

The Church.

THEREFORE I WILL NOT BE NEGLIGENT TO PUT YOU ALWAYS IN REMEMBRANCE OF THESE THINGS, THOUGH YE KNOW THEM AND BE ESTABLISHED IN THE PRESENT TRUTH.—2 PETER, I, 12.

VOL. I.]

COBOURG, U. C., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1838.

[NO. XXXVII.]

Poetry.

THE CHURCH BELLS.

I heard the chime of the merry bell
On the breeze of the forest flowing—
And as I listened to each full swell,
I thought on the hearts that were glowing;
But the wind soon chang'd, and bore away
The happy sounds of pleasure,
And I thought how the heart must often stray
Without its most valued treasure.

I heard—and the note was chang'd to woe,
And the funeral peal was knelling:—
And I thought of the tears that were doom'd to flow,
And the hearts that grief was swelling.
But again the wind blew the sounds afar—
But again the wind blew the sounds afar—
And I thought how soon ends sorrow:
'Tis a tear in the morn, and a sigh in the eve,
And a smile, perhaps, to-morrow.

And I heard—and the bells rang the Sabbath peal
Which nor merry chim'd, nor sadly;
And the steady wind did no change reveal,
As when notes were mixed more gladly.
There was no change, as when woe had been
The burden'd music's measure:—
And I thought—that peace lies more between
The extremes of pain and pleasure.

Sunday Reader.

THE ENGLISH LAYMAN.

No. IX.

THE ORGAN.*

When beneath the nave,
High arching, the Cathedral organ 'gins
Its prelude, lingeringly exquisite
Within retired the bashful sweetness dwells;
Anon like sunlight, or the floodgate rush
Of waters, bursts it forth, clear, solemn, full;
It breaks upon the mazy fretted roof;
It coils up round the clustering pillars tall;
It leaps into the cell-like chapels; strikes
Beneath the pavement sepulchres; at once
The living temple is instinct, ablaze,
With the uncontrol'd exuberance of sound.

The organ is an instrument of great antiquity, and was known to the Romans during the latter period of the Empire, though not exactly in its present state. St. Jerome, a Father of the fourth century, describes one that could be heard a mile off, and says that there was an organ at Jerusalem, the sound of which reached even to the Mount of Olives. It was in use among our Anglo-Saxon ancestors, as passages in the works of Aldhelm, (who died A. D. 703) and Bede, (who died A. D. 735) most fully prove. "St. Dunstan (J. A. D. 903) great in all the knowledge of his day,"—remarks Sharon Turner,—"as well as in his ambition, is described to have made an organ of brass pipes, elaborated by musical measures, and filled with air from the bellows;" and in the tenth century, one was erected in Winchester cathedral by St. Elphage which was of such immense power, "that," the same writer remarks, "the effect of its diapason and choruses on the ears of the Anglo-Saxons must have been so tremendous, and so like a battle-cannonading, that all melody must have been lost in the overpowering roar within a confining edifice, however spacious." Seventy men, forming two companies which worked alternately, supplied it with wind; so that in the cathedral there were probably, according to the conjecture of the Rev. H. Soames, many unglazed apertures, otherwise machinery so colossal must have emitted sound almost beyond endurance.

From the tenth century, organs were more and more introduced into cathedrals, Abbies, and larger churches, until at last they became identified with the national worship. The hand that for a time expelled them from the sanctuary, was that of their own familiar friends, of a party in the very bosom of the church. When the Puritan clergy were gradually undermining the battlements of the Establishment, and depriving it, one after another, of those decent ceremonials, which constituted its outer wall of defence, they levelled some portion of their wrath against that ungodly relic of Popery, the organ. In the commencement of Queen Elizabeth's reign, the leaders of the Nonconformists, though still remaining within the fold of the church, included the use of music, and of organs in divine worship, among the scruples which their tender consciences could not overcome. In vain did the moderate divines of Zurich, to whom they referred their doubts and difficulties, advise them to submit to many matters indifferent in themselves, rather than endanger the peace of the Reformed Church of England. Their blind zeal, which at first could not tolerate an organ, went on unrestrained, until the church itself, fell beneath wounds inflicted on it by its own undutiful children. When Laud succeeded the Puritanic Abbot, in the see of Canterbury he found the chapel at Lambeth, "a scene of filth, disorder, and decay,"—internally and externally neglected,—the organ broken and tuneless. This he immediately repaired, and his so doing, formed the substance of one of the many baseless charges urged against him on his trial. He had

* The erection of a new organ in the church of St. James at Toronto has led to the compilation of the present article. Of this instrument, and its humbler predecessor, it is to be hoped that some account will be transmitted to 'The Church.' It is a duty we owe to those who may come after us, to record every incident in our ecclesiastical history, and to hand down the names of those generous benefactors who have built a house unto the Lord, or, when built, have furnished it with those instruments, decorations, and appliances, which are prescribed or permitted by our Ritual.

previously incurred a storm of obloquy, and the imputation of Papistical practices, when he introduced an organ into the chapel of St. John's College, Oxford, of which he was the munificent President.

As the darkness fell thicker and thicker on the Church of England, this instrument, which, by the common consent of many nations for many centuries, had been dedicated to the service of religion, was more and more inveighed against and proscribed. The Clergyman who defended its use, was summoned before the Committee for Scandalous Ministers, or, as it might be more appropriately termed, the Scandalous Committee for Ministers: the organs were sold to tavern-keepers, and, ceasing to administer to devotional purposes, became subservient to the Puritan's stolen pleasures, accompanying the demure drunkards of the Commonwealth in their "bestial bacchanalias."

So successful was the warfare waged against them, that, at the Restoration, an organist, or organ-builder could scarcely be found. To supply this want, foreign artificers were invited to repair to England; and thus encouraged Bernard Schmidt (Smith) and his two nephews, natives of Germany,—and Harris, and his son, natives of France, commenced trying their fortune in London. A contest for superiority soon arose between these musical clans, which was decided in favour of the Smiths by the notorious Lord Chief Justice Jefferies. The Temple Church was the scene of this harmonious discord, and the victorious masterpiece still remains within the walls of a sanctuary, which a Hooker and a Benson have made vocal with their holy eloquence. The rejected instrument, which though rejected, was still one of surpassing excellence, travelled to the Cathedral of Christ-Church at Dublin, and subsequently from thence to the Parish Church of Wolverhampton.

