

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

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

- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

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

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

THE
CANADIAN PRESBYTER.

JUNE, 1858.

SYNODS.

Two of the three Presbyterian Synods in Canada are now in Session, and the meeting of the third is at hand. We deem it an appropriate time to offer a few observations on the uses of Synods, and the best modes of increasing their interest and usefulness.

The Supreme Court of a Presbyterian Church, whether a Synod, or a General Assembly, ought to be the highest expression of the Church's life—of her wisdom, power, and love. Its meeting should be expected and watched with prayerful interest by all within the Church's bounds. Its influence should be beneficially felt in every department of the Church's duty, diffusing a fresh virtue even to the hem of the garment. This is all the more to be looked for in non-established Churches. When there is no connection with the State, and the Church is perfectly uncontrolled in her self-government, very great powers, legislative, judicial, and executive are wielded by the Supreme Court. Very blessed are the results when these powers are exercised in successive years with fidelity, discretion and high consistency. Very sad are the consequences, when a Synod, with large powers and noble opportunities, ties the Church to narrow views of Christian duty, or pursues a weak, capricious, precipitate public policy.

If any Synod lack wisdom, let it ask of God. The higher our sense of the duties incumbent on our Supreme Court, the deeper our conviction of the unspeakable value and absolute necessity of prayer in the Synod—fervent, fraternal prayer. In every Synod this is acknowledged, but it is not common to find a Synod bathed as it ought to be in devotional feeling, and awed by the felt presence of the Holy Ghost. Many earnest men ask year by year, what can be done to increase and elevate the devotional element in the great Annual Convocation of the Church? The remedy sometimes proposed is to allot a larger proportion of time than is usually given to devotional exercises, and to insist more rigorously on a punctual attendance of members on the exercises with which every "sederunt" is opened. We presume to think that a more judicious advice may be given. A Synod, being a Court of the Church under obligation to transact a large amount of business in a limited number of days, cannot give

a much larger proportion of its time than is now given, even to so precious an exercise as prayer. What is needed, is not so much an extension of time, as a more skilful and earnest employment of the time now allowed for calling upon God. The prayers we have heard at Synods and General Assemblies have almost always been too long. Both in Scotland and in Canada we have known the special devotional "diet" at the opening of the Court, to be entirely occupied by two or three brethren, each praying for fifteen, twenty, or even thirty minutes. With rare exceptions, these long prayers are as wearisome to the spirit as they are to the flesh, and the very comprehensiveness for which they are sometimes praised, forms one of our chief objections to them. We want, at the opening of a Synod, short prayers with definite aims and compact expressions; and instead of two or three brethren, we should like to hear the voices of six or eight successively in prayer, interspersed with the singing of Psalms. At the commencement of each sederunt too, the prayer should not be lengthy, and should bear upon the matters of business about to be considered. If the devotional exercises were made more apposite and more lively than they usually are, there would be little reason to blame the members of Synod for remaining without till the commencement of actual business.

In this very important matter, no reform can be obtained without wisdom and tact in the Moderator; but not even the most judicious Moderator can effect the reform, unless sustained by the good sense of his ministerial brethren.

While on this topic, we may add the suggestion, that in order to increase the spiritual tone and profit of a meeting of Synod, the Court might advantageously resolve itself into a Brotherly Conference on the religious life of the Church—its impediments, decays, or revivals—and on the practical difficulties which ministers and kirk sessions encounter in furthering the work of the Lord. We know that many young pastors would gladly hear the ripe judgment of senior brethren on these matters. To maintain the interest of such a Conference however, and reap its benefits, it would be necessary sternly to repress the proneness to lengthy and tedious remarks. If the speakers were restricted to five minutes each, they would learn to dispense with introductions and repetitions, and give in a concise form the best results of their observation and experience.

The business of a Synod in a living growing Church is not confined to matters of internal administration. It relates also to the extension of the kingdom of Christ by Missions, by Sabbath-Schools, by itinerant evangelisation, and by the diffusion of sound religious literature. There is a tendency perhaps in young Churches, to exaggerate the legislative functions of a Synod, and to multiply minute and rigid laws, based on insufficient experience, which are soon suffered to fall into abeyance, or are remembered only to be repealed. We deem it more necessary to lay stress on the judicial and missionary duties which devolve on a properly constituted Synod. Such a court, or convocation, is at once our Judiciary and our Propaganda.

The judicial functions of the Synod are to be exercised with the greatest patience, calmness and care. "It belongeth to Synods and Councils, ministerially, to determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience; to set down rules.

and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of His Church; to receive complaints in cases of mal-administration, and authoritatively to determine the same."—(Conf. of Faith., chap. xxxi., sect. 3.) Questions of internal government and discipline, sometimes involving points of great delicacy and difficulty, may come up by appeal or reference from the inferior courts. It is no secondary duty of the Synod to adjudicate upon and adjust such questions. Indeed on the impartiality and discretion with which this department of the business is conducted, depends in great measure the moral influence of a Synod over the Sessions and Congregations of the Church. Tedious 'cases,' it is true, provoke impatience, but they should be faithfully heard and cautiously determined. Time and pains are never lost, which tend to increase that confidence in the Supreme Court of Appeal which is an essential condition of ecclesiastical peace and welfare. At the same time, no encouragement is to be given to frivolous complaints; and the 'business committee' should arrange that the more petty personal cases be not called till all important matters are duly considered and despatched.

The extension of the Church deserves the grave and earnest attention of young and vigorous Synods. They might combine the prudence of a missionary committee with the enthusiasm of a public missionary meeting. They are bound to consider the claims of duty toward souls that perish for lack of knowledge, and to encourage and direct the missionary zeal of the Church at large. There is abundant need for such zeal in providing for the education of the Ministry, in sustaining home missions, in assisting weak congregations, and in promoting foreign missions as opportunity may offer. It well befits a Christian Synod to have a large warm heart, beating in sympathy with the unselfish beneficent heart of the Lord Jesus. In the propagation of the gospel, the policy of extreme caution and economy is the worst policy of all. Better to devise liberal things, even at the risk of occasional precipitancy, than by liberal things the Church may stand.

Whatever the business in hand, we hold freedom of speech essential to every successful Synod. We have no sympathy with those who would arrogate to a few all liberty and boldness in discussion, requiring all others to keep silence, or speak in timid tones with bated breath. Whenever free speech is suppressed, the entire liberty of a Synod is surrendered to a self-constituted oligarchy. Let Canadian Synods, now, we believe, free from this evil, be careful to maintain their freedom. At the same time, let this freedom not be abused. It is intolerable to make the floor of a Synod an arena for displaying the "popular gifts" of individual members. A Synod is not to be confounded with an ordinary public meeting intended to influence the popular mind and illustrate the oratorical qualifications of speakers. It is a deliberative Court, and the speaking required is speaking *to the point*—clear, terse, unaffected, and if possible, conclusive.

Every year increases the value and influence of the Presbyterian Synods in this country. Not long ago, they attracted little attention, were scarcely noticed by the public press, and exercised a very slight and uncertain authority. This

can no longer be said. The meetings of Synods are expected with interest, and the proceedings reported with tolerable accuracy and fulness. How incumbent is it on the members to maintain and increase Synodical influence, by taking good heed to themselves, that they speak and vote and act with godly wisdom, brotherly kindness, and spiritual dignity! How much more incumbent this, when it is remembered, that the Lord Jesus Christ is invoked as Head of the Church, to preside in the Court, and to guide and sanction the deliberations of His servants!

IS ROMISH BAPTISM VALID?

In the last Number of this Magazine there appeared an able article, in which the affirmative of this question is vigorously maintained. An intimation however was given by the conductors of the *Presbyter*, that in the next issue an article would appear in support of the opposite view. This promise we now re-deem. In entering upon this theme we do not conceal from ourselves that it is beset with certain difficulties, but they are of such a nature, and lie within such a moderate compass, that we do not despair of finding our way through them to the truth.

Our standards do not directly touch the point under review, but they lay down principles which have such an immediate bearing upon it, that we confess it was with some degree of surprise that we found the writer in the last number of this Magazine, as well as Dr. Hodge, attempting in various ways to support the validity of Romish baptism by the high authority of the Westminster Divines.

Our confession teaches:

1st. That baptism is not to be repeated, chap. 28, sec. 7. This would settle the whole question as to the views of the Westminster Divines, could it be shown that they regarded Romish baptism as an Ordinance of the Church of Christ; but unfortunately for this attempt they teach,

2nd. That the Church of Rome is one of those Churches "which have so degenerated as to become no Churches, but Synagogues of Satan." Chap. 25, sec. 5. Vide proofs in which the compilers refer to only two cases, viz: that of the Romish Church, Rev. xviii. 2.; and that of the Jewish Church at the Advent of Christ, Rom. xi. 18-22, in support of their assertion that a Church may so degenerate as to become no Church, but a Synagogue of Satan. And they hold,

3rd. That Baptism must be dispensed by a minister of the gospel lawfully called thereunto. Chaps. 27, sec. 4, and 28, sec. 2.

The inference seems so plain that it scarcely requires to be put in words, that Romish priests, not being ministers of the gospel, but of a "Synagogue of Satan," are at best, mere laymen, and therefore cannot baptize. On this however we shall not dwell.

To prevent misconception, it may be well at the outset to note two points on which all Protestants are agreed.

1st. That the want of faith, piety, or good intention on the part of him who administers baptism, does not destroy its validity. On no other principle could any but the Omniscient say who are baptized.

2nd. That the want of faith or piety in those who receive baptism, either for themselves or for their offspring, does not destroy the validity of the ordinance or require its repetition when parties come to be possessed of grace. On these points all Protestant churches are fully agreed; and we shall take them for granted.

Standing on this undisputed ground, *one class* of the advocates of the validity of Romish baptism maintain, that inasmuch as the want of faith, piety or good intention on the part of the administrator or of the recipient of baptism, does not invalidate the Ordinance; nothing can destroy out a corruption of the Sacrament itself, either in the element used, or in the formula employed. Grant the correctness of this method of solving the problem, and there can be no very serious dispute as to the validity of Popish baptism. Romanists use water, and they retain the formula prescribed by Christ. Additions are made, but no subtractions. As far, therefore, as the tests in questions are concerned, the performance might perhaps, in the judgment of charity, be accounted Christian baptism. This method, however, of verifying the validity of baptism wears the mark of the Beast. It is the natural offspring of the doctrine that baptism is essential to salvation; and hence Romanists and their so-called Protestant followers charitably admit both the validity and the efficiency of baptism by women and laymen, and even by Turks, Jews, Infidels, or Protestants. It is true that they require the child to be afterwards re-baptized by the priest, *cum ceremoniis*. This however is designed as a denial not of the *validity* of *obstetric* baptism, but only of its *regularity*. And they firmly believe that, should a little one thus initiated into the Church die before the arrival of the deputy of Peter to sign his papers, he is as truly regenerated, and gets as safe a passport to heaven by the midwife's baptism, as if he had been crossed, oiled, spilted, salted and sprinkled by any of the successors of the apostles or of their deputies. This theory was born of baptismal regeneration. It came into the Church on the bark of that dogma, and with that dogma it will die. It savours so strongly of Babylon, that although it is the only hypothesis upon which Protestants can, as we think, consistently admit the validity of Romish baptism; it has found little favour among the Reformed Churches. Calvin, indeed, has used some ungrounded expressions which countenance this notion; but the great mass of the early Reformers based the validity of their own Romish baptism upon the supposed fact that the Church of Rome is a part of the Visible Church.

