She objects to the prohibition which would bar her marriage to the surviving brother, and says, in words which have *exactly* the same value as in Mr. Punshon's argument:—"If my husband's brother is still my husband's brother, then logically my husband is still my husband, and so far from restricting my liberty to marry to his own relations, his death—as it does not alter my relations to him—does not leave me at liberty to marry at all." Now, if this argument have the effect Mr. Punshon wishes, it justifies a union *expressly* forbidden, Lev. XVIII. 16! But this is no more than the gentleman's whole letter aims at.

Let the public at large notice what the Rev. W. Morley Punshon, President of the Wesleyan Conference, distinctly says: It appears to me, and has always appeared to me that the doctrine of this passage (Rom. VI: 2) is that the relationship of *affinity*, created by law, ceases when the law

ceases." An astounding, a tremendous conclusion! Observe, so a man may marry his father's wife, his son's wife, his brother's wife, his wife's mother, his wife's daughter, his wife's grand-daughter—all expressly forbidden in Scripture! Thus he interprets St. Paul so as to make him directly contradict himself: see I Cor. V. 1. It would be treason to religion, and a wrong every Christian who venerates the Bible as God's sacred and authoritative Word, not to cry out with loudest voice—"Behold a blind guide, and beware of him!" Let there be no misconception, no shirking—here is his statement: "*The relationship of affinity ceases.*" Who is prepared to accept it and all its consequences? This is what self-will is driven to, when it thinks itself wiser than the whole Church of God!

Mr P. wishes his friend Dr. Hodgins, to "affirm (privately) on his behalf that he tries to love Jesus"; and Dr. Hodgins, like a zealous friend, does it publicly and at once. The christian public must be allowed to doubt the love that asserts itself in such new ways—Dr. Hodgins' assurances, and, a still more unlikely method, breaking the Laws of the Lord Jesus! whose Spirit was in the Old Testament writers. "If a man love Me he will keep my words", says our Lord. Now, supposing Mr. P. "knows and is persuaded by the Lord Jesus," [N. B. St. Paul does not venture on the familiarity "Jesus"], that this marriage in question is "not unclean of itself", does that justify him in evading the laws of his native land, in presuming on the laws of this land, and outraging the moral sense of nearly all religious communities, in order to contract it? "If thy brother be grieved with thy marriage, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy marriage for whom Christ died"—as he now runs the risk of doing manifoldly, by encouraging weak consciences to act against external laws and inward convictions in compliance with unregulated desire, under the patronage of a distinguished religious leader. A religious leader might well pause in the exercise of what he thought a lawful liberty, at the Apostle's words: "Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak." "When ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ." I fear Dr. Hodgins's "affirmations" will hardly outweigh these last considerations in the public mind.

III. There is one more argument which is relied on to weaken the force of all that has been said. It is objected that in spite of the plain prohibition in Lev. xviii. 16. of marriage with a deceased brother's wife, (and by "parity of reasoning," as we hold, with a deceased wife's sister), yet there can be nothing *intrinsically immoral* in such unions, as in a special case they are even enjoined, Deut. xxv 5-10. The whole force of this objection depends upon the assumption that the brothers are *own* brothers, sons of one father or mother. It is truly surprising how generally this assumption has been allowed. Its force is parried by the maxim that "the exception proves the rule"—that God is the supreme Lawgiver, whom we cannot limit. Weighty and true indeed; but the assumption itself is to be denied: and thus what seemed an exception, weakening the moral force of the general prohibition, turns out to be no exception, but an unmitigated enforcement of that rule, giving it a resistless moral weight. For the knowledge of this fact (I feel bound very clearly and thankfully to say) I am entirely indebted to Mr. Galloway, whose proofs I shall do but little more than arrange in my own words.

The point of the case as put by the Sadducees to our Lord, (Matt

xxii. 24-28), was not that the Seven were all sons of the same parents, but simply that "*Seven had her to wife*," and that she had a claim to the seven. But the Levirate Law, *i. e.* respecting a husband's brother, nowhere specifies or contemplates that they must be *own-brothers*. The book of Tobit, though uncanonical, is a fair reflex of Jewish practices and beliefs, and may perhaps have suggested, as it certainly does explain, the case proposed by the Sadducees. Sara, the daughter of Raguel, of the Captivity in Media, had married seven husbands in succession, to whom she bore no children; and she laments to God, "I am the only daughter of my father, *neither hath he any child to be his heir, neither any near kinsman, nor any son of his, alive, to whom I may keep myself for a wife. My seven husbands are already dead; and why should I live!* but if it please Thee not that I should die, command some regard to be had of me, and pity taken of me, that I hear no more reproach." Chap. iii.

It was believed that the full extent of her Levirate claim had been exhausted, and she was unwilling to marry a stranger, thereby carrying the inheritance out of her own family; much less would she marry a heathen, and so pollute her name in the land of her captivity. When all the families of all her kindred were supposed to have been exhausted, Tobias, a kinsman, arrives from a distant part, and marries her under the Law which gave her a claim on his hand. Now he was but her father's cousin, *c. vii. 2, vi. 11, 12*; and there is nothing to shew that the seven were more nearly related to one another, than they were to the eighth, Tobias, and he certainly was not own-brother to any of them.

In truth, the idea that the Levirate Law contemplated own-brothers is wholly baseless, and should be unceremoniously abandoned. It *must* be, unless we would contradict an absolute enactment: "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife: it is thy brother's nakedness." Lev. xviii. 16. The very terms of the Law in question may serve to show this: "If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry *without unto a stranger*: her husband's brother [margin: "next kinsman"—*i. e.* brother opposed to *stranger*, and thus equivalent to "kinsman,"] shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her." Then follows the ceremony of CHALITZAH, by which the inheritance was *transferred*, in case of a man's rejecting the childless widow's claim to him as next kinsman. The shoe was pulled off, for another, as, it were, to step into, as we learn from Ruth iv. 7.

The Levirate Law evidently existed ages before among the nations of Canaan, but, as might be expected from their moral corruption, with no bar on account of any nearness of consanguinity. Gen. xxxviii. 8, 9. The conduct of Judah showed that he more than suspected the unlawfulness of the existing customs, (verses 10, 11, and end of 14). In Moab, as appears from the book of Ruth (i. 11), the same licence existed. Even heathen writers reproached the Asiatics with their dissoluteness: "Such is the whole barbarian race: a father has intercourse with his daughter, a youth with his mother, a maiden with her brother." (Euripides, *Androm.* 173). The Law of Moses re-established the holy limitations of domestic virtue, but not ignoring the civil customs of the time. The Law of inheritance applied first to the husband's next of kin; but he was not only exempt from taking the widow if she were within the prohibited degrees—he *dared not* take her. Let it be noted

that there is no case in all the Scriptures, canonical or uncanonical, which justifies the vulgar meaning of *brother* in the Levirate law, or tolerates any infraction of Lev. xviii. 16. Nay, if the strict meaning of "brother" be insisted on, then it is quite clear that Ruth could not lay claim to Boaz. He was not her husband's own-brother; he was not even her husband's nearest kinsman; but probably claimed because not within the forbidden degrees. The "nearest kinsman" was ready enough to redeem his "brother" Elimelech's parcel of ground, which the widow was about to sell; but when he found that Ruth's hand was to go with it he drew back, on the ground that he should thus "mar his own inheritance." Why? how? would adding to his own inheritance mar it, when that addition would wholly pass away from him if he refused Ruth? Nor could any expected second family mar the claims of the first, as they could but claim their ancestral property—being reckoned as Mahlon's children, *i.e.* the first husband's. It could not then be in regard to *property* the inheritance would be marred; and we have no intelligible explanation of it except in the penalty denounced in Lev. xx. 20, 21. for an unlawful marriage, "He shall be childless;" which probably applied to other near unions, as well as with a brother's wife, and which must have been the case here.

The negative testimony of scripture is irresistibly substantiated by the most ancient traditional law of the Jews—the MISHNA. There is no dispute that the Mishna is the most exact representation of ancient Jewish opinion. In the treatise entitled YEBAMOTH the precept *Yeboom*, or obligation to marry the widow of a childless deceased brother, and the ceremony of *Chalitzah* in the case of him who refuses, are discussed, with indeed the various cases arising out of Deut. xxv. 5-10. Throughout the treatise the general names "sister-in-law," "brother-in-law," are applied to the parties whatever may be the degrees of their relation. The word "brother" is used with the same latitude. The name "rivals" is applied to the several wives of one man. This is to be noticed in order to avoid confusion.

"In their introduction to this book of the Mishna, in the English translation executed by them, Mr. De Sola and Mr. Raphall (both of them Jews, and following here a prefatory tract of Maimonides their commentator) have remarked that when circumstances exist which would render such marriage unlawful; as, for instance, if the parties were related to each other within the degree of consanguinity prohibited by the Holy Law to intermarry, the precept of *zeboom* is superseded, and even the ceremony of *Chalitzah* is unnecessary; and that when the brother-in-law cannot marry the widow on account of near affinity, he may not marry any of the other wives of his deceased brother, who in the technical term of the Mishna are called *rivals*. (Galloway). Mr. G. gives the words of Maimonides in the Latin translation of Surenhusius, from which it may be seen that he read in connection and verses 17 and 18 of Lev. xviii.\*

The most negligent may perceive that the law in Dent. xxv. cannot be absolute—that it must have many exceptions. And the Mishna specifies *fifteen* classes of women, who, in consequence of being within the forbidden degrees, are released, and release their "rivals" from

\* Since writing the preceding words I have observed what Allen says in his "Modern Judaism" (p. 417, ed. 1816): "By the practice of the modern Synagogue, this part of the law is, *in fact*, entirely abolished: the rabbies oblige their disciples invariably to refuse compliance with the *precept*; and nothing remains of the original institution, except the ceremony of releasing both parties from a connection which is never permitted to be formed."



the obligation of this law altogether. These are: 1. Where the widow of the deceased is the *daughter* of the "brother" [i. e. next kinsman—otherwise a man might marry his own daughter]. 2. When she is his *daughter's daughter*; or 3. his *son's daughter*. 4. Where she is his *step-daughter*; (daughter of the so-called "brother's" wife). 5 and 6. Where she is his wife's *grand-daughter*, whether daughter of her daughter or of her son. 7. Where the widow is *mother-in-law* of the "brother," or nearest kinsman; or 8 and 9. The *mother of his mother-in-law or his father-in-law*. 10. Where she is his *own sister* [which she could not be if deceased husband and he were own brothers]; or 11, his *mother's sister*; or 12, his *wife's sister*. 13. Where she is the *uterine brother*; or 14, of a "brother" who had not been contemporary with him (i. e. who died before the now nearest kinsman was born). [N. B. from case 13 it is quite clear that the law was not supposed to contemplate the marriage of a husband's own brother with his sister-in-law—this being here specially forbidden]. 15. Where she is *daughter-in-law* (i. e. where the deceased husband's "brother", so-called, or next kinsman, was HIS FATHER)." Every one may see here how wide is the use of "brothers." The list begins with the widow's own father, and ends with her father-in-law.