Though the organ is admitted into the churches of England, Holland, and Rome, and into those of Germany, Protestant as well as Catholic,—it is entirely banished from the severer forms of the Scottish Kirk. Yet even in the latter denomination, some innovating Erastians, as old Mause Cuddie would have designated them, have at various times attempted to introduce the 'Kist fu' o' whistles' into their places of worship. Bishop Horne, in a sermon preached by him in 1784 at the opening of the new organ in Canterbury, says that he believes some Presbyterian ministers have adopted it in their chapels. In the Presbytery of Glasgow, however, at their meeting on the 7th October 1807, after deliberating at great length, a resolution to the following purport was adopted: "That the Presbytery are of opinion, that the use of organs in the public worship of God is contrary to the law of the land, and to the law and constitution of our established Church, and therefore prohibit it in all the churches and chapels within their bounds." And this may be considered as the general opinion of the Kirk. I am not aware, whether our respectable half-brothers, the Wesleyan Methodists, are friendly, as a body, to the introduction of organs into their chapels. One of their brightest ornaments, the late Rev. Richard Watson, gave his opinion in favour of their use in large chapels, when the end for which they are introduced, to assist congregational singing, is steadily maintained.

In our own venerable and beloved Church, which steers a midway course between the chilling nakedness of Nonconformist worship, and the gorgeous ceremonies and sensual allurements of the Roman Catholic Ritual, the use of organs has not only been sanctioned by immemorial prescription, but vindicated by our most learned, pious, and apostolical divines. Jeremy Taylor, whose prose is but one continuous strain of the noblest, the sweetest, and most musical poetry,—and whose heterodoxy on this point must therefore strike us as the more extraordinary,—in a tone of faint and dubious approval says, he "cannot condemn instrumental music, if it be used as a help to Psalmody." Yet a higher authority on such a subject, the wise and irrefutable HOOKER, has delivered a decision which, it may safely be pronounced, is the rule of our church to this very day:—"They which, under pretence of the law ceremonial abrogated, require the abrogation of instrumental music, approving nevertheless the use of vocal melody to remain, must show some reason wherefore the one should be thought a legal ceremony, and not the other. In Church music* curiosity and ostentation of act, wanton, or light, or unsuitable harmony, such as only please the ear, and doth not naturally serve to the very kind and degree of those impressions which the matter that goeth with it, leaveth, or is apt to leave in men's minds, doth rather blemish and disgrace that we do, than add either beauty or furtherance unto it. On the other side, these faults prevented, the force and efficacy of the thing itself when it drowneth not utterly, but fitly suiteth with matter altogether sounding to the praise of God, is in truth most admirable, and doth much edify, if not the understanding, because it teacheth not; yet surely the affection, because therein it worketh much. They must have hearts very dry and tough, from whom the melody of the Psalms doth not sometime draw that wherein a mind religiously affected delighteth." "It is not

* The end of Church-music is to relieve the weariness of a long attention; to make the mind more cheerful and composed; and to endear the offices of religion. It should therefore imitate the perfume of the Jewish tabernacle, and have as little of the composition of common use as is possible. There must be no voluntary maggots, no military tattoos, no light and galliardizing notes; nothing that may make the fancy trifling, or raise an improper thought: this would be to profane the service, and bring the play-house into the Church. Religious harmony must be moving; but noble without grave, solemn, and seraphic; fit for a martyr to play, and an angel to hear. It should be contrived so as to warm the best blood within us, and take hold of the finest part of the affections.—Jeremy Collier. Essays II p. 25.

wonderful," says Dr. Hawkins, the Reverend Provost of Oriel, the latest authority I can adduce,—"that the organ has been so long and so closely associated with sacred songs and sacred edifices, when it does not necessarily divert even a single Christian from his own devotions, and yet so beautifully and appropriately assists the devotions of the whole congregation by its magnificent compass, and its solemn tones."

Who that has ever poured out his devotions within one of England's venerable cathedrals, survivors of the Puritanic tempest, without feeling himself enwrapped in a frame of mind, pure, spiritual, and seraphic? As the organ swells or sinks, he rises and falls with its wings; he soars from a world of pain into regions such as Milton has described, and enjoys a fruition such as the same bard represents angels as enjoying, when they "circle the throne of Heaven rejoicing," and strike Hallelujahs from their golden harps. If aught of earth intrude into his thoughts, it is perchance, a passing vision of the angelic Herbert wending his way to Salisbury to taste his "heaven upon earth," cathedral music,—or of the blind Milton, reviving the ancient union of poet and musician, and with his own hands pouring melody into his own ears. Perchance also when the worshipper's overstrained imagination returns from wandering through the empyrean, where it has been lost in conjecturing the condition of saints and martyrs in their beatified state, he thinks of those earthly means and appliances, which may assist him in attaining an immortality, the glories and bliss of which it is beyond the power of man to conceive. Among these he instantly recollects that the ministrations of his fathers' church, are the most efficient; and filled with the genius of the place, ravished with the strains that softened the Puritan Iconoclast, with the monuments of ages around him, bathed in a flood of varied light, peered through rich painted windows, and with the dust of generations beneath him, he vows within the secret chambers of his heart, that, while the breath of life is in his nostrils, he will defend the bulwark of England's liberties, the National Church,—internally he ejaculates, "when I forget thee, O thou church of my country, may my right hand forget its cunning." "Let us,"—writes the Quarterly Reviewer, whom I suspect to be Dr. Southey,—"Let us bring the sternest of our northern brethren, who ever denounced the Papistical 'Kist fu' o' whistles,' and place him within the choir of York, or in King's College chapel, and if he be not entirely of Cassius's vein, we do not doubt that we should find him surprised into involuntary devotion; and even perhaps bowing the knee to Baal. There is something in that wonderful instrument itself which the Puritan spirit would rashly have assigned over to the enemy, the fulness of sound, without the visible appearance of human agency, which appears singularly adapted to devotional purposes. We know little of the human heart, we know little of our own, if multitudes have not felt the purest devotion heightened by those sounds accompanying one of our own simple scriptural anthems; if many, who were never disposed to devotion before, have not derived incalculable advantage from feelings thus kindled for the first time."