But if all that is essential to baptism is that water be applied, and the gospel formula employed, "by whomsoever at all, as Calvin says, it may have been administered," then will not only the baptism of modern Unitarians, who for the most part, we believe, comply with these requisitions, be valid; but wherever a person has been sprinkled with water, accompanied by the use of the baptismal formula, be it by Mahometan, Mormon, Infidel, Jew or Christian, by Church, Temperance Society or Railroad Company, there we have valid Christian baptism! This, who can believe? Baptism has in all ages been regarded as the initiatory Ordinance of the Christian Church, by which it recognizes its members. But how can baptism by an open infidel, or by any person not himself in the Visible Church, constitute the recognition of another as a member of the Church? The administrator has no connection with the Church, that he should, in his own right, initiate members. He was never authorized by the Church to act for it. He was not appointed by the Head of the Church to such an office. How then can baptism by him be the recognition of another, as a member of the Visible Church; wherein is it more valid than for a man to baptize himself? It was not to infidels, but to the church that Christ gave the command to disciple and baptize the nations. And with the commission he gave to his Church the promise which secures the efficiency both of the Word preached, and of the ordinance dispensed, "Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

The doctrine of our standards, and as we believe of the Word of God, is that unto "the Visible Church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles and ordinances of God." Conf. chap. 25, sec. 3. Ministers are the servants of the Church for Christ's sake; 2 Cor. iv., 5. They are the organs through which the Church

dispenses the word and ordinances committed to her. According to this view, baptism is valid wherever it is dispensed by a minister of a Church of Christ. His acts are valid, because they are acts competent to the Body which he represents. He may himself be an unbeliever or a hypocrite, but this does not make void his baptisms. Their validity depends not on him, but on the Church which has sent him to baptize, to which Christ has given the Ordinances of God. A foreigner palming himself off as a native of England, and gaining the confidence of the nation, might enter Parliament, or might even be sent as an ambassador to negotiate important treaties with other Powers. All the acts of such a person within his sphere, whether in Parliament or in foreign Courts, would be perfectly valid, although he never was a citizen of Great Britain. To be assured of the validity of his acts, all that any foreign nation required to know is, that he came duly accredited from the Court of St. James'. In harmony with our standards, we believe in like manner, that if the organization which sends forth the minister is a Church of Christ, his baptisms should be recognized; but if the body which commissions him is not a portion of the Visible Church, his baptisms are no more valid than the sprinklings of a heathen, Mahometan or Mormon—performed, it may be, in solemn mockery of the Ordinance of Christ.

The solution of this whole problem, as seems to be clearly perceived by the Writer in the last number of this Magazine, as well as by Dr. Hodg., turns upon the answer which may be given to the question; is the present Church of Rome part of the Visible Church? An affirmative response involves not only the validity of Romish baptism, but a good deal more. It implies, 1st., that the ordination of Romish priests is valid, inasmuch as they have been *recognised* as ministers of a Christian Church; and we are also bound to receive them in the same way as we do the ministers of the other Churches not in close communion with us: and 2nd., that the members of the Church of Rome must be received by us upon the same footing as members of other branches of the Visible Church. Moreover, courtesy to a *sister*, or rather perhaps, we should say a *mother* church (O! how amiable we will become!) would require that no member of the Romish Church should be received by us, until he had applied to his Priest for a *certificate*!

We do not wish to excite the prejudices of our readers, but we esteem it prudent in stepping on board a ship which is just spreading its canvass to the favouring breeze to inquire, whither are we sailing? lest perchance, after we have left the port, we should read on the streaming colours of our gallant bark, *Tendimus in Latium*.

The argument of this *second class* of the advocates of the validity of Romish baptism, as presented in the *Princeton Review*, and more recently in the pages of this Magazine, may be summed up as follows:

- 1st. The present Church of Rome is part of the Visible Church.
- 2nd. Her priests are consequently ministers of the Visible Church, to which Christ has committed the ordinances of God; and hence
- 3rd. The ordinances which they administer are valid, unless they have been essentially corrupted in matter or in form, but
- 4th. Baptism has not been so corrupted by them, therefore Romish baptism is valid.

It may be seen at a glance, that the *staple* on which this whole chain hangs is the assertion that the present Church of Rome is a part of the Visible Church. If that assertion can be made good, the argument is as strong as a chain of adamant, but if that gives way the whole will prove weak as a rope of sand.

The affirmation that the present Church of Rome, which most Evangelical Christians have been wont to regard as Antichrist, is a part of the Visible

Church, that what they have usually esteemed as the Mother of Harlots, doomed to destruction, is also the Bride, the Lamb's wife, is so startling to Protestant ears that it is with some degree of difficulty they can be brought to listen to the reasons which may be adduced in support of it. It is therefore evident that in these circumstances the advocates of the validity of Romish baptism must, in any Protestant community, take the field against great odds. But fortune favours the brave. Let us see how they propose to conquer. They first seek to turn aside this prejudice which keeps guard against their approach by a skilful distinction between the Papacy and the Church of Rome in which it exists. Then they attempt to carry by storm conviction to our minds by a definition of the Visible Church, which seems to coincide with the attributes of the Church of Rome. And lastly, they confirm and establish their advantage by the *reserve force* of the clearly outstanding fact that there are true Christians within the pale of the Romish Church.

Before, however, even in the presence of such masterly tactics, giving up all as lost, it may be well for us to examine a little more carefully the process by which, as in a logical Waterloo, the common convictions of modern Protestants are to be annihilated, lest we be found admitting distinctions without a difference, deluding ourselves with ambiguous definitions, and accepting as proof irrelevant facts.

I. To disarm our prejudices, we are informed that "We must distinguish between Antichrist and the Church of God in which Antichrist exists,—in other words between the Papacy as a hierarchical system and the Christian community connected with it." "The man of sin, the Son of perdition is said to sit *in the temple of God*,—that is to be *within the Church*, but distinct from it." "The whore of the Apocalypse is a *woman* defiled, that is a Church apostate."

In reply to all this, we remark,—

1. That the distinction between the present Church of Rome and Antichrist appears to us to be unfounded. There was once no doubt ground for such a distinction, but it has long since disappeared. When a woman hides leaven in three measures of meal, the leavening process goes on gradually. For a time we can properly distinguish between the fermented and the unfermented, but after a season this can no longer be done; for the whole is leavened. In that organization still called by courtesy the Church of Rome, this point has long since been reached. The leaven of Popery has leavened the whole lump. The malady has overspread the entire organization. Not only does the plague spot appear on the shaven pate of its hierarchy, but the whole body to its remotest member is leprous. The time was when a distinction might have been correctly drawn between England's Norman Rulers and their Saxon subjects who were anxious to cast off the foreign yoke, but the man would err egregiously who in the present day should attempt to make the distinction of that *transition* period, now that the enthusiastic loyalty of the people has for ever effaced it. In like manner there was a time when within the Romish Church large masses of the people were anxiously striving to cast off the errors and corruptions of the Papacy, and enjoy the light and liberty of the Gospel. That time has fled for ever. The people have *cordially accepted* the Papacy with all its errors, idolatry, corruptions, abominations and spiritual tyranny. They would not thank us for such distinctions. They hug their chains. They will be found to have both more love to and a clearer understanding of the monstrous errors of their system than of the truth which lies imbedded in their creeds, deep and useless, to all but the antiquary, as the ruins of Herculaneum.

2. That all well ordered societies must be judged of through their *recognised governments* by external communities. Thus Protestant Churches judge of sister organizations and of the relations which they should sustain to their mem-

bers. In this way one nation deals with another and with its citizens. We are never safe in dealing with any organized Society as if it were better than its avowed principles and practices. We are much more likely to discover a wolf in sheep's clothing than a sheep in wolf's clothing. The whole Church of Rome as an organized Society having homologated the Papacy with all its abominations, Protestant Churches must treat its members accordingly. That the eye of God or even the eye of man can here and there detect a true believer, living in the midst of this corrupt society, does not change the relations which we sustain to its members generally. It is a well known fact, strange as it may appear, that there are in the Unitarian Churches of New-England, not a few members who live and die in the full belief of the supreme divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. This, however, does not constitute these organizations Christian Churches, or make their baptism valid.

3. That the fact that the man of sin is said to sit in the temple of God, no more proves the reality of the distinction between the Papacy and the Church of Rome, than the fact that, the Madonna of the Sun now sits at Rome in the temple of Vesta proves that that ancient goddess now has a temple and worshippers in the City of the Seven Hills. There is no usage of language more common than that which permits us either to speak of persons or things according to outward appearance or profession, or to apply to them historical names, ages after the original signification has ceased. We call an old ruin a Temple of Jupiter, long after it has become a habitation of jackals. And in memory of departed glory an organization may be called the Temple of God long after it has become, as the context shows, a Synagogue of Satan. The same principle would explain what is said in the Apocalypse of the woman on the scarlet coloured beast, if it could be imagined that a case so well nigh self-evident required any explication.

II. To convince our minds that the Church of Rome is a part of the visible Church, a definition of the visible Church is given which it is maintained is met by the Church of Rome. A visible Church, says Dr. Hodge, as quoted in the May number of the *Presbyter*, is "An organized Society professing the true religion, united for the purposes of worship and discipline, and subject to the same form of government, and to some common tribunal."

We accept this *ambiguous* definition, as, in one sense, correct, but we deny that, in that sense, the Church of Rome meets it. And in the sense in which the Papal Church does meet it, it is not an *adequate* definition of a visible Church. We maintain that the Romish Church does not hold the true religion in the sense in which that forms an essential element in a visible Church. That she holds a great deal of the true religion in a certain way, we readily acknowledge. She holds it very much as a thief holds stolen property, as far out of sight as possible.

But why is the holding of the true religion an essential element of a visible Church? Visible Churches are those Societies into which God is wont to gather the saved for their edification, and by which he usually carries salvation to others. Truth, or the true religion is essential to the visible Church in the same sense, and to the same extent as it is essential to salvation. But how does the truth become, under God, effectual to salvation? How does it either convert or sanctify? It is not by being distorted, concealed, overlaid or explained away till its very nature is changed, and instead of pure gold there is given to the people only rust, and rust which eats as doth a canker. Bibles are a means of salvation only when *read*, and correct creeds only when *understood*. It is by being seen that truth operates. Rome keeps it out of sight. The Bible she refuses to the body of the people, and never except under strong external pressure, when she may make a virtue of necessity, does she permit it

to any until their minds have become so thoroughly debauched by her sorceries that their souls are esteemed impervious to the light. The great saving truths of her creeds she distorts and makes void by her errors. It may be admitted that she holds the doctrine of the Trinity and of original sin with a very great freedom from error. But these great truths never saved any one. They lie at the basis of the gospel scheme: they form the foundation on which the remedial system is erected. Rome therefore could afford to allow them to remain undistorted, but she has not so dealt with the great facts connected with the way of salvation for which these prepare the way. There is not one saving truth which the Romish Church has not neutralized by her errors, by her explanations or by her practical directions. Of what avails the atonement of Christ, when the sinner is sent to a priest on earth for pardon, instead of to the Great High Priest within the veil? Of what value is the doctrine of the work of the Holy Ghost, when the sinner is taught that He is to be obtained only through bishops and their deputies, and is deluded into the belief that all the regeneration he needs or can expect was necessarily experienced by him in baptism? What becomes of the sole mediatorship of Christ, when every saint in the Calendar is made an intercessor? And when the sinner is taught to look for justification by faith and by works, where shall we find a foundation for that ample and entire reliance on Christ which saves the soul?

The great essentials of the gospel may be so held as not to be a means of salvation. Truth, that it may save the soul, or be an appropriate instrument in the hands of the Spirit of God for the salvation of men, must be presented in its proper relations, and not turned upside down or distorted in any way which the ingenuity of Satan can devise. Distorted truths are often the most dangerous falsehoods. And these are the falsehoods which the Great Deceiver delights to scatter over the world for the ruin of mankind. The greatest and most destructive falsehood ever uttered, "Ye shall be as Gods knowing good and evil," was only a truth presented out of its due relations. It is in this way that Rome presents the great truths of the gospel. It should be remembered that there is such a thing as turning the "truth of God into a lie." And of all lies these are the most pernicious. And of all the sorceresses who have practised this *black art*, Rome has been the most successful.