It is a matter of regret and wonder alike that the late Dr. McCaul, on whose Hebrew learning Mr. Punshon, and doubtless others too, relied, should have mistaken a matter so plain, and now placed within reach of English readers in the publication above referred to. "Brother then in Deut XXV. does not necessarily mean *own brother*; and the tradition of the Jews, for whom the law was intended, shows that they did not hold that interpretation which the moderns have strangely accepted, nor think it allowable, but on the contrary strictly repudiated it. A single quotation (7 Sect. 3 Chap. of same Treatise) shows that "nearness of kin" was an obstacle of an *indelible* character, which does not "cease". "When of three brothers (i. e. kinsmen), two are married to two sisters and one to a stranger; if one of them who marries the sister died, and he who had married the stranger marries the widow, and then the wife of the second brother, and also the third brother, *then the widow will be forever prohibited to the second or surviving brother, because she was for some time prohibited to him (as his wife's sister.)*"

The consequences of disregarding the general prohibition in favour of the particular Levirate enactment, may be easily worked out, but are too horrid for contemplation. That the view set out in the Mishna was that accepted by the Jews, appears from another quarter. John the Baptist's rebuke of Herod was not on the ground of adultery; for Herodias, as appears from Josephus, was now divorced from Philip; and if a brother's wife were no otherwise forbidden than as any other man's wife, it could not be unlawful, according to the Mosaic law, for Herod to marry her. But John's testimony, sealed with his blood, was against the *incest* of "having a *brother's wife*:" "it is not lawful for thee to have her." I need not here point out all the force of the "parity of reasoning:" it will be "wonderfully" clear or very inconvenient, as the case may be.

Josephus gives us his own testimony in a similar case, to the same effect, (Antiq. B. xvii. c. xiii). "Moreover he (Archelaus Son of Herod the Great) transgressed the law of our fathers, and married Glaphyra, the daughter of Archelaus (King of Cappadocia), who had been the wife of his brother Alexander; which Alexander had three children by her;

while it was a thing detestable among the Jews to marry the brother's wife." [Alexander was dead, see Jewish War, B. ii. ch. vii, where the story is told at greater length]. These two cases are so much the stronger, because Philip and Herod Antipas were not sons of the same mother; and Alexander and Archelaus were not sons of the same father.

Thus, that very supposed exception, which was relied on to bar the intrinsic immorality of such unions, now when properly understood, —in the light of the negative testimony of Scripture and the positive testimony of the Jewish interpretation and practice, as witnessed by the Mishna, Josephus, and Philo,—is the most decided proof of the essential unlawfulness of the mixtures justified *en masse* by Mr. Punshon's principle, (vid. Ante, p. 10). even in those cases which must be preeminently regarded as "socially expedient."

In conclusion I would add a few words as to the judgment of the Church on this matter. The general sentiment of antiquity may be seen in Bingham's Antiquities, Bk. xxii. c. ii. sec. 3, where various councils expressly forbid this union with a deceased wife's sister. The sixth of the Apostolical Canons, allowed by all to be ante-Nicene, says "He who hath married two sisters, or his brother's or his sister's daughter, cannot be a clergyman." St. Basil, in the 4th century, as quoted in Bishop Wordsworth's Commentary, says: "Our custom in this matter has the force of law, because the statutes we observe have been handed down to us by holy men; and our judgment is this, that if a man has fallen into the sin of marrying two sisters, we do not regard such an union as marriage, nor do we receive the parties to communion with the Church until they are separated." Bishop Wordsworth also observes that the *Vatican Manuscript* of the Septuagint (lately published by Cardinal Mai,) contains in the text a curse against those who lie with their wife's sister, in Deut. xxvii 23,—an important witness of the opinion of the early age in which that M.S. was written.

Luther, who was certainly no "ascetic High Churchman," with all his most renowned colleagues, the Westminster Divines, and their English, Scottish, and Canadian followers to this day,—who are not thought to be either "ascetic" or "High-Church,"—have all steadfastly adhered to the Church's sense of the Bible, and in this point are at one with antiquity.

I must leave for other hands among us the discussion which the great principle involved in "they twain shall be one flesh" so amply deserves. I have the satisfaction of having done something towards clearing away the cobwebs of misconception which so conceal and befoul this question. Others still will take up the matter in its social aspects; and I have every assurance that the cause of the Bible and the Church and of the morality they espouse will come out of the conflict with added clearness and lustre; and that the good sense and the enlightened conscience of the various Christian communities of this Province, and their tender regard for the high interests of Christian morality amongst us, will disdain the petty arguments and withstand the example of such as would break down the ancient barriers of domestic purity, of whatever eloquence they may boast, or on whatever position they may rely.

## GERMS OF THOUGHT.

Acts 17, 26. "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth."

"If you assign the same parentage to all mankind," says the unbeliever, "you place the African Moor, on the same footing, with the beautiful European. Who can believe that they are of the same origin?"

Buffon the celebrated Naturalist, who was by no means a bigot in favor of the Sacred History, from a number of well attested observations, was forced to the following memorable conclusion: "From every circumstance proof may be obtained that mankind are not composed of species essentially different from each other: that on the contrary there is every proof that there was originally but one individual species of men, which after being multiplied and diffused over the whole earth, underwent many changes from the influences of climate, difference of food, mode of living, epidemic disorders, and from the marriages of individuals more or less resembling each other."

Professor Huxley, in his Lecture "on the Perpetuation of Living Beings, Hereditary Transmission and Variation," makes it very clear, that these alterations must have been, at first, inconsiderable and confined to individuals, but from the long continued action of causes assigned, for the variation in the form and colour of mankind, arose that variety of human species which we now see. That these varieties are perpetuated from generation to generation, in the same way that disease descends from parent to child. These facts if calmly considered, are sufficient to convince any unprejudiced person that God has made of one blood all the nations of the earth.

The assertion of Lord Kaimes that, the Giages, a nation of Africa, could not have descended from the same origin as the rest of mankind, because unlike other men, they are totally devoid of natural affection, since they are said to kill their own children as soon as they are born, and replenish their nation by children stolen from other tribes, destroys itself, by proving too much. If this were true, would not the Giages soon run out, and the stolen youth resemble their own parents, and not the Giages? This is a very fair specimen of the easy credulity of unbelief.

We are told that the African is an inferior link in the chain of nature, and that this appears from his inferior capacity. This idea is being rapidly exploded. When the same means of education and development have been afforded to the African, which opportunities, to him, have been of rare occurrence, he has shewn himself no way inferior to his white brother, in mental vigor.

How then can we account for the difference in the colour of the human race? It seems absurd to maintain that all men are not of "one blood" because not all of one colour. This difference seems to be accounted for, chiefly by difference in climate. For if we travel from the Equator to the North Pole, we find a regular gradation from black to white, and if back again, from white to black. Even there is a great difference of shade, in the colour, of the inhabitants of the South of Spain and the North of France. Even the members of the same family, when divided into different countries, have changed their colour, in the course of a few generations. This is very marked in the case of the Jews, who are acknowledged on all hands to be the descen-

dants of one father—Abraham. The English Jew is white, the Portuguese Jew swarthy, the American olive, and the Arabian copper colour. In short, the Jews are of as many colours, as there are countries in which they live. This is rendered still more remarkable from the fact, that though they be scattered among all nations, they never intermarry except with those of their own kind, therefore have no foreign blood in their veins to account for the difference of their colour.

That all men were, at one time, of the same colour, as they were of the same language, when they were few in number and lived together, seems undeniable: but what that colour was can only be conjectured. It was, however, most probably that which now prevails, in that country, where man had his primeval habitation, which is neither white nor black, but something between the two.

Modern geographical discovery has put an effectual stop to the taunting and triumphant inquiry of the unbelieving: "If all mankind are descended from one pair according to the Scripture History, and the Red man of America be a part of their offspring, how did he get to America across the Atlantic in his frail bark canoe?" Not easily indeed. But it was no difficult matter to cross Bering's Straits, from Asia, on the ice, a distance of thirteen miles.

But the most convincing proof that all men are "of one blood," is to be found in the great universal Law of Nature. If two animals of different species propagate an offspring, that offspring is incapable of continuing its kind, by the wise arrangement of Divine Providence, for keeping every species distinct, "whose seed is in itself," but the Malatta is just as capable of continuing his species as his father was.

Hence, it appears that all the inhabitants of the earth are of the same parentage, and that their difference in appearance, has arisen from a combination of causes. Hence, it appears likewise, that the Scripture account of the formation of man is true, and that all men are "of one blood."

W. L.

## RELIGIOUS REVIEW.

### THE SUBSTANCE OF AN ADDRESS BY THE BISHOP OF TORONTO.

DELIVERED AT THE OPENING OF THE SYNOD OF THE TORONTO DIOCESE, JULY 20TH, 1871.