The Haarlem organ for a long time bore the reputation of being the largest in the world; but a writer in the *Penny Magazine* for 1834, states that the organs at Seville, Gœtitz (Upper Lusatia), Marsoberg, Hamburg, Weingarten (a Benedictine monastery in Swabia), and Tours, are all larger than that of Haarlem, and that the new instruments at York and Birmingham exceed them all. I have very lately met with an account of a wonderful organ at Freyburg in Switzerland, built within the last six or eight years, and said to be capable of imitating all other instruments, and the human voice. The maker, Moser, now about 75 years of age, is reported to have declined building one, on a similar plan, for the King of France, saying that he was too old to build another, and that he wished his own city to possess the only instrument of the kind in the world. No one is allowed to see the interior.

The largest organ on this continent is, probably, at Baltimore.
ALAN FAIRFORD.

Toronto, 7th February, 1838.

HOMER BIBLEIA.

No. X.

THE FIGURATIVE STYLE OF SCRIPTURE,

CONTINUED.

Although sceptical readers of the Bible may be disposed to ridicule some of those figures which appear to them extravagant, and even absurd; yet any one who lends an impartial attention to the subject, will clearly perceive that the occurrence of imagery, which would be frequently obscure, and sometimes unintelligible to us, was to be expected in any composition formed on the model of our sacred writings.

First. The innovating hand of time has rendered many things obsolete; and, consequently, the allusions which in metaphorical language are made to those things must be difficult, if not impossible, to be understood. And when we recollect that some portions of the Scriptures were written more than 2000 years ago, and that the latest of them were written between 1700 and 1800 years ago, it would have been very remarkable had we lost sight of none of those customs and none of those events on which the figures of Scripture are founded.

Secondly. The difference between the scene and climate in which the sacred writers lived, and our own, forms another barrier to the right understanding of their figurative terms. This prevents us often from perceiving the full force of a passage even when its beauty, nevertheless, powerfully affects the mind. Thus, when the Psalmist says, "As the hart panteth after the

water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God," it is impossible not to be affected by the combination of chaste elegance of expression with vehement ardour of feeling. Yet in our temperate clime, where water is scarcely ever known to fail, where the sun scarcely ever pours his sickening ray upon our heads, we are not prepared to enter into all the beauty of the figure, as an inhabitant of Judea would have done. Again, the hart is not with us a wild animal, subject to the various privations which it was compelled to endure in regions where the sun had burned up its food, and dried the streams at which it was accustomed to slake its thirst. It would be no unusual thing; however, for an Israelite to see this inoffensive animal exhausted and fatigued, and panting for a drop of water; and, consequently, the application of the figure to the Psalmist's desire after God would convey an impression far more forcible than can be produced by it on our minds.

In the forty-ninth chapter of Jeremiah, we have another figure still more peculiar to the land of Judea.—He shall come up like a lion from the swiftings of Jordan against the habitation of the strong. In this passage too, there is obvious beauty and even sublimity of description; but it is considerably more obscure to us than the former. It would, however, be perfectly familiar and intelligible to those for whom it was first written. What we here know of a lion is chiefly by description, and by the exhibition of a few of these monarchs of the four-footed race engaged in caravans. These are comparatively small and feeble, and at the same time so tame through confinement and the discipline of the keepers, that they shew us nothing of the true character of that unrivalled animal, who walks in conscious superiority through the forest, or bounds with resistless speed and violence across the plain, and fills, by his tremendous roaring, a whole neighbourhood with terror. The river Jordan, too, is so dissimilar to our rivers, as to increase the obscurity of the passage to those who are not acquainted with the peculiarities of its course. When the snows of Lebanon and of the neighbouring mountains began to melt, and when the rainy season commenced, the mountain torrents rushed into the vale below, and regularly caused Jordan to overflow all its banks, and thus inundated all the adjoining lowlands. The lion had his abode among the lofty reeds which grew on the bank of this river; and when the descending waters caused Jordan to swell so as to invade his resting-place, he was driven to madness by the intrusion of an enemy whom he could not resist, and flew to revenge himself against the inhabitants of the adjoining cities. How striking a picture of the rage and violence of an invading army!

In the second verse of the fourteenth chapter of Hosea, the prayer of repenting Israel is, "Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously, so will we render the calves of our lips." To an English ear there is something grating in the expression "the calves of our lips,"—and without a knowledge of Jewish peculiarities, we shall not understand it. But when we remember that calves were among the best of the sacrifices which were offered up to God, we gain at once a key to the explanation, and a view of the beauty of the figure. The passage in our language, means simply this; "So will we render the best sacrifice of praise from our lips."

Thirdly. The dress and manners of the ancients were exceedingly different from ours. Their loose and flowing raiment formed a perfect contrast to the tight elegant garb of our own time and country. A knowledge of this is necessary to explain many passages of Scripture. The girding-up of the loins is frequently mentioned in places which allude either to diligence in labour, or to swiftness in running the appointed course. Now it is obvious, that a long, loose robe, would be very inconvenient to servants who required to have their hands much at liberty, and to be able to stoop with ease in the performance of their work; and also to those who had to move quickly, and required that their step should not be impeded, nor their feet entangled by the length of their garments. To remedy this, they always had a girdle, by means of which, when they had gathered up the skirts of their garments, they fastened it round their loins. To one who knew that he could neither work nor run without having recourse to this measure, how forcible would be such passages as these—*Let your loins be girded, and your lights burning, and ye yourselves like unto men who wait for their Lord. Gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope unto the end, &c.*

It were easy to extend observations of this kind, and to produce other causes of obscurity in the various figures which are employed in the page of inspiration. The truth is, that similar difficulties present themselves in all the classical productions of antiquity; and it would have been a strong argument against the genuineness of the scriptures, had they been wanting in that style of speaking and thinking which was peculiar to the times in which they were written.

There is only one more remark on this subject to which the attention of the reader is particularly requested; and that is, the difficulty of conveying the true import of a figure in a translation. Let the reader take a French book, and regardless of the idiom of the two languages, and of the different class of figures employed by them, let him translate literally, and how much will he lose of the beauty and, in many cases, of the sense of the original!