We delude ourselves entirely, if we imagine that there is a difference only in degree between the erroneousness of the Church of Rome, and that of those Evangelical Bodies from which we differ on the non-essentials of our faith. In the teaching of Evangelical Churches truth so preponderates over error, that the natural tendency is to lead sinners to the Saviour. In the Romish system, on the contrary, error predominates, and is the conspicuous characteristic. In Evangelical Churches the cardinal truths of the gospel are both theoretically and practically kept in the foreground, so that they are continually coming in contact with the hearts and consciences of men, and the Spirit has an appropriate instrumentality for effecting our salvation. In the Romish system, on the other hand, these truths are either concealed, or distorted and turned into soul-ruining error; so that no man can be saved by believing what the Church of Rome teaches. In Evangelical systems there is no element which binds the people to receive everything which their Churches teach. The dogma of the infallibility of the Church which every Romanist has acknowledged binds him, on the other hand, not only to receive every doctrine taught by his Church, but to accept every explanation of the same, however absurd. Thus no man can do and be saved. Such as may be saved within her pale are saved not by her teaching, but by departing therefrom.

Therefore we conclude that, inasmuch as the Romish Church does not present such views of the truth of God as are essential to salvation, it does not hold the true religion in the sense required by an adequate definition of a visible Church.

III. In answer, however, to all this reasoning, and as in itself sufficient to establish the Church standing of the Romish synagogue, there is adduced by the advocates of the validity of Romish baptism the clearly outstanding fact that good Christians have lived and died, among its members.

The fact, which we joyfully admit, we regard as irrelevant.

1. Because these Christians may have been converted and edified within her pale, yet not by her instrumentality. Lot led a godly life in Sodom. Rahab was converted in Jericho. And we have recently read of a man who was seized with such convictions of sin in a gambling saloon as issued in his hopeful conversation. And although it is true that "where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church of God" yet will none of these places or the communities which they contained, ever thereby, obtain a name or a place in the visible Church.

2. Because the conversions which take place within the Romish Church may all be accounted for otherwise than by the Church standing of that corrupt organization. Light coming directly and indirectly from Protestants, Bible circulation forced on by external pressure against the will of Rome, Providential interpositions or dealings, which shake the faith of her votaries in the infallibility of their Church, and prepare the way for their open or secret rejection of her guidance, and the absolute Sovereignty of Him who works with means, without means, above means or against means, need only to be mentioned to show that there is no necessity for assuming that the Holy Spirit dwells in that "habitation of devils, and hold of every foul spirit and cage of every unclean and hateful bird."

3. Because, could it be demonstrated that God has used the Church of Rome for the conversion of sinners, it would not follow that it is a part of the visible Church. It is one thing to *use*, and another to *accept* of an instrumentality, and sanction it as an ordinary means of grace. He employed an ass to instruct a prophet, devils to preach Christ, and unconverted men to proclaim the gospel to the salvation of others. In the present day God does occasionally use unconverted men for the conversion of others, but he does not accept their labours or promise to them a blessing. The Rule, is "if the blind lead the blind both shall fall into the ditch." They have no part in the promise, "Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Exceptional conversions in a corrupt organization certainly no more prove its Church standing, than occasional conversions through the instrumentality of ungodly men prove that they are God's ordinary means of saving sinners. All established in either case is the Sovereignty of Him who fed Elijah by the ministry of ravens, and who now works all things after the counsel of his own will.

We have thus, at some length, examined the process by which the advocates of the validity of Romish baptism seek to prove that the Church of Rome is a part of the visible Church. We have seen that the distinction between Antichrist and the Church of Rome is one without a difference. We have discovered that the Church of Rome does not hold the true religion in the manner which is essential to a visible Church, and finally that the fact relied upon as demonstrative of the Church *status* of the Romish community is not relevant. And the result of the whole is, that inasmuch as the Church of Rome is not a Church of Christ, priestly baptism cannot be a recognition of membership in that Church, and converted Romanists should be baptized.

Let no study prevent the thoughts of death; and though we visit Athens, let us dwell at Jerusalem, and Mount Calvary rather than Parnassus: let us never busy ourselves about many things, and neglect the good part which shall not be taken away from us.—*Hon. R. Boyle.*

PENIEL—GEN. xxxii. 24—32.

No. II.

THE BLESSING.

The victory was won, yet the Angel did not at once bless the patriarch. "He said unto him, what is thy name?" This question was humbling, and seems designed to bring his sin to remembrance. "And he said, Jacob"—the supplanter. Here we are brought back to the position in which Jacob stood. His past sin must have come back retributively upon his conscience. His very name is suggestive of that act for which he had fled from Esau, and which now made him tremble at the prospect of a meeting with his brother. He had doubtless during the twenty years sincerely repented of his sin. He had received assurance of the Divine forgiveness. It seems strange, therefore, that he should be reminded of it at the very moment of his illustrious victory. Yet all this is only to mark more signally the grace of God. Now, he is to receive a new name; a name to be had in everlasting remembrance; a name which was to be borne not only by the nation of which he was the illustrious father, but by the whole elect church of the living God, gathered out of all the tribes of earth, through all succeeding ages. "And he said thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israei; for as a prince hast thou power with God and with man and hast prevailed." True, God had given him that power, but it was none the less true that he had prevailed, because the power by which he had held fast was the gift of God. Here we see why the covenant Angel wrestled with Jacob. It was not to cast him down and take away the little strength he had. It was to establish and strengthen him, to draw forth and increase his power. Painful as the experience was through which he had passed, it was all ordered in love, and the consequences thereof were eminently gracious. So is it ever with the Christian. He may for a time be brought into a horror of great darkness; there may be a struggle in the very depths of his being like the passing through the valley of the shadow of death; he may be distracted and full of fear; in the presence of the Holy One, he may feel his very soul shrink and shrivel up—yet through grace is he enabled to keep fast hold of the Angel of the Covenant; and in every conflict is his faith strengthened and his earnestness deepened, until by faith and prayer he prevail at length. Then a glad deliverance comes, the clouds are rolled from his heart and from his destiny, and he walks again in the undimmed and glorious light of God's countenance.

With men too Israel had prevailed. In prevailing with God, he had necessarily and certainly prevailed with men; the one was the pledge of the other. Either the meeting with Esau would be averted; or the anger of Esau turned away, and the dreaded interview prove one of peace and love; or at the very worst Israel would meet him in that strength that always gives victory. He has only now to stand still and see the salvation of God. We see at once that Israel no longer fears to meet Esau. Personal danger is no longer his absorbing thought. He continues his petition, but there is no trace in it of any anxiety as to how he shall get through the morrow. He knows well that a brother offended is harder to win than a fenced city. But he has the assurance that Esau is already won, for God has undertaken for him. Hence in that most solemn moment of his existence, his prayer is, "Tell me, I pray thee thy name." He would know more of that being who had wrestled with him till the dawn of day, and from whom he is now about to part. But the answer is, "Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my name?" This does not seem to us, as though the Angel would hide himself from Israel, and shroud his character in mystery. But rather it seems spoken in the way of gentle rebuke; as though he said, 'Thou hast felt my pre-

sence, thou hast heard my voice, thou hast experienced my power, and yet hast thou not known me ? It reminds us of what He said, long ages after this, to one of his disciples. In the new name which he had received the MAN was revealed: Israel, the prince of God. Wherefore then should he ask after His name? God does reveal Himself in his name; but far more clearly in the experience of communion with him. It is one thing to know the name of God, to know God Himself is quite another thing. This last had been vouchsafed to Israel: he knew God as giving him strength in weakness, and victory in trial. He who had wrestled with Israel was the same glorious one who afterwards revealed Himself saying, "I am the resurrection and the life"; to know Him is life Eternal. His name is LOVE: the highest blessedness of life is devotedness to Him.

It is added, "And he blessed him there." Jehovah blessed the earnest suppliant, and in the deep and spiritual experience of that blessing he went forth no longer the supplanter, but the Prince—a more leal and earnest, and a braver man. He has a new spirit as well as a new name. We doubt not but that long before this Jacob was a child of God—what took place at Bethel is proof enough of this. But up to this time he retained much of his natural character, and we are pained to find him if not untrue, at least only half-sincere, and consequently timid and weak. But from this time nearly all traces of this natural timidity and proneness to resort to stratagem, rather than to meet difficulties and charges manfully, disappear, and Israel is a more unselfish and altogether a truer man. Thoroughly honest now, he goes forth to meet his impetuous brother; no longer shrinking like a coward, but with the light of holy courage, as well as of true affection beaming in his eye. The brothers meet, they fall on each other's necks and weep, and in that brotherly embrace Israel is the prince who prevails by love. What though he goes from Peniel in helplessness and weakness halting on his thigh; his weakness is strength, for in God he hath righteousness and strength:

"Contented now, upon my thigh
I halt, till life's short journey end;
All helplessness, all weakness, I
On Thee alone for strength depend."

THE APPLICATION.

We need to hold communion with God "alone." Precious and important as social worship is, it can never take the place of the closet. Nay more; social worship itself is but a lifeless form to the man who lives in the neglect of secret prayer. In the solitude of the closet, when the door is shut, we attain to a true sense of our weakness; and yet this is not that crushing and terrible feeling that seizes the man, who after having long battled in self reliance, finds that in the very crisis of the life-battle his arm has failed. The praying soul is alone; and yet not alone, for his God is with him. He needs more than an arm of flesh to lean upon, but in God he hath strength. In communion with God he receives, out of the Divine fulness, grace for grace and strength for strength. Such weakness is real strength. All Scripture and experience join in assuring us that in order to our work and warfare, in order to the vigour and enjoyment of the Christian life, it is indispensable that we be much in secret prayer.

Let us not be discouraged when prayer is not immediately answered. Sometimes we are left to struggle in the dark, in silence and alone. Intellectual difficulties press upon us for solution—the windows of the soul are darkened—our souls are athirst for God, yet depression unaccountable and irresistible presses upon our spirits. We know and believe that there is a sun; but it is behind a cloud so thick and impenetrable that no single ray reaches us, and dark cold

night is around us. In the soul-struggle that ensues, God wrestles with us. Our prayers seem to us unanswered. How then shall a man contend with God? But is not the case of Jacob illustrative of a great general principle in God's dealings with His people? He weakens their strength by the way. They are made to feel their own utter impotency, but it is only that they may, when in the depths of weakness and distress, be led to feel the Divine energy of their living Head. The recorded experiences of David in many of the Psalms are illustrations of this. Paul too knew the intensity of this conflict of spirit, this wrestling of God with him, when he besought the Lord thrice that the thorn in the flesh might depart from him; and in his case too the crushing trial was followed by a most illustrious victory. And so still, out of weakness God's people are made strong. God sometimes so shuts up the soul, that there seems to be no advance from before and no retreat from behind—then He so weakens the spirit that it seems to be incapacitated for further struggle, and can neither stand nor go; but it is in that very moment of mortal weakness that He enables His servant with the triumph of faith to take hold of some covenant promise, to believe against hope, and then the power of Christ is made to rest upon him. Nay more, his strength is in exact proportion to his weakness. 'When I am weak then I am strong.' The time of our sorest trial is the occasion of the Lord magnifying His grace in us. Most gladly therefore may we glory in our infirmities, when we are enabled to say, "The Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song; He also is become my salvation."