The events of the past year, as affecting the welfare of our beloved church, are of great interest and importance. But before I touch upon those of a more general character, I must set before you what refers to its condition and progress in this diocese. Since I last addressed you five clergymen have removed from this diocese, and we have received ten clergymen into the diocese. During the past twelve months the division of several of our larger missions has been effected. We have to lament, in the past year, the death of the Rev. Bold Cudmore Hill. For more than thirty years he had pursued his missionary work on the shores and in the neighbourhood of the Grand River, with the village of York as its centre. Though at the time of his death he had passed his seventy-first year, his energy and activity seemed to be unimpaired. He was a man of unfeigned piety and blameless life. We have also to regret the death of the Rev. John Pentland. Mr. Pent-

land having left the army, in which he was an officer, came to this country about the close of the year 1841, and was placed in charge of the mission of Whitby. He never spared himself at the call of duty, and endeared himself much to his parishioners by his kind and obliging disposition. Early in July last I resumed my confirmation journeys which comprehend the more northerly portions of the diocese. Manitoulin Island, in consequence of the recent settlement of the missionary there, was not ready for the confirmation; but I paid very interesting visits to Sault Ste Marie, Garden River and the Bruce Mines. At the Sault Ste Marie a handsome and substantial church has been commenced, and I hope to be able to place a clergyman there during the present year, who can render service at Bruce Mines, until it shall become possible to furnish this also with a resident clergyman. During the progress of these journeys in the past year, I consecrated seven churches, while many others throughout the diocese will soon be ready for this ceremonial. Amongst these is a new church in this city, and another in its northern environs. They have been built within the last twelve months, and each is supplied with a clergyman. Up to the present time, since my last address to you, I have held confirmations at 77 places, and admitted to the rite 643 males, and 944 females,—in all 1,487. This makes the whole number confirmed, since my entrance upon the episcopal office, 7,282. It is much to be lamented that so few, comparatively, from amongst the wealthy and more influential classes of society in this country, devote themselves to the sacred work of the ministry. If it be that the clerical profession offers, in this country at least, no promise of wealth, and none of the rewards which lure the ambitious and urge on those who aim at earthly distinction, it affords the opportunity, and with it the pre-eminent satisfaction, of being in the most exalted sense useful to mankind. Connected with what we are privileged to say of an encouraging character in regard to church progress in this diocese during the past year, it is very gratifying to be able to state that in many places laudable efforts have been made to increase the stipends of the clergy, and to mark the appreciation of their services and add to their comforts by special gifts. This we trust, is but the commencement of a general movement in that direction,—the first fruits, we shall believe, of the cordial approbation expressed by this Synod last year of the proposal that in the every instance the stipend of a missionary in full orders should not be less than \$800 per annum. A plan recently adopted by the Diocesan Mission Board for giving practical efficacy to this laudable intention, and for carrying out more effectually the objects of the appointment of the Board, will be laid before the Synod. The plan cannot fail of success if the missions themselves are but true to the desire of having faithful clergymen, and of securing their services by furnishing a liberal and punctually paid stipend. And here I cannot refrain from adverting to a contemplated wrong on the part of the Legislature of the Province, in proposing to withdraw from the religious bodies within its limits certain fiscal privileges which they have long enjoyed. I allude to the exemption from taxation of the edifices, with the ground contiguous, which have been erected for public worship, and of those sacred spots set apart for the burial of the dead. In the exemption of these from the ordinary imposts, and in the reduction of these imposts in the case of the stipends and residences of the ministers of religion, there has been what it is very gratifying to observe,—a tacit recognition of the claims and benefits of our common Christianity;

an indirect acknowledgment of the duty of the State to encourage if it cannot absolutely support its holy and useful ministrations. To withdraw this slight recognition of the beneficial influence of religion,—where it can be manifested without exciting jealousy, or exposing to the charge of partiality,—cannot be excused on the plea by which it is attempted to be supported; because they upon whom the expense falls of maintaining the services and diffusing the blessed influences of religion are actually providing these benefits to a large class in the community who are unable, or unwilling, to supply it to themselves. It would, therefore, appear but just that the State should assume at least as much of this burden as would be comprehended in the remission of taxes in the case of parsonages and clerical stipends. They ought, I conceive the more readily to make such exemptions, when they contemplate the amount of property originally intended for the support of religion which some years ago was placed at their disposal; a property which has been applied to the relief of municipalities from the very burden which they seek to impose upon religious communities. And they may be further influenced to adopt this view of the case from the fact that in the neighbouring State of New York—and probably in most of the sister States—all these exemptions are enjoyed by religious bodies. In a country where the repudiation of any alliance between Church and State has long been so marked, it is gratifying to observe this recognition of the blessings of christianity, and this encouragement of the bodies who are labouring to maintain and diffuse them. The same exemptions from taxation, I have learned, are made in case of colleges and schools, whether on public or a private foundation. The example, it is hoped, will not be lost upon us here. It is with peculiar satisfaction that we notice the desire expressed by so many of our lay brethren to be useful to the clergy in conducting the services of the Church—as far as laymen legitimately can—in places to which the clergy, unless at long intervals, cannot extend their ministrations; and it is gratifying to discover that, in view of the emergency of the case and the benefit it ensues, of a better observance of the Lord's day and a fitter recollection of its peculiar duties, such services are usually well received. I have felt it a duty, as well a pleasure, to encourage such lay ministrations in every quarter in which the need of them has been pointed out, and where the clergymen in charge have expressed their hearty recommendation of the individual employed. While we cannot for a moment allow it to be thought that such ministrations are to be looked upon as a fitting substitute for the services of those duly set apart and ordained for the purpose, we shall in the contemplation of the fewness of our authorized labourers, always gladly welcome the services of those of our lay brethren, who, from love of the church and love of souls, are willing to undertake this good work.

A staff of such laborers—comprising for special work devout and earnest women, as well as pious and energetic men,—would be a very possible organization in almost every parish or mission. With ministrations occasionally of a more public character, they could pursue, with benefit incalculable, those unobstructive ones of visiting the poor and the sick, and of directing the sympathies and help of all their brethren towards the alleviation of the temporal and spiritual needs which everywhere exist. This would be converting every parish or mission into a Christian brotherhood indeed. It would gradually break down that insolation of its members in works of piety and charity

which is now so much complained of; it would blend classes together in active duties for the best welfare of all. Amongst the subjects of interest and importance about to engage your attention, we cannot overlook what was last year the subject of earnest discussion, and on which some decision may be expected at our present session.—I mean the question of Patronage; so that appointments to rectories and other incumbencies may be made in accordance with recognized Episcopal rights, and with a due consideration of the interests and wishes of the congregations concerned. I have endeavoured, in all such appointments hitherto, to meet as far as possible the wishes or expectations of congregations; but the Synod will understand that without a great sacrifice of other interests in the church this is not at all times possible. It is not simply the transferring to a vacant parish of a suitable and acceptable person that is attended with difficulty; but innumerable complications present themselves in supplying the vacancies thus created elsewhere. I am by no means desirous of exercising this difficult duty on my single responsibility; and while I contend against any thing like direct and absolute popular election as most hurtful to the genuine interests of the church, I am sensible of the need of giving careful consideration of the special requirements of the parishes to be supplied, and of the men best suited to meet those requirements. In such consideration I should desire to be aided; and if the counsels of the Archdeacon and Rural Dean to which the vacant parish pertains should not always be available, there are other experienced and judicious clergymen, familiar with the locality, whose aid could be obtained. I should desire that we should be joined in such consultations by two delegates chosen for that purpose by the parish to be supplied; and while such a course would have the benefit of enlisting the best practical aid in forming my own judgment, it would afford the required opportunity for the expression of the feelings and wishes of the parishioners to whom a clergyman is to be appointed. An impulse has doubtless been given to the more vigorous and successful working of our Sunday-schools through the very interesting Convention which was held last autumn on their behalf. Though not strictly bound by the ecclesiastical laws of our Mother Country, or directly affected by the judgments of its ecclesiastical courts, we cannot feel ourselves uninterested in the proceedings of those courts, or look unconcernedly upon the judgments they promulgate. We must wait, however, for further issues; and employ, in the meanwhile, a universal effort to conduct the worship and carry out the work of the church without extremes, on the one hand, which awaken suspicion and distrust; or interpretations and acts, on the other hand, which are calculated to retard its legitimate progress and even to surpress its life. I am not of the opinion that it is desirable to take a public or formal notice of every aberration from what we should consider the strict line of truth and duty; but where extravagances on the one hand, or defects on the other, are exhibited, a way can generally be found of restraining and correcting them without the notoriety and exposure which must always be attended by irritation and injury. Moreover, consideration is to be had for convictions which may be conscientious, while they are unsound; and the hope should influence us that kindly remonstrances and friendly discussion may effect what harsh and imperative dealing would rarely produce. In words which fell from an eminent statesman during a recent interesting debate in the Mother Country, "Let it be

remembered that the varying types and the varying passions of mankind require spiritual interpreters as various; that some minds will take refuge in symbols and ceremony, and others will find support in the inspirations of enthusiasm." It is also to be borne in mind that life and activity awakened in the church, especially after a long period of lethargy and neglect, will, from the very exuberance of resuscitated energy, drive some honest and earnest minds beyond the limits of discretion. And if we must lament such a disposition, and use our best efforts to restrain and correct it, we have the relief of feeling that it is not the result of an inherent waywardness, but the effect of a zeal and impulse which has not been duly guided and controlled. Circumstances, however, which have occurred within the last few months, trying and embarrassing to myself, and which have created distrust and apprehension in others, compel me, with not a little reluctance, to offer a few remarks upon the indiscretion to which I have referred. And in doing so, I desire as far as possible to speak in general terms, and avoid a reference to particular cases. First, then, permit me to say that I must regard societies or associations within the church, which partake in any degree of a secret character, as entirely alien to the spirit of our most holy faith. "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works." is our blessed Lord's instruction; and nothing but distrust and division can possibly result from any attempt at concealment, whether in respect of religious belief or religious practice. If either the one or the other is supposed to be distasteful to the many, it should still be maintained by those who esteem it, with a candour and boldness which may challenge the respect and perchance conciliate the favor of opponents. Again, if a bishop is to be held responsible for the results of religious movements within his diocese, it would appear to be nothing more than his due that he should be consulted respecting these movements. There are, no doubt, ordinary and recognized institutions existing within every parish or cure, of which a bishop is supposed to be fully cognizant, and his interference with which would generally speaking, be officious and unnecessary. But if organizations of the unusual character—connected with religious associations beyond the limits of an diocese, or instituted within it, not for parochial but for diocesan purposes—are to be established without any reference to the bishop's authority, and to be maintained in opposition to his judgment and counsel, it becomes apparent that his influence for good, as a centre of unity, is lost. I am fully conscious how widely the organizations which I have attempted to characterize extend—how very different they will be found to be in their nature and in their purposes: yet I would seriously commend to the attention both of the clergy and laity, whether movements which some regard as fraught with very serious evil can possibly be checked, except by the hearty recognition of a general rule which shall restrict liberty of action to purpose which are on all hands admitted to be lawful and excellent. The Church should, in all these matters, act as a body; and the fact that she now possesses in this Synod a representative assembly, would seem to cut away every pretext for the separate action of parties amongst us. Let me further add how necessary it is that, in respect to the most sacred and mysterious verities of our faith, eager and zealous men should consent to submit their own fancies and persuasions,—or at least the language in which they venture to clothe their thoughts,—to the approval of those whom God has set over them