Now in the translation of the Bible there is less liberty allowed to the imagination, and even judgment of the translator, than in any other book. His business is not to embellish, and not even to give his own explanations of passages, but to put his reader in possession of the plain word of God. He must not sacrifice correctness to beauty; he must not aim at what he thinks the spirit of the passage, while he neglects the letter; because, in so doing, he may have missed its true meaning; he may have mistaken the nature of the allusion, and then he entails his own mistake upon posterity. But if he translates accurately, though the passage may be obscure to himself and to his readers, yet perhaps the information brought home by some traveller who has observed the customs of eastern nations, or the discovery of some book of antiquity, may throw light upon it, and enable us to perceive beauties which were before concealed, and which would have remained in darkness had the translator taken the liberty which translators of other books are permitted to take with impunity.

Making then due allowance for these several circumstances, which hinder us from perceiving many of the excellencies of Scripture, are we not still constrained to acknowledge that there is no book that can stand a comparison with the Bible—none, which labours under such great disadvantages to the development of its peculiar beauties of composition, and which yet rises far above them all, exhibiting those specimens in every style of writing and of thinking, which are above all imitation and all praise.

J. K.

To the Editor of the Church.

STREETSVILLE, February 8th, 1838.

STR.—It is now ten days since I received the copies of your paper, which contain the letters of Dr. Strachan to the Hon. William Morris: but I have been prevented until now by other duties from offering you a few remarks on the censures and accusations which the Hon. and Ven. the Archdeacon has brought against myself. I perceive, indeed, from a Toronto newspaper that you had refused admission into your columns to the reply of Mr. Morris to Dr. Strachan; but I am unwilling to think that you will refuse insertion to these lines, as all the vindication of my character which I am concerned to make, rests in a few brief explanations which I desire to submit to the readers of Dr. Strachan's Letters. You aim, as I learn from the editorial article in one of your papers, to make the Church "speak exclusively of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God"—an object in which I heartily bid you God speed: and nothing but the consideration that I have been maligned in your columns would induce me to trouble you with a single sentence on the subject to which this letter refers.

The censures and reproaches which Dr. Strachan has dealt out against me, are founded on two separate communications of mine to Mr. Morris; the one of which is simply referred to in his printed correspondence; the other forms a part of that correspondence. The former is a letter which I wrote to him accompanying an abstract of certain returns from a considerable number of our congregations in this Province; the latter is the abstract itself, with certain appended remarks. Now, of the former I have to say, that it was not intended by me for publication; as, indeed, it was not fit for meeting the public eye. It was written in haste, and no copy of it was made; and I can account for its having been passed to Lord Glenelg, only from the circumstance of its having been written on the same sheet with the abstract and appendix, and not marked private. After this statement, it is not perhaps very important for me to notice the expressions on which Dr. Strachan animadverts. The words "arrogant claims of the Episcopalians" were I presume found in the letter; and the Attorney General and some other members of the Council of King's College spoken of as "the most intolerant grade;" and, though I might say, that I do not deem these epithets slanderous, when applied to those who would claim a seventh of this ample territory for the ministers of the Church of England, as though they were the only Protestant Clergy in it, or who would speak in the reproachful way of Ministers of the Church of Scotland, that the Attorney General is represented as having done in the House of Assembly,—I will rather say, that I should not be called on to defend them, as they were not written under the slightest sense of my accountableness to the public for them.

For a remark in the same letter, respecting the location of Reserve Lots by individuals to be eventually surrendered to congregations of the Church of England, I am accused by Dr. Strachan of fastening "a charge of deliberate fraud on the local Government." Now, it appears that I have been misinformed in regard to the particular instance, Whitechurch, which I had mentioned—though I gave it only as matter of hearsay. But, the amount of the charge was, that of partiality to the Church of England, a disposition, which, whether evinced by the Local Government or by the Lessees of Reserve Lots, is not, I am sure, a crime in the eyes of Dr. Strachan. I believe it will not be the violation of a secret when I say, that those who were desirous of securing Reserve Lots for congregations of the Church of Scotland were counselled from a somewhat influential quarter to adopt the very expedient which we understood was practised for congregations of the Church of England; though I am not aware that the advice was followed in a single instance.

So much for Dr. Strachan's remarks on the communication which should have been private. As to the reproaches which he has cast on the Statistical Table with which I furnished Mr. Morris I may say, that I am not very careful to reply to them. Mr. McGill of Niagara has vindicated the portion of the appendix which he supplied. The direct accusation against myself is weighty enough;—it is that of *having attempted a gross deception on the Colonial Secretary* in the drawing up of that table: and, if this were indeed true, honest men might not only be amazed, as Dr. Strachan says, but also be grieved. But let the readers of the Church judge between us.

I was called on, as Moderator of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, to abridge certain returns from our congregations, and send the substance of them to Mr. Morris when he was in London; now this I did with some pains, though one or two errors are found in the table which I drew out. Let it be observed, that I gave to Mr. Morris all the information contained in all the returns which had reached me at the time I wrote to him. These returns, in point of fact, were only twenty in number; many of the congregations not having sent returns at all; and a few, not until after my communication to Mr. Morris was despatched. The table was thus necessarily partial; and the letter accompanying it which, contrary to my intention, Lord Glenelg and Dr. Strachan have seen, and which, the latter at least has conned with care, stated—if I can at all trust my memory—my regret at having received so few returns. And yet, I am charged with attempting "a gross deception" on Lord Glenelg, as though I had possessed returns from all our congregations, and had selected only those cases which might go to shew the unkindness of the Colonial Government to our congregations.

Dr. Strachan has constructed a table from the records of the Executive Council, shewing the result of all applications for land from congregations in connexion with the Church of Scotland until September 1837; but, he knew I was not quoting from

those records. His experience in making ecclesiastical tables might have taught him, that accuracy in such matters is a somewhat difficult virtue. And Mr. Morris, in his reply, has given pretty strong reasons for doubting the accuracy of the present Table of the Archdeacon. I by no means claim the merit of perfect accuracy to the Table which I drew up. A mistake in regard to the title and endowments of the Episcopal Church at Brockville was promptly acknowledged by me, in the newspapers in which the mistake was first pointed out to me. Another mistake in the Table, as it appears in the printed correspondence, may shew, that the errors have not been all in the way of exaggerating the liberality of the Colonial Government to Episcopal Churches, as the united congregations connected with the Church of Scotland in Peterborough and Cavan are represented as aided by Government in the building of Churches to the amount of £135 17s 10d while the true reading is "Peterborough £20 0s 0d Cavan £65 0s 0d."