Let us learn the power of faith. As Jacob clung to the very hand that seemed put forth only to cast him down, so faith cleaves to God in the darkest and stormiest hours. Faith trusts on, even when no answer is vouchsafed, yea when God seems to be hiding His face from us. It is easy to trust when the sun shines, and all is well with us. Faith triumphs in the dark and stormy day. So with the Syrophenician woman, Christ answered her not a word, still she cried to him. The disciples said, "Send her away away," but clung the closer. At length the Lord spoke to her, but it was as though he too would cast her off. 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' But she cast herself at His feet, and cried "Lord help me." Again he seemed to deny her. "It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs." Surely this will prove too much for her faith; no, her faith rises with the emergency. Thankfully will she take the crumbs that fall from the table, the dog's portion will suffice for her. This was the victory. Our Lord no longer denies the blessing sought. Such is ever faith's triumph. As the Lord put Himself in Jacob's power when he said, "Let me go," so still he puts himself, as it were, in the petitioner's power in the exceeding great and precious promises. What power does this give to the prayer of faith! "If we ask any thing according to His will, He heareth us."

THE EXPECTED UNION.

Union is the question of the day with the Presbyterian Church of Canada and the United Presbyterian Church. Heartily in favour of this union as we are, we count it a duty to offer the following observations, with a view to remove certain mistakes that are afloat regarding the terms on which it may be accomplished.

Christian forbearance is urged as the only possible ground on which the union can be consummated. This we believe; but the question remains, How far shall this forbearance go? Shall it extend to every possible opinion as to the civil magistrate's duty; or shall a recognition of that duty, to a certain extent,

be required? To find an answer satisfactory to both parties has been the work of the Committees; whether they have successfully accomplished their task remains to be seen.

In the first minute, besides the assertion of the Spiritual Independence of the Church and Liberty of Conscience, we find a recognition of the duty of the magistrate, in the discharge of his official duty, to obey God's revealed will. Doubts, however, being entertained whether an agreement would be found in the practical application of the principle thus recognised, the Committees next considered the application of the principle to the observance of the Sabbath; Endowments; the use of the Bible in the Common Schools; and the observance of days of Public Humiliation and Thanksgiving. They then found that on all these points there is either an agreement, or a readiness to forbear, sufficient to ensure constitutional unity of action in the Church. Other points of detail were considered by the Committees, who were at length led to express their conviction that nothing stands in the way of a union, and they agreed to recommend accordingly.

Now, it is evident that the Presbyterian Church of Canada could not consent to such union if the *whole* question of the duty of the civil magistrate were to be made a matter of forbearance, that being in her view to abate from the full profession of revealed truth; but it is as evident that she can unite if the principle contained in the first minute and the applications of it in subsequent minutes be agreed to. No one on the United Presbyterian side asks forbearance to the extent of ignoring or tolerating a denial of these; they can go as far as they are asked to go in that direction; and hence union is practicable.

Do we ask *Theoretical* agreement? No; no further than to recognise the above principle. Do we ask all to maintain the practical issues by the same reasons and no other? No. It is enough to agree in these issues. Do we require oneness of sentiment on every minute point of detail? No; we believe there may be a cordial union and harmonious co-operation with minor differences in sentiment. We are satisfied that the forbearance asked from the Presbyterian Church is not greater than may be conscientiously conceded to brethren; and the United Presbyterians, we hope, will not find the ground of forbearance so narrowed that they have not standing room.

Such, then, is the present position of the question. Common ground has been found, viz., *FORBEARANCE as to the duty of the civil magistrate to a DEFINED EXTENT.* And it is on this ground that the Committees recommend union.

We are deeply and solemnly impressed with the imperative duty of accomplishing the union. We feel that a state of severance is not justifiable. Surely great will be the responsibility of the man who, in either Synod, may be found directly or indirectly opposing the union, or even manifesting indifference about it. The interests of Presbyterianism, nay of the Church of Christ, are deeply concerned; and it becomes every one to think well before he casts a stumbling-block in the way, or gathers again the scattered fragments of misrepresentation and embittered feeling to build up a wall of partition between two parts of Christ's spiritual building, which rest on the same foundations.

Sooner or later these Synods shall be one Church; and we will patiently wait on the Lord till He make of the two one stick in the hand of the Great Shepherd.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

"This do in remembrance of me." Luko xxii. 19.

The sacrifice of the Mass is the most important part of the service of the Church of Rome, and is offered daily in her Churches. Some suppose that the word Mass is derived from the Hebrew *MISSACH*, which signifies a voluntary oblation; but it is more probable that it is derived from the Latin *Missæ*, in allusion to the dismissal of Catechumens and others, who were not permitted in ancient times, to be present at that service.* "*Ita missa est*—thus the Congregation is dismissed," said the officiating minister, and the general congregation withdrew. The term thus employed was used, in process of time, to designate the service about to be performed: it was called *Missæ*, the Mass.

The sacrifice of the Mass is inseparably connected with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and founded upon it. Romanists believe that the consecrated wafer is really changed into the body and blood, the soul and divinity of the Lord Jesus. They regard it, as really the Lamb that was slain,—the propitiatory victim,—(*hostia*, the host,)—that was offered up on Calvary. Hence they elevate the host, or victim, that it may be seen and worshipped by the people. And hence, having Christ really before them, as they suppose, they offer him up afresh, or repeat the sacrifice of him in the Mass; and imagine that the Mass is a true, propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, and equally meritorious with that which was offered up on the cross of Calvary. They believe that the Mass is something much more than a spiritual communion with Christ, or a commemoration of his death upon the cross, and curse those, who say that what is to be offered is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat. †

The original idea of a sacrament is in a great measure lost in that of a sacrifice; and the sacrifice of the Mass has ceased to be generally regarded as a commemorative festival, and an ordinance in which Christians hold spiritual communion with the Saviour, and with one another. At the sacrifice of the Mass, it is not necessary that there should be a single communicant present, to whom the Sacrament is administered; it is held enough that the officiating priest himself communicate sacramentally. And the supposed sacrifice, thus offered up, is believed to be efficacious for many things, for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities.

In general, Romanism is a well considered scheme, presenting an awful consistency in error, but in some respects, it betrays a childish inconsistency; and perhaps in nothing more than the idea, that Masses may be offered up in honor of the saints, to procure their intercession for us with God. Monstrous idea! blasphemous absurdity!—that the eternal God should himself be offered up in sacrifice, in honor of men, however holy; that they may be induced to intercede with himself, in behalf of mortals. We are afraid that much of the inconsistency and pertinacity in error of the Church of Rome, in regard to this subject, arises from the fact, that the saying of Masses is a prolific source of revenue to the Church. The saying of a Mass costs a certain sum, and the greater the number of purposes for which Masses are thought to be serviceable, the more lucrative the traffic in them becomes. Romanists believe that, in the Mass, the sacrifice of Christ is repeated, and many Protestants will perhaps, in one sense, be disposed to admit this, for there is such a thing as crucifying the Son of God afresh.

* Elliot. † Council of Trent. Canon. 1.

Roman Catholics appeal to several passages of Scripture, in support of their views with regard to the doctrine of the Mass; but the words at the head of this article seem to be the stronghold on which they mainly rely. They believe that by the words—"This do in remembrance of me," or, as they translate them, "Do this for a commemoration of me," Christ constituted his apostles priests, and ordained that they, and their successors, should offer his body and blood up in sacrifice. Thus in one of the Canons of the Council of Trent, it is said, "If any one shall say; that by these words, 'Do this for a commemoration of me!' Christ did not appoint his apostles priests, or did not ordain that they, and other priests should offer his body and blood; let him be accursed."

The words in question contain no such appointment. They are simply a command to do a certain thing as a memorial of Christ; or as Romanists themselves express it, "for a commemoration of him." They confer no commission, they do not designate to any office. It was not till after Christ's resurrection, on the occasion of his first appearing to the disciples, as they were assembled on the evening of the first day of the week, with closed doors for fear of the Jews, that he said to them the second time "Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them—Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whosoever sins, ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." These words, we think, contain the appointment of the apostles to their sacred office, as rulers of Christ's Church, and ministers of the New Testament. The Old Testament Economy did not pass away till Christ, by the one all sufficient sacrifice of himself, abolished all typical sacrifices. After rising from the dead, he took possession of his mediatorial kingdom; and one of his first official acts, as the glorified King and Head of his Church, seems to have been the formal appointment of the Apostles to their sacred office. Whilst Christ was with them on earth, they were highly privileged, greatly honored; but, during all the period, they may be regarded merely as students, and it was not till after his resurrection, that they were invested with the ministerial office, and commissioned to baptize, preach, and exercise discipline in the Christian Church. If this view be correct, then it is clear that the Apostles were laymen merely, at the time of the institution of the Lord's Supper. They were his chosen friends, members of his family, who, as such, met with him to celebrate the passover; and it was while they were engaged in this act, that Jesus instituted the sacrament of the Supper. The Apostles therefore, on this occasion, are to be regarded as representatives not of ministers of the gospel merely, but of the friends of Jesus generally. And, therefore, the command "This do in remembrance of me," being addressed to all the friends of Jesus, present on that occasion, may be regarded as a command addressed to all the friends of Jesus in every age, and binding upon them till he come the second time without sin into salvation. If Christ had meant the priestly office to continue and to disinherit the family of Aaron, it is but reasonable to expect, that he would have spoken out plainly in reference to this matter; but he makes no allusion to the subject of a change in the priesthood. Again, had Christ meant to appoint the Apostles to the priestly office, at the time of the institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, it is reasonable to suppose, that he would have employed language suitable to the occasion; and would not have allowed a matter of such importance to remain in uncertainty; but these words—"This do in remembrance of me"—contain no allusion to the priesthood. Again, with the sacrifice of Christ, all sacrifices terminated, because, by the one sacrifice of himself, he "perfected forever them that are sanctified." All the sacrifices that had

been offered up, from the beginning, were typical of the great sacrifice, which was to be offered up once for all on Calvary, and when that one sacrifice was offered up, and accepted by God, as an all-sufficient atonement for sin, the repetition of sacrifices is not only unnecessary, but unlawful, reflecting as it does dishonor on Christ, as if his sacrifice were not sufficient; sacrifices, therefore, having ceased, the office of priest of necessity ceased also. Among the various offices of the New Testament Church, which are so particularly enumerated, that of priest is not once mentioned. We conclude, therefore, with the most positive certainty that the words,—“This do in remembrance of me,” have nothing to do with appointment to the priestly office, and that it is an outrage on the principles not only of sound interpretation but of common sense, to apply them in such a manner.

But further, it is concluded by Roman Catholics, that the thing which Christ commanded his Apostles to do, at the time when he instituted the Sacrament of the Supper, was, that they should offer up to God, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, the body and blood, the soul and divinity of the Lord Jesus, under the species of bread and wine; “This do, said Christ, in remembrance of me.” Now the question is—What were they to do? Roman Catholics allege that they were to do what Christ had done, *i. e.* take a blessing upon the bread, and break it, or as they interpret it, “consecrate the bread and break it.” In these words they contend, that they were commanded to offer up Christ himself as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. That, according to their view, was what Christ actually did, in the upper room at Jerusalem, on the night previous to his crucifixion, for they allege that the Apostles were commanded to do just what He had done. But if this was the case, if he really offered himself up, as a propitiatory sacrifice, on the night previous to his crucifixion, what was the need of his suffering on the cross, when the sacrifice had been offered up before?