in the Church; at all events, before these words are put forth in a printed manual for the use of societies within the diocese and as a guide in religious belief and practice. Truth has again and again been scorned and hated for the sake of the error which has so closely intertwined itself with her that men have held the two to be identical. And so, especially in regard to the Holy Supper of the Lord, language which exceeds the reverent bounds of Scripture and of our formularies, instead of enforcing, not unfrequently neutralizes the teaching of God's Word and of the Church, and leads men to deny that life-sustaining Presence which unwise and unguarded utterances have in their apprehension neutralized and debased. In connection with the same unfortunate circumstances to which I have been referring, the question of prayer for the dead has been opened. The Church of England has maintained a judicious silence upon this subject; or has certainly expressed no words that bear upon it which could fairly be made the ground of speculative opinion or discussion. She teaches us to "bless God for all his servants departed this life in His faith and fear;" but she affects not so to unveil the secrets of the unseen world, or so to declare the condition or necessities of the departed, as to justify or render seemly special prayers on their behalf. There may, in individual minds, be the impulse to remember the beloved departed, even in their supplications before God; but even they must feel how unwise and how perilous it would be to invest those private sacred thoughts with words that are to be spread before the world. We discover indeed, that where such solemn privacy is violated, and expression is given to such thoughts, they are to the great mass of believers objectionable and even repulsive. They are calculated surely to suggest to men's minds a belief in a purgatorial condition after death, and to shake their conviction in the solemn truth declared by St. Paul, that "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things he hath done, whether good or bad." The new translation of the Holy Scriptures which has been commenced is an undertaking of interest and anxiety to a portion of the Christian world. Of interest, because the wisest and ablest of our biblical scholars consider that the time has arrived when it would be no longer prudent to delay a revision of the received translation; for if postponed it might be delegated to an age with intellect more wrapped by a growing scepticism, and more in danger from surrounding secular influences. Of anxiety, because a new translation, however admirable and however much to be desired, must prove a trial, yea a shock, to many a pious man used to the phraseology of the Bible—to expressions imbedded in all our literature, and grafted in every Christian mind; assured though we are that as little variation as possible shall be adopted from the words and phrases in present use. It is no doubt to be lamented that the acute minds and quick intelligence of many of the divines of the church in the neighboring United States should not have been enlisted in this undertaking: but we may presume that opportunity will yet be given for their revision of and concurrence in it. We shall have a hope, too, that similar opportunity will be given to those who are dissenters from our communion, as being largely interested in this undertaking. In the colonies it will doubtless be a general conviction that we can, with perfect confidence, leave this great and holy work in the giant hands of our fathers and brothers in the church of the United Kingdom, and of such allies out-side the church as they may feel it dutiful to apply to.

The new lectionary, or tables of lessons to be read in divine service, exposes to no such risk or objections as a new translation of the scriptures. It means simply a more judicious and more edifying adaptation of our use of the word of God in public worship; and though some may consider any change to be unadvisable, there is almost a general persuasion that the present arrangement of scripture lessons is susceptible of large improvement. In conclusion, my brethren of the clergy and laity, I would urge upon you that, as time is valuable and your own convenience makes it desirable that our business should be concluded within the present week, subjects, should be withheld from the discussions of the Synod of which they cannot legitimately, or even usefully, take cognizance. And I trust that in the discussions in which you will be required to take part, you will never lose the recollection that we meet here as a religious body, and for holy purposes; that you should be mindful of the charity which beareth all things and hopeth all things in the brethren from whom you may differ; and that every member of the Synod may so speak, and so act, that there shall be no upbraiding from their own consciences, and no reproach from without.

UNAUTHORISED PROCEEDINGS.—In both Toronto and Montreal some excitement has been produced by certain ecclesiastical proceedings which are believed to have been in contravention of the doctrines and liturgy of the Anglican Church. At Holy Trinity Toronto, a secret religious Society or "Confraternity" had been formed, in connection with which a manual was used, and practices were observed, which savoured rather of popery than a pure protestant worship. At St. John's the Evangelist, Montreal, a manual has been put into circulation entitled the "Rule of Faith" and the "Rule of life," which was alleged to have upon it the image and superscription of the "Beast." In each case, the Bishop of the diocese has had his attention called to the subject, and has taken prompt and decided action. As the result, the Rev. Mr. Denroche, the principal offender in Toronto, has removed from the diocese; and in Montreal, the Rev. Mr. Prime has had his license withdrawn. The action thus taken by the Bishops must commend itself to the approval of all thoughtful and dispassionate members of the Church. They have acted in accordance with the high obligations of their office, and with a due regard to the peace and purity of the Church. We could not reasonably expect more from them. There are those who may still be dissatisfied, because the Bishops do not indulge in wholesale and indiscriminate censure and denunciation. This would be unworthy of their character and position, and would frustrate the very object sought even by the complainants. In both Toronto and Montreal, a correspondence has been published on the subject. We think in each case the Bishop appears to greatest advantage, and those who would compel the Bishops to adopt extreme and harsh measures will be doomed to disappointment. There was doubtless ground for complaint. The proceedings objected to were contrary to the spirit and teaching of the Church. Our articles and formularies have no where sanctioned secret societies, prayers for the dead, the invocation of saints, and genuflexions and crossings which are unmistakeably popish in their origin and prejudicial in their influence. It is a mistake to try to introduce them amongst us. The clergyman is unfaithful to his ordination vows who does this. Nothing but harm can result from it. The consciences of weak brethren

are offended, and the Church is scandalized. We have no need of such things; the Church will be vastly more united and successful without them. When brought under their notice, the Bishops were bound to take cognizance of such things; and we hope their unhesitating and decided condemnation will have the effect of preventing any further attempt at the introduction of doctrines and ceremonies which are unauthorised by the Church, and which are alien to its articles, its creeds, its canons, its rubrics, and its customs. We must, however be moderate and discreet while we are determined and zealous. It is not wise to magnify the evil, much less to indulge in exaggeration and falsehood. Nor should we suspect of heresy everything which may be novel or which may differ from our ordinary routine of thought and action. We cannot always move in one beaten path: The life of the Church will soon stagnate if we refuse to sanction and adopt any new thought or any new plan. There is progress in everything around us. Old customs are abolished; new ideas are promulgated, and new schemes are tried. The Church must move with society. If it stand still, and try to live upon the traditions of the past, it will soon become inert and powerless. Where there is vigorous life, that life will show itself in vigorous and oftentimes strange action; and we had rather the Church, or individual members of the Church, indulge in a few excesses—rush even into wild extremes—so that the Church might fulfil its mission in the world, than see it relapse into indifferentism in doctrine and worship, and eventually die of respectability and prim formality. We have no sympathy with the system or the practices, which are now known under the popular designation of ritualism. We believe that all such excesses of either doctrine or worship are attended with injury to the Church. And yet we also honestly believe that many things are now denounced as ritualistic which are in perfect accordance with the teaching of Scripture, with the custom of the English Church since the Reformation, and with the uniform practice of the early christian church; and they have come to be so denounced either through ignorance or prejudice. The rule of the Church in most cases is explicit enough; and if in carrying out that rule we can—without violating the formularies and doctrines of the Church—add to the attractive and vivifying power of its services, and the completeness and efficiency of its labors, we are justified in doing so, yea, we are required to do so, and any such effort ought not to be interpreted as ritualistic in spirit. In all these matters, we want more charity and forbearance; more confidence in the integrity of our brethren, and less dogmatism in the enunciation of our own ideas; and painful as the circumstances have been which have given rise to these remarks, we hope the action of our Bishops will show that they are men to be trusted for the guidance and governance of the Church, amidst the conflicts and changes which are going on around us.

**THE SYNODS.**—The annual Synods of our Canadian dioceses have been held during the last two months. A full report of their proceedings, or even a good epitome of them, would occupy too much of our space. The most important subjects have been discussed on the whole in a calm and temperate spirit. In some cases there was bitterness of feeling— even asperity of temper; and words were spoken and things done which had better been avoided. Our Synods are not debating clubs; we do not meet for the promotion of mere party objects. However much

our views may differ upon certain ecclesiastical or theological matters, we are still members of one church, and are supposed to be united by a common bond of sympathy and love, as we are actuated by one desire for our Masters's glory and the extension of his Kingdom. The Church admits of such latitude and diversity of opinion; and it is a very great mistake for any party in the Church to arrogate to itself a sort of infallibility and virtually anathematize those who presume to differ from them. There has been a little too much of this spirit in some of our Synods, and in many of our recent proceedings. We are not yet tolerant enough of each other's convictions. The effect is highly prejudicial. Such a spirit engenders distrust and suspicion, and then leads to the adoption of very questionable practices. We have seen instances of this which we do not care to particularize. The remedy for this evil is the exercise of a more generous confidence in each other's words and deeds. We must think, and let think; while it will prove far more in accordance with our christian character, and far more conducive to the spiritual efficiency of the Church to eschew all such electioneering tactics and intrigues as are now becoming far too common at our Synods, and to leave each member to the exercise of his free, deliberate, and independent judgment. These strong party movements can only result in mischief; and we hope no future Synod will witness the antagonism and collision which have unhappily taken place in the recent meetings. A large amount of business has undoubtedly been transacted; but in many cases there has been apparently the want of a directly practical purpose and aim. Our legislation should tend in all cases to invigorate the spiritual life, and to extend the evangelistic labours of the Church; and if we fail in making our Church "a praise in the earth" for its purity and power, all our fine speeches and elaborate schemes will prove utterly worthless. The question of patronage in the appointment of Clergymen to vacant parishes again excited an animated discussion in the Toronto Synod. It was eventually decided by a sort of compromise which leaves the power of appointment in the hands of the Bishop, but provides that before any final appointment is made, the lay officers of the vacant parish shall be consulted. Under all the circumstances perhaps this was the most practicable plan of settling the matter, although grave objections may be started to its operation. If the power were left unconditionally in the hands of the Bishop we do not think any evil would accrue; and in this, as in many other things in our Church arrangements, we have need to exercise a more perfect mutual confidence, believing that each is influenced by a right motive, and that each is seeking the good of the Church. An increase of the Episcopate, an extension of missionary operations, and various points touching upon rubrical revision, and some of the phases of the great ritualistic controversy which now agitates the Church, were respectively discussed. We shall refer in detail to some of these questions in future numbers. Our Synods have no doubt supplied us with food for thought, and with material for work; and if, as a body of clergy and laity, we honestly strive to carry out the principles of the Church, we shall give proof that Synodical action is not an evil—as some represent—and that our Church here has within it elements of vitality and vigour which will yet make it a glorious success.