Dr. Strachan has noted that my Table, as it appears in the printed correspondence, is not quite the same with that which had been sent to Mr. Morris. The truth is that it is enlarged in the printed correspondence with the substance of the few returns which reached me after I had sent off my communication to Mr. Morris—so little thought had I of keeping back any information in regard to our Churches, whether it made for, or against the liberality of the Colonial Government to them. The copy of the Table and the appendix were furnished to the publisher of the printed correspondence, on his own request, by myself, and not by Mr. Morris, and the additions to it, which I have just mentioned, were noticed in a letter to him from me, intended for publication, though, he appears to have thought the circumstance too trivial for public notice.

I trust, Mr. Editor, that, in seeking the insertion of this letter in your Journal, I shall be regarded by you, as only shewing a due respect to the good opinion of that branch of the Christian family, before whom, through your Journal, I have been evil spoken of, and, as I think, without cause.

I remain,

Yours &c.

WM. RINTOUL.

THE CHURCH.

COBOURG, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1838.

We observe from remarks in a few of the newspapers of the day, as well as from certain private intimations, that an erroneous and unfair construction has been put upon our denial to the Hon. W. Morris of the opportunity of replying through our columns to the Letters lately addressed to him by the Venerable the Archdeacon of York. We should have thought that a reference to our Prospectus,—a reference which, in the case of any such misconception of our conduct, it would be but natural to make,—would at once have satisfied any individual disposed to join in that complaint, that not only were we consistent to our avowed principles in declining compliance with the request of Mr. Morris, but that, in acting otherwise, we should have been departing from the plan and intention so specifically announced at the outset of our editorial labours.

It was distinctly stated that the object of establishing this paper was, on the one hand, to disseminate amongst our fellow churchmen that information regarding our venerated communion which might serve to "put them in remembrance" of its claims to their unwavering support and love; and, on the other hand, to defend the interests of the Church, whether temporal or spiritual, whensoever and by whomsoever assailed. With this candid declaration of our objects, it could not, in the mind either of friend or foe, be matter for a moment's doubt that this journal was to be *exclusively* the advocate of the Church of England; nor could it have been anticipated, that if to the doctrines or to the secular claims of our Church objections should be advanced, the pages of this journal were to be open to the expression of such objections. Were such a species of concession ever meditated, we should have to permit the publication—side by side with their defence—of invectives against Episcopacy, of raillery at our Liturgy, and of attacks at last upon the vital doctrines of our common Christianity! That "THE CHURCH" was to evince so pernicious an inconsistency in its management, its friends at least would have been astonished and grieved to discover.

But why the same sound rule of action is to be departed from, when the outward defences of the Church are assailed, we can, we confess, see no sufficient reason. The exercise of a native willingness to oblige, or a condescension to the "liberal" spirit so much eulogized by the careless ones of the day, might have prompted a departure from the natural and proper rule by which we felt it necessary to be guided; but principle is not to be sacrificed to good nature, and the elements of truth are not to be abandoned because such concession may win the plaudits of the Dissenter, or gain perchance the fellowship of the Infidel.

After a long and stormy agitation of the question of the Reserves and Rectories, during which the members of the Church of England sat in meek and uncomplaining silence, a pamphlet is produced detailing the operations in London of the Hon. W. Morris, as agent for the Scottish Presbyterian body, and explaining to the world the progress he had made towards overturning what we believe to be the rightful claims of our own communion. To this pamphlet, after it had been widely circulated and copied into several newspapers, we believe, in both Provinces, an answer is returned by the Archdeacon of York through the legitimate channel of such defence, "THE CHURCH;" but if it be expected that a rejoinder to that reply is to have a place in our columns also, we should like to be made acquainted with any argument which would not render necessary a similar concession, under similar circumstances, to the opponents of our ritual and ministry, and even to the advocates of false religion.

We certainly feel much pain in being compelled to deny any request of so respectable an individual as the Hon. W. Morris; and the more so, as his reply evinces so careful an exclusion of that asperity of feeling and coarseness of language which has characterized so many other productions on his side of the

question; but we trust that to every unprejudiced mind the reasons we have advanced cannot but prove satisfactory.

It is, we believe, pretty well understood that, in order to guard against the dissemination of strange doctrines amongst her people, the pulpits of the Church of England are closed against all but her own accredited ministers; and we know of no reason why the same principle of exclusiveness should not, on similar grounds, be adhered to in the *weekly journal* which is sent forth as the organ and advocate of her interests and claims. Moreover, to admit replies and rejoinders from all who may choose to object to the matter contained in our paper were to bring it down to the degradation of a mere polemical print;—a mortifying and injurious position, to which we at least shall never lend a hand in reducing it.

If it be thought that we have relaxed from this principle in giving admission to the letter of the Rev. W. Rintoul, which appears in our columns to-day, we have to observe that, although from the apparent encouragement to controversy which the publication of this letter affords, we give it a place with some reluctance, it appears to us in its bearing and spirit rather explanatory than controversial, and to acknowledge error without seeming to bring accusation. Under such circumstances, we are not unwilling that its author should have the benefit of its promulgation amongst the readers of "THE CHURCH;" for where our consistency is not compromised, we are ready enough to oblige. Upon this letter, however, as well as upon the published Reply of Mr. Morris we feel ourselves at full liberty to offer such animadversions as they may seem to call for.

On the present occasion, our space being limited, we shall confine ourselves to a few remarks upon some alleged inaccuracies in the tables of Glebe Lots stated by the Archdeacon of York to have been granted to congregations in connection with the Church of Scotland. The statements thus furnished, from having been obtained from official sources, must be presumed to be correct; but should it in any case be proved that they are not so, such inaccuracies are certainly not to be laid to the charge of the Archdeacon, but of those who were employed to compile them, and who, from haste or inadvertence, may possibly, in some instances, have committed mistakes. But again we say, that for such, if they do exist, the Archdeacon of York is not accountable: he received his information from the Government offices, and he gave it precisely as it was furnished to himself.