That Christ did not, in the Sacrament of the Supper, offer up a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, is evident from the fact, that no blood was there on that occasion, that no living victim was then offered up, and suffered unto death, to give satisfaction to offended justice. There was simply the breaking of bread, and the pouring out of wine, and the distribution of these among the disciples, with the eating and drinking of them on their part. Sacramental and symbolical acts these certainly were, but there was no oblation, and no shedding of blood. But we are distinctly told that, “without shedding of blood there is no remission” of sin. It is plain, therefore, that there was no sacrifice at the Sacrament of the Supper as instituted by Christ himself, and therefore there can be no sacrifice at the repetition of it, when the disciples are commanded to do simply what Jesus had done.

It has been already shown, and it must be clear to any one who reflects upon the subject, that the doctrine of the Mass is founded on that of transubstantiation. It assumes that the bread and wine have been really changed, so as to become the very body and blood, the soul and divinity of the Lord Jesus; and, therefore if we can demolish the doctrine of transubstantiation, the foundation on which that of the Mass rests, is swept away, and down it must inevitably fall. But even if the doctrine of transubstantiation could be established, that of the Mass would not necessarily follow. Even if we were to admit that the change supposed in transubstantiation takes place, we should be almost as far as ever from proving that a sacrifice takes place in the Mass. A propitiatory sacrifice, as we have seen, implies of necessity the shedding of blood, but in the Sacrament of the Supper there is no shedding of blood, and Romanists do not pretend that there is, for they term it an ‘unbloody sacrifice;’ we have, thus, therefore, the most satisfactory evidence that it is no sacrifice at all. But fur-

ther, the idea of the repetition of the sacrifice of Christ is not only dishonoring to our great High Priest, inasmuch as it detracts from the completeness of his finished work, but it runs in direct opposition to the plainest statements of Scripture. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands," says Paul (Heb. ix. 24-28,) "which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entered into the holy place every year, with blood of others; (for then must he often have suffered, since the foundation of the world,) but now *once*, in the end of the world, hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many." The frequent repetition of the Old Testament sacrifices is mentioned by Paul, as an evidence of their imperfection; and, in this respect, he contrasts them with the sacrifice of Christ, which, just because of its completeness, and perfect efficacy, never required to be repeated. Hence he says—"We are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all. And every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool, for by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." (Heb. x. 10-14.) A little further on he adds—"And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now, where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." (Heb. x. 17, 18.) These passages are so plain, that they need no exposition, and so decisive, that they who advocate the sacrifice of the mass, do it in direct opposition to the plainest statements of the inspired Word of God. Hence the opposition on the part of the Church of Rome, to the perusal of the Bible by the people, aware as they are, that its statements are in direct opposition to some of their most lucrative ordinances.

We are aware of only two other passages, to which Romanists are in the habit of appealing, in support of their sacrifice of the Mass. The first of these is the well known text (Genesis xiv. 18) where we have an account of Melchizedek, when he went forth to meet Abraham, returning in triumph from the conquest of Chederlaomer, and the allied kings, carrying forth bread and wine. It is impossible to see any legitimate connexion between this circumstance and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. There is no evidence that there was anything sacrificial, or even sacramental, intended by the bread and wine on this occasion. It is more probable, that it was meant to refresh Abraham and his friends. But even if the bread was employed, in some symbolical, religious act, this had nothing to do with the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and the pressing of such a text into this service by the Roman Catholics, shows the desperate shifts to which they are put, to get some scripture text, that has even a remote, outside appearance of countenancing their views. The other passage to which Romanists appeal, in support of the doctrine of the Mass, is that contained in Malachi i. 11: "For from the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering." No doubt this refers to gospel times, and just predicts the spiritual sacrifices of praise and prayer which would everywhere be offered to the Lord. Thus David uses the very same figures, as descriptive of the offerings of praise and prayer, "Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice." This shows that it is no arbitrary interpretation which we put upon this passage, when we explain the incense and the pure offering spoken of, as referring to the pure spiritual worship which

would be presented to God during the Christian dispensation. In this figurative sense, prayer may with propriety be termed a sacrifice; and so the devoted life of an earnest Christian, consecrating himself to God's service, may be regarded as a continuous act of sacrifice. Thus Paul exhorts the Roman Christians to present their "bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." In this sense, the Lord's Supper has been termed a commemorative sacrifice; and we do not object to the use of the term in this figurative sense, any more than we do to its being applied to the exercises of praise and prayer. But the pretence of the Roman Catholics, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a real propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, and capable also of procuring the blessings or averting the evils of life—this is an outrage upon common sense—a blasphemous perversion of one of the most solemn ordinances of the Church of Christ, which can only be believed either by the grossly ignorant or by those who are already intoxicated with the wine of Babylon's idolatry.

We have seen that the command contained in the words, "This do in remembrance of me," was addressed to the Apostles, not as officebearers of the Church, for the Church of Christ was not then constituted or organised, but as friends and followers of the Lord Jesus; so that what he said to them, on this occasion, may be regarded as addressed to all his disciples, in all lands, in all ages. And that this is the case is evident from the fact that the words were so understood by the primitive Christians, and the practice founded upon them sanctioned by the Apostle Paul, who reproves the Corinthians, not for partaking of the Lord's Supper, but for certain improprieties of which they were guilty in connexion with it. It is admitted by Roman Catholics, that the duty of celebrating the Lord's Supper is incumbent on all Christians, upon the people, as well as the ministers; but there is no other warrant for this than what is contained in the words, "This do in remembrance of me," so that the practice of the Roman Catholic Church contradicts its theory,—a practice established from the beginning, and consequently before the introduction of ruinous errors. But what do the words, "This do in remembrance of me," refer to,—to the action of Christ in asking a blessing and breaking the bread, or to the action of the disciples in taking and eating it? Undoubtedly the words refer to the action of the disciples. "This do," refers to what disciples were to do, not to what Christ had done. This appears more plainly from the account of the institution of the ordinance, as given by St. Paul, (1 Cor. xi, 24–26): "And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, 'Take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.'" Here, from the position of the words, "Take, eat," it is plain that the expression, "This do," refers to *them*; that is, to the taking and eating, on the part of the disciples. This view is confirmed by the 26th verse, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." The thing which they were to do, was to be done in remembrance of Christ; and here it is said, that, by eating this bread, and drinking this cup, they did that very thing: they showed the Lord's death.

It appears to us certain that the words, "This do," refer not to the action of Christ, in asking a blessing upon the elements, and breaking the bread, and pouring out the wine, but to the action of the disciples in taking them, and eating and drinking them; and consequently, the only thing in the shape of an argument for interpreting the words, as if they conferred special power upon the apostles, is utterly swept away.

It is rather a remarkable circumstance that Bishop Stillingfleet, in his valuable little work on the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, misapprehends the meaning of the words, "This do," and refers them, with the Ro-

manists, to the action of Christ. His words are: "Christ indeed did bid them do the same thing he had then done in his last supper; but did he then offer up himself or not?" In his notes on Stillingfleet, Dr. Cunningham does not notice this blunder—a circumstance which makes us regret all the more that he has not written an independent work on the subject. Cunningham's Notes on Stillingfleet we consider by far the ablest sketches that have ever been written on the Popish Controversy, particularly in its modern aspects; and we feel that we cannot do a greater service to our readers than recommend them to procure and peruse that masterly production.

KNOX COLLEGE—ACT OF INCORPORATION.

The subject of putting the College property under Trust has now been before the Church and Synod for several years. It has been frequently discussed at length. Several Committees have been appointed to consider it maturely and to take legal advice concerning it. We have not been rash in this matter. Fully aware of its importance to future generations, our desire has been to weigh the whole subject carefully in the light of past history and experience, and to devise such a settlement of the property as would so far as we could see, secure it to the principles of our Church, and guard us from unnecessary or improper interference by the civil courts.

In the year 1855, the Synod resolved to secure "the property to the principles of our Church as at present defined in the Standards of this body, the property to be held by Trustees elected annually by the Synod." A Committee was accordingly appointed to obtain a Deed in terms of the motion and to report to the next Synod or to a meeting to be specially called. In 1856 the Committee reported and brought up particulars of a Draft Trust Deed—but in so incomplete a form that the Synod could come to no decision regarding them. After mature consideration, the whole subject of framing a Deed for the College property, was remitted to another Committee, with instructions to take legal advice and to prepare a Deed binding the property "to the principles of the Church."

In accordance with this remit the Committee took the best legal advice in both Provinces on the subject, and were informed that no existing law permitted a body constituted like the Synod to hold property or to put property under trust; and that the only way in which the objects of the Synod could be attained was by an "Act of Incorporation," in which the Synod's power over the College would be secured and the property would be tied to the recognised principles or Standards of our Church.

Acting on this advice the Committee drew up a Draft Act of Incorporation which was sent, prior the meeting of last Synod, to every minister and to many of the elders of our Church. This Draft was also reported to the Synod; every clause of it was carefully discussed and several amendments introduced into it, and finally after mature deliberation and with all the light which could be got to guide us, the whole "Act" as amended was passed and a Committee appointed "to take steps for having it brought before the Legislature." At a subsequent diet the Synod appointed twenty-four Trustees in terms of the Draft Act eight of whom were ministers and sixteen laymen.

The Committee accordingly took the usual steps necessary to bring the Bill before the Legislature. In the meantime that there might be no mistake, the

Convenor wrote to the parties appointed Trustees who were not present at the Synod, requesting written permission to insert their names in the Trust. One or two of these gentlemen declined and the Committee using a discretion unavoidable in the circumstances obtained the consent of others to take their places. From one gentleman only the Convenor did not receive any reply to his communication; but from previous conversations on the subject with him he was led to suppose that his silence might be interpreted as consent; subsequent developments, however, have shown that this inference was not correct.

The Bill was finally introduced into Parliament, and having been read a first and second time, was sent to the Committee on private Bills. Up to this stage of the proceedings not a whisper of opposition was heard. Hopes were accordingly entertained that the Act would be passed through both chambers of the Legislature without opposition, and receive the Royal assent before the meeting of the Synod in June, 1858.

In this expectation the promoters of the Bill have been disappointed. At the first meeting of the "Private Bill Committee" a member of Parliament connected with our Church entered a serious objection to what was considered by its promoters to be the very principle of the Bill. With due consideration for the interests of parties concerned, a delay of a few days was granted by the Committee for its consideration. In the meantime enquiry was made by members of the Synod's Committee as to the grounds of the opposition now raised against the most important clause of the "Act." It was considered that every care had been taken to prepare the Bill with a due regard to the well-founded antipathies of the Protestants of this country to ecclesiastical incorporations. In the matter of real estate we had limited ourselves to the holding of only so much as was necessary for College buildings and grounds, and in the event of our obtaining bequests of real estate we were willing to bind ourselves to alienate or dispose of them within three years under the penalty of forfeiture. To avoid besides the possibility of taking advantage of death-bed bequests we were willing to regard those bequests only as legal which had been made six months before the death of the party bequeathing. These provisions it was conceived would effectually guard us from the allegation of giving any sanction to the objectionable corporate powers claimed by Popish institutions.

It appears, however, that many of our friends in the *House*, detected in our "Act" a clause which they deem highly objectionable, and the passing of which they determined to oppose both in Committee, and on the third reading in the House. The second clause is that to which they objected and is as follows:—

The principles and doctrines to be taught in the said College by the professors and tutors, or other persons who shall, from time to time, and at all times hereafter be employed or appointed in giving instruction in said College, shall be such and such only as are consistent with the "Confession of Faith;" "The larger and shorter Catechisms," and "The Form of Church Government," all of which are called "The Westminster Standards;" Provided always, that the said "Confession of Faith" be understood and taken with the explanatory note thereto agreed upon by the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, met at Toronto in the year of our Lord, 1854; Provided also, that the said Westminster Standards be taken and understood, together with such other or further directions and rules as to Church government, discipline or worship, as may from time to time be prescribed or ordained by the Synod of the said Presbyterian Church of Canada, and that such directions and rules be duly recorded in the Minute Book of the said Synod, and signed by the Moderator and Clerk for the time being of such Synod; Provided also, that in case of difference of opinion in regard to the true meaning of the said principles, doctrines, standards, directions, and rules, or any or either of them, the same shall be taken and deemed to be in accordance with the interpretation thereof respectively by the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada at a regular meeting thereof, of all which directions, rules, or interpretations, a copy certi-

sted by the Moderator and Clerk of the said Synod for the time being shall be sufficient evidence.