---

**OUR CHURCH SCHOOLS.**—Great advance has been made within the last two or three years in the cause of Church Schools for the education of

both boys and girls. Our children are no longer left to the evil influences which in too many cases were brought to bear upon them in Roman Catholic Convents, and other professedly public schools. We have now in connection with the Church a number of institutions in which a complete secular and a religious education is imparted in harmony with the formularies of the English Church. Prominent among these we call attention to the Bishop Strachan School in Toronto, the Hellmuth Colleges in London, the Trinity College Grammar School at Port Hope, the Ontario College at Picton, the Ladies College at Ottawa, Bishop's College at Lennoxville, the Weston Grammar School, and the Church of England Boys' School at Rice Lake. All these Schools are placed under able management, and all, we are glad to learn, are in a prosperous and encouraging condition. The reports presented, and the exercises observed preceding the Midsummer vacation, show a satisfactory state of things. The promoters of these Schools have reason to feel encouraged; the Church should rejoice and assist them in their work. Our Schools and Churches are indissolubly linked together. If the latter are to succeed, we must pay increasing attention to the former. We do not know that even now we have enough. The Roman Catholics are greatly in advance of us in their efforts for the education of the young. Our present Schools should be well sustained. We call upon the Church people to aid in the establishment of others in every important Centre. In Hamilton the Rev. Mr. Jemmett is laudably endeavouring to supply a public want. But this is not enough. It is not simply Schools in which a higher education can be imparted that are needed. Do we not want parochial Schools, in which the children of the poor can receive a good education on the basis of the Church? We suffer as a Church for want of these Schools. Our poor children are left often to the mercy of any body who will take charge of them, and we cannot much wonder if they are taught sentiments antagonistic to the Church, and to the Bible too. The Common School system of the country has its advantages, and we are not disposed to open a crusade against it; but it is notoriously inefficient, while as a training system for the Church it is more than a failure—it is positively injurious. In every large parish, we ought to have a parochial School under the direct supervision of the clergyman of the parish, and which shall carry on during the week the instruction which is given on a Sunday. Our Church will never have its proper influence, and perform its appointed work, among the poor until some such arrangement is carried out. And there is really no reason why it should not be attempted. We must educate the young and the poor, and in order to do this we must adapt our arrangements to their circumstances. It is a gross dereliction of duty to leave this work in other hands, and we hope proper action will be taken, that we may have a School for the poor conjointly with a Church.

**OUR MISSIONS.**—We intended in the present number entering somewhat largely into a consideration of the state and prospects of our Missions. The articles prepared are held over to make room for the lengthy and important article on marriage with a deceased wife's sister. It is now possible to do little more than call attention to the subject, promising that before the meeting of the Provincial Synod we shall issue a special appeal on the necessity of appointing forthwith at least one Missionary Bishop for the Indian tribes, and the new section of country

contiguous to them which is now opening up. Our Diocesan Missions demand a more generous support and a more vigorous prosecution. In many parts of the country the Church is not yet established, and unless a greater missionary spirit can be infused into our people, it is not likely to be for some time to come. We regret to find such a lamentable want of laborers, and still more of funds. The Mission fund of the Montreal diocese is heavily encumbered. In the other dioceses things are better, but not by any means so satisfactory as they should be. At the Toronto Synod, the Rev. T. S. Cartwright brought forward a resolution suggesting the desirability of raising the annual income of that diocese to \$50,000, and pointing out the means by which it could be done. The resolution was referred for consideration to the General Mission Board. We hope the Board will earnestly take the matter up. In every diocese, we are persuaded, a much larger income might be raised. There is a want of system in our contributions and efforts. Our Missions should receive greater prominence in our parochial arrangements. Mission Boxes might be more generally and usefully employed. In each diocese there should be a special secretary appointed to take cognizance of this work. A contribution on an average of a cent per week from each member of the Church would supply a largely augmented income. It will be a reproach to us if we longer delay in the appointment of a Missionary Bishop. The requisite funds can be obtained. We are a missionary church, and we must faithfully perform our missionary work. If we fail in this, others will step before us, and we shall become, as we deserve to do, small and of no reputation.

**COADJUTOR BISHOP.**—The Bishop of Huron having for some time felt himself physically unequal to the duties of his diocese, has requested the appointment of a coadjutor, following in this respect the example of the late Bishop Strachan. A special Synod for this object was held in London on Wednesday, July 19th, and resulted in the election by a large majority of Dean Hellmuth. The proceedings appear to have been conducted with great decorum, although preceded by a large amount of caucussing and canvassing so common on these occasions, and which are to be so strongly reprobated. In the election of Dean Hellmuth the aged Bishop will have a valuable coadjutor, and the diocese may be congratulated on having a man at its head full of practical energy and wisdom. The Dean has long been closely identified with the workings of the Huron diocese, and in his educational institutions has conferred a great boon upon the public. In his future more prominent and responsible office he will have a wider sphere and an ampler opportunity for the exercise of his powers of management, and we cannot doubt that he will fulfil the duties of his office with credit to himself and with advantage to the Church over which he will preside. We offer the Dean our heartiest congratulations on his election, and we anticipate for the Huron diocese under his energetic and wise supervision a career of increasing success.

**IN MEMORIAM.**—We have to record the removal from amongst us by death of two respected clergymen in the Toronto diocese. The Rev. Dr. Neville, of Hamilton, and the Rev. J. Hilton, of Toronto, have finished their work, and have entered upon their reward. Each suffered a long and painful illness; each bore his sufferings with christian resignation and fortitude; and each gave testimony in his death to the

reality of the gospel he had preached, and to the strength of his attachment to the Church at whose altars he had ministered. We offer the bereaved families our heartfelt condolence, while we pay a tribute of respect to the memory of their departed friends. In this expression of feeling we are sure all our readers will heartily join.

**MINOR EVENTS.**—Among minor events which we cannot particularize in detail may be mentioned, the confirmation tour of the Bishop of Toronto, Ordination services, the opening of several new churches, testimonials to clergymen, appointment of the Rev. J. P. Dumoulin as successor to Dr. Neville, at St Thomas's Church, Hamilton, the raising of nearly \$400,00, at a Pic Nic at Ancaster towards the reduction of the debt on the church there, and sundry local efforts to build up and extend the Church. Our future is bright if we are faithful to our principles and ourselves.

## Church of England Private School,

RICE LAKE,

*Will re-assemble on the 1st September, 1871.*

F. W. BARRON, M. A., MASTER.  
Formerly Principal of the Upper Canada College.

### PRIZE LIST.

#### CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIVATE SCHOOL, RICE LAKE.

- BIBLICAL LITERATURE, Rev. A. Lampman's Prizes.—1st J. Galt, 2nd, H. Ross.  
 ENGLISH GRAMMAR, Analysis and Parsing.—J. Galt.  
 IMPROVEMENT IN ALGEBRA.—1st, J. Galt. 2nd, D Burnet.  
 IMPROVEMENT IN ARITHMETIC.—J. Sutherland. A. Reynolds. D. Paterson. J. Bower.  
 EUCLID.—J. Galt. T. Cockburn. D. Armour. R. Fowler. C. Campbell.  
 FRENCH.—J. Galt. H. Yates. D. Armour. C. Campbell. B. Yates.  
 IMPROVEMENT IN GEOGRAPHY.—J. Finlay. J. Bower.  
 GREEK.—J. Galt.  
 HISTORY AND DATES.—D. Armour. C. Campbell. D. Paterson. R. Cartwright.  
 LATIN.—D. Armour. C. Campbell. H. Yates. B. Yates. J. Finlay. A. Lampman.  
 IMPROVEMENT IN WRITING.—H. Yates. J. Sutherland. F. Cockburn. F. Ellis. R. Fowler. R. Cartwright. A. Lampman. A. Patterson.  
 GREATEST PROGRESS.—H. Yates.  
 GREAT IMPROVEMENT.—D. Armour. J. Finlay. G. Bower. A. Patterson. A. Lampman.  
 LESSONS WELL LEARNT.—A. Lampman. A. Patterson.  
 ENTERING SUMS.—J. Galt.  
 GENERAL PROFICIENCY.—J. Galt.