Yet, in comparing the respective tables of the Archdeacon and Mr. Morris, the apparent discrepancies between them we find are fully explained by the circumstance that some lots which had been granted to congregations of the Church of Scotland, were not located by them. And although this may be a distinction very material as respects the advantage to those congregations, it affects not, on the one hand, the credit of the Archdeacon's statements, and it proves, on the other, the readiness of the Colonial Government to accede to the applications of such congregations. If a tract of land, in all respects suitable or convenient for location, were not to be found, such was the misfortune of the applicants, not the fault of the Government. Moreover, it is very evident that, although the Archdeacon of York had access to the requisite documents for shewing what lands had been granted to congregations of the Church of Scotland, he had not the means of ascertaining whether the lots thus granted had been located by them or not.

That suitable locations were not always to be obtained, can in some degree be explained by the fact of the lateness of the applications. It appears, for instance, that prior to the year 1833 there were only seven applications for glebes from congregations of the Kirk of Scotland, and since that year nearly thirty have been made. Now as these applications have come generally from congregations established in towns, or in townships long settled and populous, the difficulty of finding suitable locations in contiguous places was naturally much increased. It appears in short—and we would have our readers bear that fact in mind—to be the main tendency as well of the argument of the Archdeacon as of the facts adduced, to shew the friendly intentions of Government towards that body, and to exonerate them from the charge of partiality attempted to be fastened upon them.—This argument has been most fairly and satisfactorily sustained; and if these good intentions of the Government have not always proved availing—if the lands granted were not deemed worthy of acceptance—we can only say that congregations of the Church of England have, in many cases, experienced precisely the same inconvenience, and that very many of the lots constituting the so much talked of Rectories are as valueless as those which have been rejected by the Church of Scotland.

It would appear that the Lots assigned by the Archdeacon to the Presbyterians of the Kirk of Scotland in Williamsburg and Osnabrock, were in reality granted to congregations of Presbyterians comprised under what is termed the Synod of Canada.—This was a distinction very likely to be overlooked by the compilers of the tables furnished to the Archdeacon, and is an error for which he is evidently not accountable: at all events, it rather strengthens than diminishes his argument, as proving that the friendly intentions of the Colonial Government extended farther than to one denomination of Presbyterians. However, to balance any advantage to the Archdeacon's opponents from this inaccuracy, there is to be adduced in his favour an omission of a valuable Lot at the mouth of the River aux Raisin in Glengary, in possession of the Church of Scotland, on which or contiguous to which we believe the flourishing village of Lancaster is growing up.

These are facts which will shew, to the satisfaction we trust of our readers, that—notwithstanding all attempts to impugn their accuracy—the statements of the Archdeacon of York in relation to grants to Presbyterians, are substantially correct; that for the slight inaccuracies which have occurred in their compilation, he is not accountable; and that his argument, the leading object in short of his Letters to Mr. Morris, in exculpation of the Provincial Government from alleged neglect of the Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland, stands unshaken.

LENT.

ECCLESIASTES III. 4.—A time to laugh; a time to mourn.

The wise author of these brief but impressive sayings furnishes us, in the first few verses of this chapter, with a very solemn and very affecting comment upon the position with which he sets out; "To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven."—If the gay and thoughtless, who form unhappily too large a portion of the rational world, conceive that during the days of this speedily passing life it is their "time to laugh," it is but natural to suppose that the contemplation of its fast approaching end would also induce an occasional "time to mourn."

In the varied circumstances of ordinary life, there are times in which mirth would be unbecoming, and mourning unseasonable. It would be a grievous outrage upon the customs of propriety to assume the look of jocund gaiety, or to utter the words of inconsiderate mirth, while attending for example the funeral procession to the grave; and, on the other hand, the interruption would be incongruous and unbecoming, were the social company which had professedly met for innocent hilarity and recreation to be saddened by the voice of weeping and a countenance in tears.

A confused blending of these useful and becoming alternations would be equally unsuitable in religion. Even religion has, as it were, its "time to laugh,"—moments of spiritual joy, when the experience of our heavenly Father's love warms the soul into holy transports—when the heart bounds at the joyous foretaste of heaven's bliss—when the spirit, in the fulness of its thankfulness, "breaks forth into singing."

There are times, again, when this holy transport cannot be felt, and when these joyous sounds should not be expressed. There are hours of sadness, when the whole soul is mournfully engrossed by the recollection of manifold and multiplied offences against our merciful and indulgent God—when the weeping spirit can scarcely raise its penitential voice to his throne of grace—when, in distress and sorrow beneath the burden of unatoned sin, the conscience-stricken transgressor "goeth heavily all the day long."

Such, too, are alternations of joy and mourning which are fitly introduced into our ordinary exercises of devotion. In our incomparable Liturgy, the sinner who comes to the house of God to hear the mingled words of warning and consolation is furnished with appropriate exercises for these changing moods of the spiritual frame. In language of chastened "truth and soberness," he is taught to bend meekly on his knees as the vilest of offenders, trusting for pardon only to the merits and mediation of a crucified Saviour; and there, too, he is instructed to raise his thankful voice to the heavenly throne, for those glad tidings of salvation with which his sorrowing heart is cheered in the pages of God's own book.

As the Church of Christ, we are also furnished with stated seasons of public joy and public mourning. When we hail our Redeemer's advent as a weeping babe in the stable at Bethlehem, it is with a joyous participation in the angels' song;—but when we see this persecuted 'martyr of the world,' with his crown of thorns and mangled limbs, dying for our sakes in agony upon the cross, our joy is "turned into the voice of them that weep."