It was objected that in this clause we were asking legislative sanction to teach and to confirm our principles—that we were putting it in the power of the Legislature to alter our principles at any time; for the power that enacts can dis-enact. How would we like, it was asked, to pass a Bill in which for similar purposes the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church were introduced? The objectors alleged that the ends which we aimed at could be gained by another method than that proposed by us. After mature reflection the members of the Synod's Committee present in Toronto, judged that there was no impropriety in this clause, all that it contained being in their judgment nothing more than a declaration of our principles, which we did not ask powers to teach but to which we asked the Legislature to do that which we could not do for ourselves, namely, to bind the College property to them. This we believed could not be done in any other way than by an Act of Incorporation in which such a clause as this should be introduced. The object of specifying the Standards as they are in this clause with the provisoes which it contains was to guard us as much as possible from the interference of the civil Courts in the event of any dispute about the property. According to this clause it will be obvious that any enquiry which a civil Court could make into our principles would be limited to a simple matter of fact—to the avowed principles of the Church as defined in its recognised and specified Standards. On this view of the case the promoters of the Bill, deeming that this clause was an essential part of it resolved to defend it in Committee. They did so and it was carried. The whole Bill also was passed in Committee with only such amendments as the promoters themselves proposed, or consented to.

On the day following this event a short editorial article appeared in the Toronto *Daily Globe* entitled, "A Singular Scene." It is to be regretted that the writer of that article had so little regard to the facts of the case or to the reputation of the gentlemen appointed by the Church to promote the Bill. The scope of the article in question gives a most unfair representation of the character of the Bill, and is calculated to excite a most unfounded prejudice against the Free Church in this Province. It says that "the measure contains some of the most objectionable clauses which have ever been placed in any charter of a like kind, clauses worse even than those of the Catholic Colleges whose acts of incorporation have been so numerous and improper." Now the second is the only clause the Opposition seriously objected to, and which the promoters would not relinquish. We are at a loss to understand on what grounds it is open to this sweeping charge of the *Globe*. It cannot be denied that an "Act of Incorporation" of some kind is necessary; and any "Act" we conceive which binds the property to the Church in any form will not escape the difficulty urged against the specific clause of our Bill. We cannot separate the Church from its principles and doctrines. If we bind property to the Church we bind it to its principles and doctrines. In the event, therefore, of any dispute arising as to the possession of such property the Courts of law would have to determine who were entitled to it, by a reference to, and interpretation of, the principles and doctrines of the Church at the time the Act was passed. Without our second clause we make the civil courts the interpreters of our doctrines; with the clause we confine them to a simple matter of fact, namely to the Standards and the interpretation of them by the constitutional majority of the Synod.

Another allegation of the *Globe* is "that one of the clauses absolutely endeavours to define the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, and seeks to give the

stamp and authority of Parliament to that definition, . . . and the courts of law may be invoked to decide what is or what is not the true interpretation of the Westminster Standards." The writer of this sentence cannot have read the clause in question; if he had he could not possibly have fallen into so manifest an error. That the courts of law must in case of disputed titles determine and interpret principles in so far as they relate to trust estate is inevitable and cannot, in the nature of things, be avoided. It is their province to guard the rights of property. While they cannot and ought not to enforce their interpretations of doctrines upon *persons* they both can and ought for the welfare of Society to enforce them as regards the destination of *trust estate*. How it could be supposed that the promoters of this Bill had performed the herculean task of *defining* the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church in a single clause of a few lines, we are at a loss to understand. That would be putting the confession of faith and the larger and shorter catechisms, with the form of Church government to boot, into a nut-shell, indeed. The man who will perform such a feat as this to the satisfaction of the Church will deserve the lasting gratitude of the world. All that we have attempted to do is to specify the books in which our doctrines are defined, (a very different thing from defining the doctrines), and by provisos to secure their interpretation, not, be it observed, to the law courts, but to our own Church. Other parts of the *Globe's* article are equally open to animadversion, but we would only further say that the statement that it was "time the laymen were looking after" the reverend gentlemen of our Church, is conceived in the worst spirit and is directly calculated to awaken causeless jealousies in the minds of laymen against the ministers of the Church. This we cannot but think is a remnant of that laic dread of ecclesiastics for which some of our otherwise excellent friends are so notorious. The catholic controversies in which they have been for so many years involved, seem to have perverted their judgment to some extent. In a black coat they seem to smell a jesuit, and in a white neck-loth to imagine the ghostly attire of a priest. Frequent bodily exercise and a cold bath now and again we apprehend would be the best cure for such dyspeptic and jaundiced minds. In the hour of need the ministers of our Church will, we hesitate not to say, be found foremost in contending for the civil and religious liberties of the country. We are not afraid of being "looked after." Yea! we invite inspection, conscious that all our proceedings will meet the approval of the wise and virtuous.

In the face of the opposition of our own friends in the House the parties in charge of the Bill felt that it would be improper for them to force the Bill through Parliament. The opposition besides promised to show us how the objects we aim at may be obtained even better than by the way we propose. One gentleman skilled in the law is preparing the Bill in such a form as he thinks will remove all objection, and yet permit us by declarations of trust in the deed conveying the property to the corporation to insert all the clauses which are contained in the Bill as it at present stands. If this can be done so as to obviate the objectors own objections, and to satisfy the Church, and the requirements of the law in both sections of the Province, it will, we are sure, be preferred. We have all along had a preference for such a mode of securing the property, but we have our doubts as to the possibility of effecting it conveniently or securely. The subject will come up to the Synod in this form, and it will be for it to decide what should be done. We are sure that it will be the desire of every minister and elder of our Church to have regard to the political consistency of our Protestant friends in Parliament who are opposing so manfully those Popish incorporations which are dangerous alike to our liberties and to the social improvement of the country.

WORDS OF THE WISE.

RALPH ERSKINE,

ON THE "APPLE TREE AMONG THE TREES OF THE WOOD."

The Lord Jesus Christ is the true apple-tree, and His Father is the gardener; and he is now come to shake the tree, to let down the apples about your hands that you may gather, or to bend the branches down to you, that you may pluck what apples you need.

What apples, say you? Why, we shall tell you of eight sorts of apples. Well here is,

The apple of imputed righteousness for you that are guilty sinners. Your own righteousness is a rotten apple, good for nothing but to be cast away with all your other idols, to the moles and to the bats; but the righteousness of Christ is a sweet apple, a fresh apple, a ripe apple, ready for eating; and if you taste of this apple you shall live a life of justification. By eating the forbidden fruit you were condemned; but by tasting of this apple you shall be justified: "By one man's offence, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: but by the righteousness of one, the free gift comes upon all men unto justification of life: for, as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous," Rom. v. 18, 19.

Here is the apple of implanted grace you may pluck from off this tree of life. Do you want even the grace of faith and ability to pluck? It grows upon this tree; Christ is the author of faith, and the finisher of it. Do you want the grace of repentance? It grows also upon this tree, Acts v. 31. "Him hath God exalted, to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sin." Do you want love? It grows upon this tree; his love is the seed of love; "We love him, because he first loved us:" his doing, dying, rising, reigning love is the seed that being sown in your heart, will make heart-love to him grow there.—Whatever grace you need you may get it upon this tree of life; for, "Out of his fulness we all receive, and grace for grace;" or, as it may read, 'Love for love.'

Here is the apple of peace. Is not peace with God and peace of conscience a sweet apple? And does it not grow here? "In the world ye shall have tribulation, but in me ye shall have peace:—He made peace by the blood of his cross." O! who would not be in hands with this refreshing apple, that will cheer the heart against all the disquiet in the world! This peace in Christ is like a dry house within, i. e. a rainy day without doors. It is like a quiet harbour in stormy weather; or a safe haven in a terrible tempest.

Here is the apple of joy, joy in the Holy Ghost; and this also grows upon the apple-tree: "Whom having not seen ye love, in whom tho' now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unpeakable, and full of glory," 1 Pet. i. 8. A taste of this apple makes all carnal joy tasteless to you; for, it is unspeakable joy, full joy, glorious joy, and unspeakably full of glory; the very dawning of the day of glory.

Here is the apple of contentment that grows upon this tree of life; contentment with every lot, every cross; "Godliness with contentment is great gain." When a man tastes of this apple, it makes him say with Paul, "I am sorrowful, yet always rejoice: I have learned in whatever state I am, therewith to be content." This sweet apple sweetens every lot, be it never so bitter.

Here is the apple of communion with God, and access to him, that grows upon this tree; for, "Thro' him we have access by one Spirit to the Father:" putting the soul in case to say, "Truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." This makes the soul to invite others sometimes to come and share, saying, "O taste and see that the Lord is good; for, that which

we have seen and heard, declare we unto you, that you may have fellowship with us ;" while we have fellowship with the Father, in his electing love ; with the Son, in his redeeming love ; and with the Holy Ghost, in his applying both the love of the Father, and the grace of the Son. This communion is sometimes only in desire ; "The desire of our soul is to thy name, and to the remembrance of thee." Sometimes in delight ; "Delight thyself in the Lord, and he will give thee the desire of thine heart."

Here is the apple of spiritual liberty that grows upon this apple-tree ; "If the Son make you free, you are free indeed." When we taste of this apple, we preach at liberty, and pray at liberty, and hear at liberty, believe at liberty, and walk at liberty ; "I will walk at liberty, for I seek thy precepts," Psal. cxix. 45.

Here is the apple of assurance that grows upon this tree : assurance of God's everlasting love is one of the swe test apples that ever was tasted ; and a taste of it makes the man to cry out, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, Job. xix. 25.—I know in whom I have believed, 2 Tim. i. 12.

This apple, being tasted, leads the soul up to the pinnacle of praise, according to that word, Psal. cxl. 13. "Surely the righteous shall give thanks to thy name ; the upright shall dwell in thy presence."

POETRY.

THE CHRISTIAN ENCOURAGED.

Give to the winds thy fears ;
 Hope, and be undismay'd ;
 God hears thy sighs, and counts thy tears,
 God shall lift up thy head.
 Through waves, through clouds and storms,
 He gently clears thy way ;
 Wait thou his time ; so shall the night
 Soon end in joyous day.

He every where hath way,
 And all things serve his might ;
 His every act pure blessing is,
 His path, unsullied light.
 When He makes bare his arm,
 What shall his work withstand ?
 When He his people's cause defends,
 Who, who shall stay his hand ?

Leave to his sovereign sway,
 To choose, and to command ;
 With wonder fill'd, thou then shalt own,
 How wise, how strong his hand :
 Thou comprehend'st Him not ;
 Yet earth and heaven tell,
 God sits as sovereign on the throne,
 He ruleth all things well.

Thou seest our weakness, Lord,
 Our hearts are known to Thee ;
 O, lift Thou up the sinking hand,
 Confirm the feeble knee !
 Let us, in life and death,
 Boldly thy truth declare ;
 And publish, with our latest breath,
 Thy love, and guardian care.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

LIFE THOUGHTS, gathered from the extemporaneous discourses of Henry Ward Beecher, by one of his congregation. *Boston*: Phillips, Sampson & Co. *Montreal*: B. Dawson, 1858. Pp. 299.