**F. W. BARRON, M. A., Master,**  
Formerly Principal of the Upper Canada College.

**FIRST PREMIUM**  
**SEWING MACHINES,**  
 MANUFACTURED BY  
**R. M. WANZER & CO.,**

Were awarded the Highest Premiums over all competitors

At the London Provincial Fair.....		1861
Do. Toronto do. do.....		1862
Do. Montreal do. do.....		1863
Do. Kingston do. do.....		1863
Do. Hamilton do. do.....		1863
Do. London do. do.....		1864
Do. Toronto do. do.....	(extra prize)	1865
Do. Kingston do. do.....	( " " )	1866
Do. Hamilton do. do.....	(not exhibited)	1877
Do. London do. do.....	(4 first prizes)	1868
Do. Montreal do. do.....	(not exhibited)	1869
Do. do do. do.....	(2 first prizes)	1870
Do. do do. do.....	(Diploma for best collection)	1870
Do. Western Fair, London.....	1 First and 1 Second Prize also a Diploma	1870

**EUROPEAN EXHIBITIONS.**

At Vienna, Capital of Austria, Royal Diploma, 1864. At Dresden, Capital of Saxony, Royal Diploma, 1864. At Leipsic, Germany, First Prize Medal, 1865. At Copenhagen, Denmark, First Prize, 1865. At the National Exhibition of the British Isles, held in Dublin, First Prize Medal, 1866. At the British Exhibition, held at Dudley and York, two First Prize Medals, 1867. At the great World's Exhibition, held in Paris, France, we were awarded the First and Highest Prize Medal for Family Sewing Machines, eighty-seven competitors, 1867. At Inverness, Aberdeen, and Glasgow, Scotland, First Prizes, 1867. At Manchester and Cheltenham, England, two First Prize Medals, 1868.

We shall leave the general public to draw their own inferences as to our success, from the above List of Prizes.

**R. M. WANZER & CO.**

**Room Papers. Room Papers.**

**DUNCAN, STUART & CO.,**

**H**AVE OPENED A SPLENDID ASSORTMENT of English and American

**WALL PAPERS and DECORATIONS,**

Comprising all the various grades and patterns suitable for Parlors, Halls, Dining Rooms, Bed Rooms, &c., to which inspection is respectfully solicited.

A full assortment of

**WINDOW BLINDS,**

**SCHOOL BOOKS,**

and **STATIONERS' SUNDRIES**

Constantly on hand.

Two Cases of **CHROMOS**, from Geo. Rowney & Co., just received.

**DUNCAN, STUART & CO.,**  
 Corner of James and Market Sts.

**GOLDSMITH'S**

**BRYANT & STRATTON'S**

**Business University,**

*Located next to the Post Office, DETROIT, Michigan.*

The oldest, largest, most thorough and popular institution of the kind in the country, and the only one in the State belonging to the great International Business College Association, extending throughout the United States and the Canadas, and scholarship issued at the Detroit branch is good in all BOARD OF TRADE sessions are held daily among the teachers and Students.

**Business Practically Taught.**

For further information please call for address

**J. H. GOLDSMITH, President.**



**YOU OUGHT TO SEE THE  
NATIONAL SUNDAY-SCHOOL  
TEACHER,**

And the national series of lessons for 1871, on the words of Jesus the Christ, before you adopt any lesson for the coming year.

**THE TEACHER** will be enlarged for 1871. Every number will be illustrated.

**THE PRIMARY LESSONS** will be conducted by **SARA J. TIMANUS**, one of the best primary teachers in the United States.

The best writers will be employed.—Every number will be excellent.

The National Series of Sunday-School Lessons, published in the **NATIONAL SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHER**, is now studied by 75,000 Teachers, and 500,000 Scholars.

**TERMS**:—Yearly Subscriptions, \$1.50, invariable in advance. Single numbers, 10 cents. Clubs of ten or more, sent to one address, will receive six Lesson Papers, gratis, for each subscriber, monthly. No Extra Papers, gratis, are sent to single subscribers. Lesson Papers, 1 cent each, or 75 cents per 100. Lesson Papers, in packages of ten or more, can be ordered, by the month or year, without the **TEACHER**. Single subscriptions must close with June or December. Clubs may begin and close at any time.

**SUNDAY-SCHOOL SCHOLAR.**

The best Monthly Magazine for Sunday-Schools in the world. It contains 16 pages of original matter, from our best writers, and is just the thing for intelligent young people to read Sunday afternoon.

**TERMS**:—56 cents per year; one copy for five subscribers; clubs of 10, at 40 cents each; 25 copies and over, 30 cents each.

**THE LITTLE FOLKS.**

**INFANT CLASS** Paper for every Sunday. A cut and two new stories in each weekly number.

**TERMS**:—30 cents a year; clubs of ten and over, 20 cents a year.

Send 10 cents for sample copy of each of the above

**CHEAPEST, PRETTIEST, BEST**

**CHRISTMAS OR  
NEW YEAR'S PRESENTS**

FOR THE INFANT CLASSES, IS

**THE LITTLE FOLKS FOR 1870,**

Beautifully bound in Illuminated Cover. Forty-eight Choice Stories by Mr. EGGLESTON, and as many beautiful Pictures, for 40 cents, postage paid. Liberal terms made to those who buy for a class or school.

**EGGLESTON'S  
SUNDAY-SCHOOL RECORD.**

In making this book, Mr. Eggleston has sought to combine all the items necessary to be kept in a Sunday-School Record, with brevity and simplicity of arrangement.

This book contains about 208 pages, bound in a substantial manner. Price \$1.00. Sent by mail.

ADDRESS,

ADAMS, BLACKMER & LYON PUB. CO.,

ARCADE, CHICAGO.

**MR. BLAKE'S  
WALKING STICKS:**

BY REV. EDWARD EGGLESTON, D. D.

Editor of the National Sunday-School Teacher. Mr. Eggleston is widely known as a most successful and gifted writer for children, and

**"MR. BLAKE'S WALKING STICK"**

is, without doubt, the most delightful story that has come from his pen. It is specially adapted for use in Sunday-School as a present from teacher, to parent, or friend, to a boy or girl.

**PRICE**—On paper, beautifully illuminated, 25 cents. By the dozen, \$2.00. Sent by mail.

**THE INFANT CLASS:**

HINTS ON

PRIMARY RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

BY SARA J. TIMANUS,

Edited, with an Introduction, by Edward Eggleston  
Editor of *The National Sunday-School Teacher*.

SENT BY MAIL FOR 75 CENTS.

**JUST WHAT YOU NEED!**

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL

**TEACHER'S  
POCKET-BOOK  
AND DIARY,  
1871**

Containing Class Register, Attendance Register, Collection Register, and Diary, Jewish Calendar, Tables of Weights, Measures, Money, &c., Calendar of Lessons, and Calendar of 1871.

**SUNDAY-SCHOOL MANUAL.**

BY REV. EDWARD EGGLESTON, D. D.

A practical Guide to the Sunday-School Work in all its departments: The most *Pointed, Complete, and Practical* work for Sunday School Teachers and Officers ever published in this or any other country. Price 75 cents. In paper cover. Sent by mail on receipt of price. For sale by all booksellers.

We have read this little volume through, every word of it, and have not found a sentence or a statement which we could willingly spare. It should be included in every teacher's library, and tested by actual experience.—*Independent*.

**THE BOOK OF  
QUEER STORIES**

BY EDWARD EGGLESTON,

Author of "The Round Table Stories," "The Chicken Little Stories," "Stories Told on a Cellar Door," Etc., Etc.,

12mo., cloth. Price, 75 cents.

THE GREAT  
**ENGLISH & SCOTCH**  
*Quarterlies, and*  
**BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE,**

Reprinted in New York by the  
**Leonard Scott Publishing Co'.**

QUARTERLY :

The Edinburgh Review | North British Review  
 London Quarterly | Westminster

MONTHLY :

Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine.

These periodicals are the medium through which the greatest minds, not only of Great Britain and Ireland, but also of Continental Europe, are constantly brought into more or less intimate communication with the world of readers. History, Biography, Science, Philosophy, Art, Religion, the great political questions of the past of to-day, are treated in their pages as the learned alone can treat them. No one would keep pace with the times can afford to do without these periodicals.

Of all the monthlies *Blackwood* holds the foremost place.

TERMS.

For any one of the Reviews,.....	\$4 00 per an.
For any two of the Reviews,.....	7 00 "
For any three of the Reviews,.....	10 00 "
For any four of the Reviews,.....	13 00 "
For <i>Blackwood's Magazine</i> ,.....	4 00 "
For <i>Blackwood</i> and one Review,.....	7 00 "
For <i>Blackwood</i> and any two of the Reviews,.....	10 00 "
For <i>Blackwood</i> and three of the Reviews,.....	13 00 "
For <i>Blackwood</i> and four Reviews,.....	15 00 "
Single numbers of a Review, \$1 ; single numbers of <i>Blackwood</i> , thirty-five cents. Postage two cents a number.	

CLUBS.

A discount of *twenty per cent*, will be allowed to clubs of four or more persons. Thus, four copies of *Blackwood*, or of one Review, will be sent to one address for \$12.80. Four copies of the four Reviews and *Blackwood*, for \$48, and so on. For clubs of ten or more persons, a copy gratis to the getter-up of the club, in addition to the above discount.

**Premium to New Subscribers !**

New subscribers to any two of the above periodicals for 1871, will be entitled to receive one of the *Reviews* for 1870. New subscribers to all the five may receive any two of the *Reviews* for 1870.

Neither premium to subscribers, nor discount to clubs can be allowed, unless the money is remitted *direct to the Publisher*. No premiums can be given to clubs.

Circulars will further particulars may be had on application.

THE LEONARD SCOTT PUBLISHING CO.,  
 140 FULTON STREET, NEW-YORK.

Postmasters and others disposed to canvas, liberally dealt with.

The Leonrad Scott Publishing Co.

ALSO PUBLISH

THE FARMER'S GUIDE

To Scientific and Practical Agricultural.

By HENRY STEPHENS, F. R. S. Edinburgh, and the late J. P. NORTON, Professor of Scientific Agriculture in Yale College, New-Haven.

Two vols. Royal octavo. 1600 pages and numerous engravings. Price, \$7 ; by mail, post-paid, \$8.

WESTON  
**CHURCH SCHOOL**

(INCORPORATED.)

FOUNDED.....1862.

VISITOR :

THE LORD BISHOP OF TORONTO.

WARDEN :

THE REV. W. A. JOHNSON.

MASTERS :

*Head Master*—The Rev. W. F. Checkley, A. B., Trinity College, Dublin.

*Classical Master*—The Rev. W. H. Priedeaux, M. A., Oxon.