We are approaching the commemoration of the 'cross and passion' of our blessed Saviour; but our apostolic church will not suffer us to enter upon the duties of that solemn day, without a previous chastening and preparation of the soul. For this reason the season of LENT is appointed; and to this ordinance of the Church, so wisely and judiciously established, it becomes all her faithful children to adhere. In our 'pure and reformed' communion, all those rigid, unmeaning and superstitious austerities, which owed their introduction to the dark ages of Christianity, have been swept away from the season of Lent. But in pruning away these excrescences of a darkened day, our Church has been careful to maintain the customs and hold fast the institutions which have been sanctioned and hallowed by the appointment and approbation of the earliest and purest ages. The dress has been burnt away—burnt away, indeed, in the fires of martyrdom; but no sacrilegious hand was stretched forth to injure the pure gold that was left. Stripped of those unedifying forms and ceremonies into which, in the dark ages of Christianity, the whole spirit and power of religion had been thrown, the season of Lent is retained by our Church as a propitious time, says an illustrious prelate, for "inquiring into the state of our account with God, of reviewing our past and present way of thinking and acting with a critical and a searching eye; of looking well if there be any way of wickedness in us; of turning from it, if there be; of confessing and lamenting our disobedience and ingratitude to our heavenly Father; of imploring his pardon; of entreating the assistance of his Holy Spirit; and under his guidance forming the most serious resolutions to correct and amend, without delay, whatever we find amiss in our temper, principles and conduct. This is the true spirit and meaning of the religious solemnities of the season of Lent: this is the substance and essence of what is called in Scripture language, 'turning to the Lord with weeping, fasting, and mourning.'"

"The earliest account," says Shepherd, "of the fast before Easter, is given by Irenæus, in a fragment preserved in Eusebius. Irenæus was the disciple of Polycarp, and Polycarp the disciple of the evangelist St. John; so that Irenæus was what some of the Fathers have termed him, a *man almost apostolic*." An allusion to this fast by him proves, therefore, its great antiquity, and that it had its origin antecedent to the corrupt days of the Church. From the earliest accounts we possess, it appears that, originally, only the two days preceding Easter Sunday were observed as days of fasting and mourning, and were thus kept in allusion to the expression of our Saviour that, "in those days the bridegroom was taken away." This space of time comprehended about forty hours, and bore a general resemblance to the forty days during which our Lord himself had fasted in the wilderness. But the Lenten fast soon came to be extended; we find that before the close of the second century it comprised a period of two weeks; and in the course of the fourth century it embraced the six weeks preceding Easter. It was in the ninth century that four days were prefixed to that period,—thus making

Lent to commence on the Wednesday preceding the sixth Sunday before Easter. This day was subsequently named ASH WEDNESDAY, from the custom which prevailed in some churches of sprinkling the heads of the penitents with ashes. From Ash Wednesday, therefore, until Easter—deducting the Sundays which were never accounted or kept as fast-days—there are just forty days; and the resemblance of this period of abstinence is thus preserved to the fast of our Saviour in the wilderness.

The institution of Lent is, therefore, very ancient; and altho' not formed upon any express precept of Scripture, is sacred from its intention and hallowed by its antiquity. In those days, it was the custom of Christians to abstain from food, as far as their infirmities permitted, during a portion of every day in this season,—for that fasting is a scriptural duty, proof need not be advanced;—yet full liberty was permitted to all to guide themselves in this abstinence by the faculties with which they were endued, and to make those periods of fasting, whether long or short, subservient to a due regard to health and natural infirmities. In the primitive days of that usage, there was also a laudable custom of bestowing upon the poor the food which was thus saved by this voluntary abstinence; so that to the conjoined exercises of extraordinary self-denial and devotion, there was added a peculiar attention to the wants of the indigent. As to the precise nature of the fast to be exercised during the season of Lent, our Church hath laid down no particular rules, but it seems to be left to every one's own conscience. One thing, however, is certain, that a fast is appointed; and that, according to the judgment of the Church, some spiritual observance of this season is requisite. The amount of abstinence from the usual luxuries and delights of life which, during this season, is becoming, we shall not—because the Church does not—undertake to define. Most Christians, however, concur in the propriety of appropriating, during its continuance, more than an ordinary portion of their time to exercises of public and private devotion; and in the opinion also we heartily concur, that the season of Lent should be marked, if possible, by a complete abstinence from those gaieties and amusements of life in which many Christians feel that they can ordinarily, without any violation of conscience, indulge. This, at least, is a species of self-denial which none can refuse who look to the voluntary mortification of our blessed Lord for our sakes, or who pay due regard to his own injunction, "if any man will come after me, let him deny himself."

An account of the Meeting of the Midland Clerical Association held at Belleville last week, was ready for this day's publication, but we have discovered, to our regret, that from want of room it must be postponed to our next.

We learn from Toronto papers received this week, that on Monday last a Resolution passed the House of Assembly re-investing the Clergy Reserves in the Crown, to be applied to religious purposes in this Province.

The following has been obligingly furnished to us for publication; and we feel assured that none who knew the late excellent Bishop of Quebec would neglect the opportunity of obtaining a record of him which promises to be so interesting as the one we announce. The Editor of this paper will be happy to receive orders for the work, if communicated within a month, and transmit them to the proper quarter:—

UPPER CANADA TRAVELLING MISSION FUND.

In the Press, and speedily will be published, by Hatchard & Son, PRICE TO SUBSCRIBERS NOT EXCEEDING 7s.

THE STEWART MISSIONS, Being a series of Letters and Journals showing the deplorable SPIRITUAL DESTITUTION OF THE EMIGRANTS IN UPPER CANADA.

To which is prefixed a short biographical sketch of the late Honourable and Right Reverend CHARLES JAMES STEWART, Bishop of Quebec, and the Primary Charge delivered by him to his Clergy, on the 9th of August, 1826, at Montreal, in Lower Canada, and on the 30th August, at York, in Upper Canada. Edited by the Rev. W. J. D. Waddilove, A. M. St. John's College, Cambridge.

THE PARISH CLERGYMAN.

Never interfering in the concerns of any family, unless his interference was solicited, he was consulted upon all occasions of trouble or importance. Incipient disputes, which would otherwise have afforded grist for the Lawyer's mill, were adjusted by his mediation; and anxious parents, when they had cause to apprehend that their children were going wrong, knew no better course than to communicate their fears to him, and request that he would administer some timely admonition. Whenever he was thus called on, or had of himself perceived that reproof or warning was required, it was given in private, or only in presence of the parents, and always with a gentleness which none but an obdurate disposition could resist. His influence over the younger part of his flock was the greater, because he was no enemy to any innocent sports, but on the contrary was pleased to see them dance round the may-pole, encouraged them to dress their doors with oaken boughs on the day of King Charles's happy restoration, and to wear an oaken garland in the hat, or an oak-apple on its sprig in the button-hole; went to see their bonfire on the fifth of November, and entertained the morris-dancers when they called upon him in their Christmas rounds.—*The Doctor.*

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE EASTERN CLERICAL SOCIETY.