The lady who has compiled this volume does not intimate whether she submitted her notes to Mr. Beecher for revisal and sanction. We are, therefore, ignorant whether she has accurately reported his thoughts, and cannot hold him strictly responsible for any rash or unsafe assertions which may be detected in this book. These, however, are not so numerous or so important as to call for serious remark.

It is not easy to read three hundred pages of short unconnected extracts, and we accord no small merit to the volume before us, when we say that we find it *read-ble*. Not destined to be so famous as Coleridge's "Aids to Reflection," or Hare's "Guesses at Truth;" it yet reminds one of these remarkable works, and gives a very favorable impression of Mr. Beecher's genius. Vivid imagination, delicate fancy, acute perception, and a certain pleasing audacity of thought and diction, unite to charm us in the pages of this book. Religious ideas and lessons are conveyed not in a didactic form, but in figures of speech, analogies from history and from nature, flashes of oratorical fire, sometimes even in sharp strokes of wit.

The following passages will give our readers an idea of the beauties with which this volume is strewn:—

EULOGY ON THE TWENTY-THIRD PSALM.—David has left no sweeter Psalm than the short twenty-third. It is but a moment's opening of his soul; but, as when one, walking the winter street, sees the door opened for some one to enter, and the red light streams a moment forth, and the forms of gay children are running to greet the comer, and genial music sounds, though the door shuts and leaves the night black, yet it cannot shut back again all that the eye, the ear, the heart, and the imagination have seen, so in this Psalm, though it is but a moment's opening of the soul, are emitted truths of peace and consolation that will never be absent from the world.

The twenty-third Psalm is the nightingale of the Psalms. It is small, of a homely feather, singing shyly out of obscurity; but, O it has filled the air of the whole world with melodious joy, greater than the heart can conceive. Blessed be the day on which that Psalm was born.

What would you say of a pilgrim commissioned of God to travel up and down the earth singing a strange melody, which, when one heard, caused him to forget whatever sorrow he had? And so the singing angel goes on his way through all lands, singing in the language of every nation, driving away trouble to the pulses of the air, which his tongue moves with divine power. Behold just such an one! This pilgrim God has sent to speak in every language on the globe. It has charmed more griefs to rest than all the philosophy of the world. It has remanded to their dungeon more felon thoughts, more black doubts, more thieving sorrows, than there are sands on the sea shore. It has comforted the noble host of the poor. It has sung courage to the army of the disappointed. It has poured balm and consolation into the heart of the sick, of captives in dungeons, of widows in their pinching griefs, of orphans in their loneliness. Dying soldiers have died easier as it was read to them; ghastly hospitals have been illumined; it has visited the prisoner and broken his chains, and, like Pefer's angel, led him forth in imagination, and sung him back to his home again. It has made the dying Christian slave freer than his master, and consoled those whom, dying, he left behind mourning, not so much that he was gone as because they were left behind, and could not go too.

Nor is its work done. It will go singing to your children and my children, and to their children, through all the generations of time; nor will it fold its wings till the last pilgrim is safe, and time ended; and then it shall fly back to the bosom of God, whence it issued, and sound on, mingled with all those sounds of celestial joy which make heaven musical forever.

SELF-KNOWLEDGE.—No man can go down into the dungeon of his experience, and hold the torch of God's Word to all its dark chambers, and hidden cavities, and slimy recesses, and not come up with a shudder and a chill, and an earnest cry to God for divine mercy and cleansing.

WORK AND WORRY.—It is not work that kills men, it is worry. Work is healthy; you can hardly put more upon a man than he can bear. Worry is rust upon the blade. It is not the resolution that destroys the machinery, but the friction. Fear secretes acids; but love and trust are sweet juices.

SABBATHS.—Through the week we go down into the valleys of care and shadow. Our Sabbaths should be hills of light and joy in God's presence; and so, as time rolls by, we shall go on from mountain top to mountain top, till at last we catch the glory of the gate, and enter in to go no more out for ever.

OUR CHILDREN.—There are many of us whose children are in heaven, who have been borne from us through quick life to lie in angel's bosoms; and though they were not wrested from us without pangs, and though the places which they filled in our hearts are as wells of tears, yet we would not have them back, and we are glad to-day for our sakes and for their own. And some we are piloting, but must soon leave them alone upon the tossing sea. God grant that then, without shipwreck, they may safely reach the haven where we have gone!

THE CHURCH OF GOD AS AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF THE GOSPEL, AND THE IDEA, STRUCTURE AND JUNCTIONS THEREOF. A Discourse in four parts, by the Rev. S. ROBINSON, Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology, Danville, Ky. With an Appendix containing the more important Symbols of Presbyterian Church Government, historically arranged and illustrated. *Philadelphia*: J. M. Wilson. *Montreal*: B. Dawson. Pp. 222. 60 cents.

The title of this volume is a good description of its contents. The object of the author is to give a brief and suggestive outline of the doctrine of the Church. This appeared to him very necessary at the present time, considering the prevalence of an anti-evangelical churchism on the one-hand, and an anti-eccelesiastical evangelicalism on the other. To counteract both of these pernicious errors our author endeavours to prove that the Presbyterian form of the Church is the divinely appointed agency through which the elect people are to be gathered into the fold of Christ.

It is refreshing to find that some one is disposed in this age of general Church disorder to hold up to public view and boldly to maintain the *ius divinum* of our Presbyterian polity. This is the old, but alas! now much neglected idea of our Church, which we find embodied in our confession and symbols, and for which the fathers contended as strenuously and with as entire a devotion as they did for any other of the doctrines of our faith. The writer says truly in his preface that "Nothing but the inherent truthfulness and power of the system itself, and that truthfulness clearly perceived and intelligently acted upon by the general mass of those called to administer the affairs of the Presbyterian Church can guarantee its permanence and further progress." We further believe with him "that just in proportion as the power of the vital truths concerning the Church shall be felt by its office-bearers, shall they impart a higher degree of earnestness and spirituality to all that pertains to the administration of the affairs of Christ's kingdom." There are few ministers but feel and deplore the laxity of the common view of professing Christians concerning the Church in these days. It enfeebles all her action and deprives her of that concentration of life without which there is no power. We therefore hail this book as another valuable contribution to the literature of the Church. To some minds the abstract and German-like form in which the subject is treated, may be somewhat repellant. We in this country are not used to that speculative treatment of ecclesiastical or theological questions which pertains to our German allies. Nevertheless we deem the subject ably and thoroughly handled, and to minds familiar with abstract forms of thought, highly satisfactory. Our space will not permit us to enter into a discussion of the points treated of by our author.

His general purpose seems to be to show that the idea, the development, and the visible form of the Church are inseparably related to the divine idea of redemption, and to the unfolding of God's gracious plan in the world. As the eternal purpose of God is the central truth of the Calvinistic theory of theology, so the same eternal purpose may be regarded as the central truth of the Church or of ecclesiology. The purpose to save sinners not so much as individuals, but as an elect ideal body of which the Mediator shall be Head, implies the actual development of this ideal visibly in the Church. The author goes on further to show that the revelation of grace and mercy in the covenant is uniformly accompanied with an ecclesiology of some kind from the days of Abraham downwards to the time of Christ. In this way an outward visible Church form has existed from the earliest time as the emblem of the eternal purpose of God in redemption. The visible Church he thus shows to be essentially one in all ages, varying only in its external attributes with the varied dispensations of grace.

This idea of the Church he contends is in accordance with the principles of Church government, and the ordinances of worship as set forth in the Scripture. In these sections of the work he very cogently demonstrates the divinely instituted form of the Presbyterian Church, with its preservatives against tyranny on the one hand and disorder on the other. With the general scope of the writer's argument we cordially agree, but against one part of it we beg leave to enter our solemn dissent. In discriminating the distinction between the civil and the ecclesiastical power, while he says that they are in common of divine authority for the welfare of mankind, and the glory of God as a final end, he yet says that in their origin, etc., they differ fundamentally. In a distinct proposition he states "that the civil power derives its authority from God as the Author of nature, whilst the power ecclesiastical comes alone from Jesus as mediator. And again he writes: "The rule for the guidance of the civil power in its exercise is the light of nature and reason, the law which the Author of nature reveals through reason to man." These statements are we consider opposed to the whole contentings of the Presbyterian Church of the past and of its most faithful representatives of the present. We have always believed with the Catechism that the word of God is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him. To the law and to the testimony we have ever been accustomed to bring for judgment the actions and procedure of men, whether political or social, collective or individual. The absurdity of using the candle-light of reason while we have the sun-light of revelation to guide us, equally in the government of person, house and kingdom, seems to us very manifest. Whatever might be urged on behalf of the light of reason and nature as the rule of law and government before the revelation of the Word, is quite out of place after the revelation is given to men. That Christ is King of Kings and Lord of Lords who can deny? That all things are put under His feet for the good of His body, the Church, is equally plain. That He has a name above every name, whether in Heaven or on earth, is also indisputable. Are these then mere empty titles? In military phrase, are they only *brevet*—honorary but not actual—rank and dignity? Scripture is too explicit on this point to permit us to think so. Christ, King of nations, is as true a title of our Lord as Christ King of Zion or the Church. We regret to find that the American Church has shown symptoms of resiling from its own testimony on this point in the twenty-third chapter of its confession. An exaggerated fear of State connection and control has we suppose led to this, if not also a culpable timidity in reference to the great question of Slavery. While however we would contend that the civil power ought in all its procedure to have regard to the Word of God, we would yet say that this regard, from the nature of things, must be of a different kind from that

which is incumbent upon the Church. The civil power ought to see that its laws and administration be not *contrary* to the Word of God in the widest sense of the terms; otherwise the subject may find it necessary for conscience sake to obey God rather than man, and thus civil authority be brought into contempt. The Church on the other hand must take absolutely and exclusively the Word as its Statute Book—its function strictly speaking as purely administrative of the Word. This is the ground which we take as regards the Civil Magistrate, and from the doctrine, that in his official capacity he ought to have regard to the Word of God, we cannot resile.

The Appendix to this volume contains many valuable documents, not easily accessible to the student. The execution of the work is remarkably good. The type is bold and clear, and the paper of the best quality. We would earnestly recommend this book to our ministers and students. It is highly suggestive and well repays perusal.

THE SPIRIT AND BEAUTY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Selections from Chateaubriand's *Genius of Christianity*. Translated from the French, with an introduction, by EMMA B. STORK. *Philadelphia*: Lindsay & Blakiston. *Montreal*: B. Dawson, 1858. Pp. 213.

This is a valuable but imperfect publication. We can never read with pleasure garbled editions of celebrated works; even when, as in the present instance, the liberties taken with the original are sincerely intended to guard the interests of Christian truth. Mrs. Stork claims too much freedom, and does injustice to the French author, when she tells us—"We have consulted our liberty of conscience, to expunge in our translation some of the sentiments of the pious and faithful Chateaubriand. Some remarks have been intentionally modified from the original, (in a few instances) where they are tinged with the Popish doctrine of penances. Others are omitted for the same reason." This is very unsatisfactory. No one wants such an expurgated edition of Thomas a Kempis, or Pascal, or Fenelon; and it would have been much better in the case of Chateaubriand to reprint the complete translation of his noble work, which was recently published in England, appending in footnotes such doctrinal corrections as may be thought necessary.

The "*Génie du Christianisme*" is an old favorite of ours; and we should be glad to see it in the hands of Theological Students and the intelligent Christian lay. It is to be read in some parts with caution and even with dissent; yet it deserves to be called a Christian Classic, written as it is with a charming eloquence, and confirming our faith in Christianity by developing its beauties and tracing its mighty beneficent effects.

THE TRUE GLORY OF WOMAN, as portrayed in the beautiful life of the Virgin Mary. By the Rev. H. HARBAUGH, A.M. *Philadelphia*: Lindsay & Blakiston. *Montreal*: B. Dawson, 1858. Pp. 263.