*Mathematical Master*—Not yet appointed.

*French and German*—Mr. Stuhlmann (for 14 years Master of Leamington College, England).

*Drawing*—Mr. H. Martin.

*Gymnastics and Fencing*—Mr. H. Goodwin.

*Music (Piano)*—Mrs. Cunningham.

The Warden will assist the Head Master in Divinity Classes as heretofore.

This school having steadily increased in public favor, it has been thought necessary to make a considerable alteration and enlargement in the Staff of Masters, and to employ none but men of acknowledged ability and long experience.

Weston, August 17, 1870.

# Goldsmiths' Hall,

12 KING STREET, HAMILTON,  
(Opposite the Large Fountain.)

**T. B. STEWARD,**

MANUFACTURERS' AGENT.

**Beaver Electro-Plate Works,**  
SHEFFIELD.

Tea Spoons, Dessert Spoons, Table Spoons  
Dessert Forks, Table Forks,  
Equal in appearance to solid silver, and are  
guaranteed plated on best nickel silver. Quality  
and wear warranted by the manufacturers.

Tea Services, Communion Sets,  
Cruets, Cake Baskets,  
At importers' prices.

AGENCY FOR THE

**American Watch Co'y.,**  
WALTHAM.

**T. B. STEWARD.**

## Our Sunday School

Issued weekly, in time for distribution in  
Sunday Schools throughout the Province, on  
the Sunday before that to which the lessons  
belong. Contains

### Lessons for Scholars.

consisting of scripture proofs and illustrations  
of the Church catechism, appropriate  
hymns, and the collect for each Sunday,  
printed in full, and thus obviating the in-  
convenience and expense of using a number  
of lesson books. Also

### Questions for Teachers

on a portion of Scripture History, and on the  
texts illustrating the Church Catechism  
which have been committed to memory; the  
whole so arranged as to provide for the sim-  
ultaneous instruction of all the scholars in a  
Sunday School, on each Sunday. in some  
one particular of Christian faith or duty, and  
in the same portion of Scripture History, with  
a view to a periodical catechetical examina-  
tion of the whole school by the clergyman of  
the parish.

Price one cent; sent by post, prepaid, at  
the following rates:

10 Copies, to one address, for 13 weeks	..... \$1 00
Or, printed on paper of inferior quality, 25 copies to one address, for 13 weeks	..... 1 75
50 Copies to one address for 13 weeks	..... 3 25

Or, half cent each; always in advance, orders  
received through the editor, box 246, St.  
Catharines, Ont.

Specimen copies sent free on application

# PARLOR ALBUM

IN FIVE QUARTO VOLUMES.

Price, \$9.00 per volume  
or \$40.00 per set, complete.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK.

The Parlor Album is doubtless the most ex-  
tensive Art Gallery ever published, and by those  
who have examined the several portions of the work,  
it has been pronounced "The Climax of Beauty."  
Each volume contains 39 full page Chromo-  
Lithographs, in Oil Colors, 40 full page Steel En-  
gravings, 40 full page engravings on wood and 260  
pages of reading matter, descriptive of the illu-  
strations, the whole making each volume about one-half  
an inch thick, and same sized pages, of Webster's largest  
Dictionary. Each volume is complete in itself and  
will be sold separately, if desired. Sold by Sub-  
scription, only.

Vol. I is devoted to Wild American Birds.  
Vol. II. Contain Wild American Animals.  
Vol. III. American Domesticated Birds and Animals.  
Vol. IV. Foreign Birds and Animals.  
Vol. V. Fishes, Reptiles and Insects.

This work will at once commend itself to the cul-  
tivated American people, and no library will here-  
after be complete without this addition to its treas-  
ure; while as a parlor amusement it is unequalled  
by American publications.

## AGENTS WANTED.

We will give agents very liberal terms for selling  
the above described publications, and wish to appoint  
an agent in every town in the United States and Brit-  
ish Provinces. Experienced book agents and all  
other persons of respectability should apply at once.  
Any Young Man or Young Lady, can, by devoting a  
short time during the day or evening, secure a com-  
plete set, free of expense, or if preferred, we will  
allow large Commission in Cash.

We have prepared a most beautiful Specimen  
Book for Agents, containing 5 of the Oil Chromo-  
mos, 10 Steel Engravings, 10 Wood Engravings and 50  
pages of descriptive reading, being selections from  
each volume, together with blank paper, specimens of  
binding, &c., &c.

Our Specimen Book has cost us quite largely, and  
we do not wish to send it to persons who do not in-  
tend to act as agents, but to any one who will make  
an effort to procure subscribers to the Work, we will  
send a Specimen Book, prepaid, on receipt of 40 cents  
to cover postage. Enclose stamp for reply, and ad-  
dress

American Publishing Co.,

RUTLAND VT

## MARKHAM BELL FOUNDRY.

The subscribers are prepared to furnish any  
number of

## STEEL AMALGAM BELLS

From 45 lbs. to 600 lbs. weight.

## WHOLESALE AND RETAIL.

These bells cost only about

One-Third the Price of the Ordinary Bells,  
and are warranted for one year. They have  
been tested for some years, one thousand six  
hundred now in use.

Satisfactory references furnished.

Jones & Co., Markham P. O., Ont.

# MAYHEW BUSINESS COLLEGE.

THIS College is worthy of its publications, which are used from British America to Oregon. Its Business Practice is protected by letters patent and copyright, and is unrivalled.

## MAYHEW'S Practical Book-Keeping,

called often by those using it  
 "BOOK-KEEPING WITHOUT A MASTER,"  
 and by Agricultural Journals,  
 "BOOK-KEEPING FOR FARMERS,"  
 is sent by mail for 80 cents.

## —OF— MAYHEW'S UNIVERSITY BOOK-KEEPING

Good business men say, we would not, for one thousand dollars, part with the instruction we have gained from it. Price, \$3 50. Sent by mail. Circulars, and AIDS IN COMPUTING INTEREST, are sent FREE on receipt of stamp. Address

IRA MAYHEW,  
 DETROIT, MICH.

## The Leading Machine

### THE LOCKMAN SEWING MACHINE.

Is now the Leading Machine in the Dominion of Canada.

This proud position it has attained through its inherent good qualities. These qualities are—

**Simplicity, Elegance,  
 Durability, Adaptability.**

Besides a score more of equal importance.

For particulars, address the Manufacturers,

WILSON, BOWMAN & CO.,  
 Hamilton, Ont.

Agents are to be found in all the principal Towns and Villages of the Country.

ESTABLISHED 1833

## HENRY ROWSELL, Printer & Publisher,

IMPORTER OF  
**BOOKS and STATIONERY,**  
 74 & 76 King Street East, Toronto.

### IN STOCK:

A complete assortment of Stationery, Account Books, Blank Forms of all kinds, University and College Text Books, School Books, Religious and Miscellaneous Books.

The Publications of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and of the Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union of New York.

*Sunday School Libraries, Reward Books, Books of Instruction, and Sunday School Requisites, Bibles Testaments, Prayer Books Church Service.*

A FULL STOCK OF THE VARIOUS EDITIONS OF  
**Hymns Ancient & Modern,**  
 With and without accompanying Tunes, and the Hymns Bound with the Book of Common Prayer.  
 (Descriptive Price Lists sent on Application.)

H. R. publishes the following: A CHURCH HYMN BOOK, under the sanction of the Lord Bishop of Toronto, and the Lord Bishop of Ontario.

	18mo. Demy	32mo. Demy
Limp Cloth, Embossed..	\$0 25	\$0 30
Cloth Boards.....	0 30	0 25
Bound, gilt or red edges..	0 60	0 50
Limp, Morocco, gilt or red edges.....	0 75	0 60
Call, limp, gilt or red edges.....	1 25	1 00
Morocco, limp, gilt or red edges.....	1 25	1 00

Church and Sunday School Requisites, among which are Catechisms, S. S. Hymn Books, Confirmation Certificates and Catechisms, Teachers' Class Books, &c., &c.

Parish Registers, Offertory Collection Books, "An Aid to Parochial Visiting," &c., &c.

Envelopes and Account Books for the Church Envelope System.

## H. ROWSELL,

74 & 76 King Street East, Toronto.

JAMES BROWNE. PHILIP BROWNE.  
**PHILIP BROWNE & Co.,**

## Bankers and Stock Brokers,

DEALERS IN  
 Sterling Exchange, Bank Stocks, Debentures, Mortgages, &c., U. S. Currency, Silver &c.

Drafts on New York issued in Gold and Currency. Prompt Attention given to Collections. Advances made on Securities.

No. 67 Yonge St. TORONTO, ONT.

**Bishop STRACHAN SCHOOL,**

Wykeham Hall, - - TORONTO,  
A CHURCH INSTITUTION  
For the Education of Young Ladies.

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL :  
THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP  
OF TORONTO.

CHAPLAIN :  
REV. J. LANGTRY, M. A.

LADY PRINCIPAL :  
MISS DUPONT.

A staff of sixteen teachers is employed including, in the departments of French Music and the Fine Arts, the best talent in the Dominion.

Fees, without extras, for all branches taught in best Ladies' Schools :

Senior and Intermediate Classes,	per term.....	\$20
Junior Class.....	.....	16
Elementary Class.....	.....	10
Board and Washing in all Classes...	.....	55

**HIGHER EDUCATION.**

**Hellmuth College,**  
LONDON, ONT.

The best masters and the most complete course of instruction.

**Board and Tuition per annum \$236.**

The HELLMUTH LADIES' COLLEGE, inaugurated by H. R. PRINCE ARTHUR.

PRESIDENT :  
The Very Rev. I. HELLMUTH, D. D.,  
Dean of Huron, and Rector of St Paul's Cathedral.

LADY PRINCIPAL :  
Mrs. MILLS, late Lady Principal of Queen's College, London, England assisted by a large and able staff of experienced

EUROPEAN TEACHERS.  
French is the language spoken in the College.

COURSE OF INSTRUCTION.  
MODERN LANGUAGES :—English in all its branches, Natural Philosophy, and other branches of Science and art; Drawing, Painting, Music, Needle Work, Instrumental Music, etc.  
Economics, etc.

APPLICATION  
for Admission and for all other particulars to be made to the Lady Principal, or to Major-General Hellmuth Ladies' College, London.

January, 1871.

**TRINITY COLLEGE SCHOOL,**  
Port Hope.

A Church School for boys under the management of a governing body appointed by the Corporation of Trinity College, Toronto.

VISITOR :  
The Right Reverend the LORD BISHOP OF TORONTO.

**Governing Body :**

- The Hon. J. H. Cameron, Q. C., D. C. L., Chancellor of the University.
- The Rev. the Provost of Trinity College,
- The Rev. J. Ambery, M. A., Professor of Classics.
- The Rev. W. Jones, M. A., Professor of Mathematics.
- The Rev. C. J. S. Bethune, M. A., Head Master of the School.
- The Venerable A. Palmer, M. A., Arch-deacon of Toronto.
- The Rev. J. G. Geddes, M. A.
- The Hon. G. W. Allan, Senator;
- C. J. Campbell, Esq.,
- F. W. Cumberland, Esq., M. P. P.

HEAD MASTER :  
The Rev. Charles J. S. Bethune, M. A., Trinity College, Toronto.

ASSISTANT MASTERS :  
The Rev. F. A. Bethune, M. A., Trinity College, Toronto.  
E. H. Harington, B.A., Worcester College, Oxford.

MUSIC MASTER.—Mr. W. Philp.

MATRON—Mrs. Marmion.

FEES :—One pupil, \$200 per annum. Brothers and Sons of Clergymen, \$180. Trinity Term will commence on Saturday, April 22nd.

Large new buildings to afford much increased accommodation, are in course of erection, and will be ready for occupation in September next

**The Craftsman**

—AND—  
**Canadian Masonic Record.**

PUBLISHED BY  
**J. J. MASON,**  
Hamilton, Ont.

TERMS, ..... \$1.50 a Year

# TO ADVERTISERS!

The attention of the Advertising Public is specially invited to the advantages offered for the circulation of their advertisements by the

## “CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE AND MONTHLY REVIEW.”

IT CIRCULATES WIDELY in every part of Canada, and in many parts of Great Britain and the United States; and commands regularly a **Larger class of Readers** than any other periodical issued in Canada.

ADVERTISEMENTS inserted in its advertising columns cannot fail to **Attract General Attention** from those who are likely to be interested in them.

No Public Institution, no Commercial Establishment, no Bookseller and Stationer, and no Dealer in Miscellaneous Goods, should fail to secure the **ADVANTAGES OF ITS ADVERTISING SHEET.**

Advertisements are Inserted on the Most Reasonable Terms.

### TERMS.

Single Advertisements under twenty lines, ten cents per line; a reduction of five cents per line for every subsequent insertion.

A full page for one year,	\$60 00
do for six months,	\$40 00
do for single insertion,	\$20 00

Half or quarter pages in the above proportion.

**SPECIAL CONTRACTS** for stitching in Catalogues, Fly Leaves, already printed, &c., may be made on equally advantageous terms.

The aim of the Publishers is to make the advertising sheet of the **CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE** the **cheapest, the most reliable and complete, and the most widely circulated of any advertising medium in the Dominion.**

Every Advertiser will be supplied with copies of the **MAGAZINE** containing his advertisement.

**PAYMENT STRICTLY IN ADVANCE,**  
or on receipt of presentation copy.

Preparations are making for

**AN ISSUE OF 10,000 COPIES** & Co.,  
Broken

Advertisers should apply at once.

Office of **CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE**,  
James St., Hamilton.

THE PROPRIETORS  
AND PUBLISHERS.



**HALL'S  
VEGETABLE SICILIAN  
HAIR  
RENEWER.**

Every year increases the popularity of this valuable Hair Preparation; which is due to merit alone. We can assure our old patrons that it is kept fully up to its high standard; and it is the only reliable and perfected preparation for

**Restoring Gray or Faded Hair to its youthful color,**

making it soft, lustrous, and silken. The scalp, by its use, becomes white and clean. It removes all eruptions and dandruff, and by its tonic properties prevents the hair from falling out, as it stimulates and nourishes the hair glands.

**By its use, the Hair grows Thicker and Stronger.**

In baldness, it restores the capillary glands to their normal vigor, and will create a new growth, except in extreme old age. It is the most economical Hair Dressing ever used, as it requires fewer applications, and gives the Hair a splendid glossy appearance.

A. A. HAYES, M. D., State Assayer of Massachusetts, says, "The constituents are pure, and carefully selected for excellent quality; and I consider it the best PREPARATION for its intended purposes."

SOLD BY ALL DRUGGISTS AND DEALERS IN MEDICINES.

**PRICE ONE DOLLAR.**

**BUCKINGHAM'S DYE**

**FOR THE WHISKERS.**

As our Remedy in many cases requires too long a time, and too much care, to restore gray or faded Whiskers, we have prepared this dye, in one preparation, which will quickly and effectually accomplish this result. It is easily applied, and produces a color which will neither rub nor wash off. Sold by all Druggists.

**Fifty Cents.**

Made by **R. P. HALL & CO.**

ALBANY, N. Y.

**NORTHROP & LYMAN,**

General Agents.

**AYER'S  
HAIR VIGOR**

FOR

**Restoring to Gray Hair its**

**Natural Vitality and Color.**

A DRESSING

which is at once

**Agreeable,**

**Healthy,**

AND

**Effectual**

for preserving the Hair.



**It soon restores Faded or Gray Hair to its original color, with the gloss and freshness of youth.**

Thin hair is thickened, — falling hair checked, and baldness often though not always cured by its use. Nothing can restore the hair where the follicles are destroyed, or the glands atrophied or decayed; but such as remain can be saved by this application, and stimulated into activity, so that a new growth of hair is produced. Instead of fouling the hair with a pasty sediment, it will keep it clean and vigorous. Its occasional use will prevent the hair from turning gray or falling off, and consequently prevent baldness. The restoration of vitality it gives to the scalp arrests and prevents the formation of dandruff, which is often so uncleanly and offensive. Free from those deleterious substances which make some preparations dangerous and injurious to the hair, the Vigor can only benefit but no harm it. If wanted merely for a HAIR DRESSING, nothing else can be found so desirable. Containing neither oil nor dye, it does not soil white cambric and yet lasts long on the hair, giving it a rich glossy lustre, and a grateful perfume.

Prepared by **Dr. J. C. AYER & CO.**

Practical and Analytical Chemists,

**LOWELL, MASS.**

**NORTHROP & LYMAN,**

General Agents.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

**Fireside Friend,**

A Monthy Periodical for the Home Circle.

Devoted to Literature, Science, Health, Amusement, and Useful Information—Containing forty-eight three column pages to the number, filled with Choice Stories, Sketches and Poems, from the pens of the Best Writers of America.

Articles on Scientific subjects, Health, and Reform.

A department for the Children, filled with instructive and amusing articles.

A Masonic department, containing information valuable to the members of the Fraternity.

A Temperance department, in which will be advocated these principles without which there can be no happy homes or pure morals.

Brilliant scraps and diamonds of thought gathered from correspondents and other sources, and arranged with care, making it eminently suited for the Home Circle of every family in the land.

Terms—Always in Advance.

1 Copy, one year	\$2 00
3 Copies, " "	5 00
4 " " "	6 00
5 " " " and one to gather up of Club	8 00
6 " " " " " "	12 00
11 " " " " " "	16 00
14 " " " " " "	20 00

Valuable Premiums given to those who get up Clubs at the regular subscription price, \$2 per year. For particulars see Club lists.

Specimen copies sent free to any address.

All letters relative to the Literary Department must be addressed to the Editor,

**J. WILLIAM VAN NAMEE,**

All letters relative to Business must be addressed to the Publisher,

**R. LEONIDAS HAMILTON,**

Post Office Box 4952, New York City.

Single Copies, 20 cents. For sale by all News Dealers.

THE

**Works of Bishop Oxenden,**

METROPOLITAN OF CANADA.

The Pastoral Office: its Duties, Privileges and Prospects	\$1 00
Portraits from the Bible, 2 vols, each	90
Cottage Readings	1 00
Cottage Sermons	75
Parables of our Lord	75
Lectures on the Gospels, 2 vols, each	63
Pathway of Safety, or Counsel to the Awakened	63
Christian Life, large type	63
Our Church and her Services	63
Family Prayers, four weeks	63
" " " " one week, paper	19
" " " " cl. limp	15
" " " " cl. extra	20
Private Prayers	25
Decision	40
Words of Peace, or Blessings and Trials of Sickness	40
Home Beyond, or Happy Old Age	40
Fervent Prayer	40
God's Message to the Poor	40
Story of Ruth	40
Laboring Man's Book	40
Plain History of the Christian Church	25
Baptism Simply Explained	25
Lord's Supper	25
Earnest Communicant—Course of Preparation for the Lord's Table	25
Do. Morocco	1 00
Great Truths in very Plain Language	25
Confirmation—Are you ready to Serve Christ	63
Do. cloth limp	15

Any of the above sent, postage prepaid, on receipt of the price.

**E. A. TANLOR & CO.,**

LONDON, ONT.

**CATECHISMS, &c.**

A Plain and Short Catechism	1
Flou. By the Rev. J. Bickel, M.A.	1
\$3 per hundred. Each	\$0 08
Questions on Confirmation	1
P. Haunam. \$1.50 per hundred. Each	3
The Catechism of the Church of England	1
\$1.20 per hundred. Each	3
Hymns for Sunday Schools. By Rev. A. Sanborn. \$3 per hundred. Each	5
Hymns for Sunday Schools. By Rev. A. Sanborn. Stiff bound. \$4.50 per 100. Each	5
First Steps to Catechism. \$1 per hundred. Each	5
An Explanation of the Church Catechism	1
\$1.00 per hundred. Each	1
An Explanation of the Church Catechism Without proof. \$6 per 100	1
The Church Catechism Bro. Questions. \$3 per hundred.	4
A short Liturgy for Sunday	1
per hundred. Each	3
Beecher's Lecture on the Episcopate	1
\$1 per hundred. Each	3

**E. & Co. Broker**