We can recommend this volume as an ample statement of all the teaching of Scripture regarding the Mother of our Lord. It should be extensively read by Protestants, who in their just and vehement resistance to the Mariolatry of the Church of Rome, have been tempted too little to regard and study that most favored one of all the human race. Mr. Harbaugh treats of Mary as the Virgin, the betrothed, the wife, the mother, the disciple, and the saint. Incidentally he discusses various historical and artistic questions regarding her, and closes with two chapters, in one of which he proves that Mary is not an object of worship, and in the other adduces the evidence or rather the probabilities in favor of her having continued ever a Virgin, very properly pointing out that the basis on which the belief of her perpetual virginity rests is quite different from that alleged in support of her immaculate conception.

Mr. Harbaugh is the author of several books which have gained a wide circulation in the United States. We are surprised that his practised pen should be guilty of such grandiloquence as too often appears in the pages of the work before us. That we may not seem captious in this remark, we quote the following sentences from the description of the nativity at Bethlehem:—"Upon the grand dial-face on which God marks the move of ages, the gnomon's shadow now falls on the line which infinite mercy has drawn with sacred blood. The fulness of time has come. An inn full of tax-payers, whose half-angry murmurs Mary hears from a distance, mingling with the night wind's moan through the stable's crannies, witness the sceptre passing from Judah's weakened hand. The oxen gaze in mute astonishment, &c., &c." This is in shocking taste, and a book that contains such passages could not be tolerated, if it had not substantial merits underlying such rubbish as this.

THE HAPPY HOME. By KIRWAN. *New York*: Harper & Brothers. *Montreal*: B. Dawson. 1858. Pp. 206.

Dr. Murray, under his old "nom de plume" of Kirwan, has here given to the American public a little book of ripe wisdom and most seasonable truth. He has unwittingly chosen the same title as Dr. Hamilton of London had previously given to a characteristic volume on the same theme. Dr. Murray, however, follows his own course of thought and illustration; and though very much has lately been written, and well written, on the constitution, duties, and enjoyments of the family circle, we regard the volume before us as perhaps the best we have seen for extensive circulation in American and Canadian homes. The price is only 50 cents.

NARRATIVES OF REMARKABLE CONVERSIONS AND REVIVAL INCIDENTS. By WILLIAM C. CONANT, with an introduction by Henry Ward Beecher. *New York*: Derby & Jackson, 1858. Pp. 444.

This volume may do good, but we cannot give it any hearty praise. It seems to be a compilation hastily got up to catch the market, and to make money out of the "Prayer Meeting Revival" in the United States.

Would that some true Christian philosopher, patient to observe and study, and with amplitude of mind and heart sufficient to the great task, would give us a real history and estimate of religious revivals! Mr. Beecher is a man of genius, but he is not competent to this work. We form this opinion from his essay prefixed to the volume before us, and from his address delivered at the Butten Theatre Prayer Meeting in New York, which has been more widely circulated than it deserves.

LEAVES FROM A MINISTER'S PORTFOLIO. By the REV. D. FRASER, A.M., minister of Cote St. Free Church Montreal. *London*: James Nisbet & Co. *Montreal*: B. Dawson. pp. 141. 3s. 6d.

This little book is the first-born of one of the Editors of the *Presbyter*, and therefore it will not be becoming in us to treat it with the freedom that we would do the work of any other writer. We may, however, be permitted to say of our brother's first appearance in the realms of book-literature, that it is worthy of praise, and will bear a favourable comparison with works of a similar kind. The typography is beautiful, and the "getting-up" very pleasing. The book contains a number of short pieces on interesting topics of practical and speculative religion. The titles are skilfully chosen. The style is clear, fluent, frequently antithetical and gracefully embellished with well chosen illustrations. To those who are in search of pleasant reading for the Sabbath day or for the leisure hours of the week, this book will we are sure prove a profitable companion. We trust it will have a large share of public patronage, and be a blessing to many a devout disciple of Christ.

SUMMARY OF INTELLIGENCE.

ECCLESIASTICAL AND MISSIONARY.

GENERAL ASSEMBLIES IN THE UNITED STATES.—The General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church met at New Orleans on the 6th May. The Rev. Dr. Scott, of San Francisco, was elected Moderator. The evangelistic efforts conducted by the several "Boards" of the Church were reported of in encouraging terms. Little favor seems to have been shown to the proposals for union made by the New School Presbyterians, who have lately formed a separate Southern organization. A minute, drawn by Dr. Robt. Breckenridge, disapproving of any changes in the old English Bible by the American Bible Society, was unanimously passed. It was agreed to hold the next General Assembly at Indianapolis.

The General Assembly of the New School Presbyterian Church commenced its sessions on the 20th May, at Chicago.

SABBATH OBSERVANCE.—This question engages the serious attention of Christians both in London and in New York. In both cities, open trading on the Lord's Day is carried on to a great extent. Consentaneous preaching on this subject has been resorted to with good effect. The Bishop of London recommended all his clergy to adopt this course. But, besides moral and religious suasion, there is needed the strong arm of law. We are glad to observe that the matter has not been entirely neglected in our Canadian Legislature. The Hon. Mr. DeBlaquiere in the Upper House, and Mr. Brown, M.P.P. in the Lower, have introduced a Bill to enforce the closing of Public Offices, Canals, etc., on the Sabbath. An important meeting in support of this Bill was held at Toronto on the 4th May.

ORGAN CONTROVERSY.—The question of the introduction of instrumental music into the public services of the House of God, has again been discussed in the Annual Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland. The Claremont Street Congregation in Glasgow, who possess an organ, have petitioned for liberty to use it. The liberty was refused by an immense majority of votes.

REVISION OF THE ENGLISH LITURGY.—Lord Ebury recently made a motion in the House of Lords on this subject, and supported it in an able and temperate speech. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of St. David's, speaking for the Episcopal Bench, stoutly resisted the motion and deprecated any change. The Prime Minister concurred with the Right Reverend Lords. Earl Grey and other Lay Lords spoke in favor of revision. The "Times" next morning supported the same view in a pungent leading article. At the close of the discussion, Lord Ebury withdrew his motion.

MEETING AT MONTREAL IN FAVOR OF PRESBYTERIAN UNION.—On the evening of the 18th May a meeting of the Office-bearers of the three Congregations in this city connected with the Presbyterian Church of Canada and the United Presbyterian Church, was held in the Lecture Room of the Free Church, Coté Street. Resolutions were unanimously passed approving of the basis of union agreed on by the Committees of those Churches, and expressing an earnest hope that the union may be speedily formed. The meeting was numerously attended, and an excellent spirit prevailed.

SYNOD IN CONNECTION WITH THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.—This Synod began its Annual Sessions at Montreal on the 26th May. The Rev. George Bell of Clifton was chosen Moderator. At the time when we go to press, no business of general importance appears to have been transacted.

CHRISTIAN CONVERTS IN CHINA.—The following calculation of the number of Chinese Christians is furnished by a Missionary of the English Presbyterian Church:—"The number of converts in the Canton Province is at present about 400; at Shanghai, 199; at Ningpo, 130; at Foochow a small number; at Amoy there are about 400. Of these, there are in Amoy itself 190 connected with the London Missionary Society, and 137 under the care of the American Missionaries; at Chioh-by there are 35, and at Pechuah and Ma-ping 53. And although at this rate there is only one native Protestant Christian out of every 300,000 Chinamen, as compared with the state of matters ten years ago the increase is sufficient to inspire us all with hope and thankfulness."

POPIH PROPAGANDA.—Great efforts are being made to extend the missions of the Church of Rome, through the Society for the propagation of the Faith. The Pope has proclaimed a jubilee, and promised indulgences to all who subscribe to its funds. Numerous allocutions are drawn up by various bishops in favour of this Society.

Bishop Charbonnel of Toronto, gives the following statement of what has been accomplished by its means. The results are undoubtedly exaggerated, but the statistics of priests employed are probably correct, and they exhibit an alarming amount of activity:—

“There are 267 bishops now existing, aided in their missions by this work. The number of priests from the seminary of foreign missions, Rue du Bac, at Paris, employed in the missions of Asia, has increased from 32 to 197, that of the Lazarists, from 30 to 200, and that of the Jesuits to 780, exclusive of the Benedictines, Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, Servites, Redemptorists, Passionists, Oblates, Mariists, &c., who have each members of their order attached to the missions. The United States alone, at the present day, are indebted to the work of the *half-penny a week* for 45 bishoprics, 1700 priests, 2000 churches, and upwards of 650 houses of education and charity, which are the most powerful means of conversion amongst the infidels and heretics.”

L I T E R A R Y .

POSTHUMOUS WORK OF NEANDER.—The late Dr. Neander left in manuscript a work on the History of Christian Doctrine, which has been published in two volumes at Berlin; edited by one of Neander's most attached pupils and friends, Dr. Jacobi of Halle. We presume that an English Translation will appear. Hagebach's History of Doctrines is well known through the Translation which was issued by Messrs. T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh—but with great merits it has also serious defects. We are not aware of any original English work specially devoted to this subject. If Principal Cunningham of Edinburgh would undertake to prepare an independent History, we know no one more competent to the task. He delivers to the Students of the New College a masterly course of lectures on Polemical Theology.

NEW LIFE OF MAHOMET.—From the London press of Smith, Elder & Co. has issued in two volumes—“The Life of Mahomet, and History of Islam to the era of the Hegira;” by William Muir, Esq., Bengal Civil Service. The peculiar merit of this work, in which it excels the popular biography by Washington Irving, is said to consist in the careful dissection of the original sources of information. There is no co temporary history of Mahomet extant, and the earliest Arabic accounts of the Prophet that exist were written in the beginning of the third century of the Hegira. These accounts were derived from earlier traditions.

PRIZE ESSAY ON THE SUPPORT OF THE MINISTRY—Dr. Wylie's Prize Essay on this important subject attracts considerable notice in Scotland. The Home and Foreign Record of the Free Church contains a strong recommendation of the work, signed by Drs. Candlish, Cunningham, and Begg. Is not the circulation of such a volume in Canada extremely desirable?

PROFESSOR FRASER'S RATIONAL PHILOSOPHY.—The small volume lately published on Philosophical Method by Professor Fraser, the successor of Sir William Hamilton in the University of Edinburgh, will interest those who enjoy abstruse metaphysics. The author classifies systems of Philosophy as (1.) Constructive systems of Realism, and these either idealistic or materialistic, (2.) Contradictory or sceptical systems; (3.) Systems of insoluble or Catholic Realism. Professor Fraser's course, of which this publication is intended to be an outline, will aim at the presentation of a system of the third class.

ESSAYS BY FREE CHURCH MINISTERS.—A literary work, somewhat new in its character, but most suggestive (as to its idea), has appeared within the last month, in the form of a volume of *Essays by Ministers of the Free Church of Scotland*, edited by the Rev. Dr. Hanna, Thomas Constable & Co., Edinburgh). Dr. Hanna states in his preface that these Essays emanate from junior ministers of the Free Church, all of whom were ordained at or after the Disruption of 1843. They embrace a great variety of subjects: “Catholicism and Sectarianism,” “Old Testament Light on our Social Problems,” “Tertullian,” “The Haldanes: a Chapter in Scottish Church History,” “The Offerings of Cain and Abel, as illustrating primeval Faith and Practice: a Critical Exposition of Genesis iv. 1-8,” “National Education in the United States and Canada, with special reference to the Settlement of the Question in this country;” “Bohemian Reformers and German Politicians: a Contribution to the History of Protestantism;” “Grammar Schools;” and “The Future of India.” These varied subjects are treated with much vigour and freshness; and in several of the essays there is brought to bear a very large amount of carefully selected information.