Reverend Brethren, You are hereby reminded, that the next Meeting of the Association is appointed to be held at Carlton Place, on Wednesday, March 7th, 1838. Your faithful Brother,

HY. PATTON, Sec'y.

LETTERS received to Friday 23d Feb:— Rev. B. H. Bourne, rem. in full for vol. 1; Rev. J. Deacon, rem. in full for vol. 1; Rev. A. F. Atkinson, com. & rem.; Richd. Athill, Esq. (2); Rev. H. Patton; Rev. H. I. Grassett, rem.; Archdeacon of York, with parcel; S. C. Keyes, Esq. rem.; Rev. J. Bethune, rem. in full for vol. 1. C. Seadding, Esq. rem.

Poetry.

STILL WITH THEE.

PSALM CXXXIX. 18.

Still with thee—still with thee,
Whether on my bed I be,
Gently cradled to my rest
By the peace within my breast;
Rapt at once into the deep
Oblivion of a dreamless sleep;
Or in my slumbers wandering far,
To visit some resplendent star,
Some home of bliss, some blessed clime
Beyond the bounds of earth or time;
'Tis sweet to think, when thought is free,
My God, that I am still with thee!

Still with thee—still with thee,
Wheresoe'er my course may be;
Though I cross the trackless main,
Or burn upon a southern plain;
Though to frozen shores I go,
Buried in a waste of snow,
Where no herb nor flow'r is seen,
Blooming in its bed of green;
Though I tread the desert wide
Without a being at my side,
'Tis sweet to think where'er I see,
My God, that I am still with thee!

CHURCH CALENDAR.

Feb. 25.—Quinquagesima Sunday.
28.—Ash Wednesday.
March 4.—First Sunday in Lent.

Youth's Department.

THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN ARMED.
CHAP. III.

ON THE THREE ORDERS OF MINISTERS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Q. 1. Is there any distinction as to rank and office among the ministers of the Church of England?

A. Yes; they are divided into three orders, Bishops, Priests or Presbyters, and Deacons, corresponding nearly with the High Priest, Priests and Levites, in the ancient Jewish Church.

2. Is there any scriptural authority for such distinctions in a Christian Church?

Abundance, or the Church of England would not have adopted them. (1)

3. To begin then with the order of Deacons. Is their office, as exercised among us, recognised in Scripture?

Yes; St. Paul, 1 Tim. iii. 8, and following verses, speaks of deacons, and gives directions concerning their character and conduct.

4. From this passage, what appears to be the true nature of their office?

It appears to be an office of a spiritual and not of a worldly character, and connected more with the souls of the congregation, than the administration of the outward affairs of the church. (2)

5. But was not the office to which Stephen and Philip and others were chosen, (Acts vi. 5,) of a temporal and secular nature?

In this particular case there were secular duties attached to it; but the qualifications required for it, the solemn imposition of hands with prayer, with which it was conferred, and the results which followed, prove that the apostles intended it to be of a spiritual and ministerial character. Acts vi. 3, 6, 10, and viii. 5, 38, 40. (3)

6. Is there any controversy among Christians concerning the scriptural authority for the office of Priest or Presbyter?

No; it is generally agreed that this office is of divine appointment. (4)

7. Is there as much agreement concerning Episcopacy, or the government of the Church by Bishops?

On the contrary, this is rejected by many, the chief of whom are the Presbyterians, the Independents, and the Baptists.

8. On what grounds does the Church of England maintain this order of ministers?

On the authority of scripture, the universal practice of the primitive Church, and the manifest advantages arising from the system.

9. What is the scripture authority for the office?

It appears from the Epistles of St. Paul, which he wrote to Timothy at Ephesus and to Titus at Crete, that these persons held an office superior to that of other presbyters or priests in those places, and were vested with authority over them.

10. Repeat some passages from the Epistles to Timothy which shew this?

Timothy was desired by St. Paul to abide at Ephesus, that he might "charge some that they teach no other doctrine." (1 Epis. i. 3.) Moreover the apostle (chap. iii.) gives him directions concerning the character and conduct of other ministers of the Church, as one to whom the choosing and ordaining such were entrusted. And again, (chap. v. 19,) he tells Timothy not to receive an accusation against an elder (or presbyter,) but before two or three witnesses; which implies that he was empowered so to do, in the presence of the required number.

11. Quote from the Epistle to Titus, to show that he had the same authority over other ministers at Crete, as Timothy had over those at Ephesus.

St. Paul says, (chap. i. 5.) "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders (or presbyters) in every city as I had appointed thee."

12. Do these passages prove the point?

Very satisfactorily; for there can be no doubt, that to charge ministers concerning what doctrine they are to teach—to receive accusations against them—to bestow ordination, and to order the general affairs of the Church, belong to an office superior to that of the common presbyter.

13. Is there any other scriptural authority for this office?

The seven epistles contained in Rev. i. ii. and iii. to the seven Churches of Asia, were addressed by St. John to the angel of each Church, (not to the angels, though he knew that there were

many presbyters in some of these Churches; but) to one individual only, as the chief or representative of all the rest. (5)

14. Does the primitive Church appear to have considered the office of Bishop as one of apostolic appointment?

Most certainly; as it is generally allowed that for 1400 years no Christian Church existed without a bishop.

15. Mention the names of some of the first bishops?

Clemens, bishop of Rome; Onesimus, bishop of Ephesus; Ignatius, bishop of Antioch; and Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, held their offices during the lifetime of some of the apostles, or within a few years after their death. (6)

16. How does it appear that the existence of such an order of ministers is beneficial to a Church?

Without some persons having power to direct and regulate its affairs, there could be little order or union or discipline maintained in it. (7)

17. What are the chief objections to Episcopacy?

It is said that for one minister to exercise authority over another is contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, and especially to our Lord's declaration, Matt. xx. 25, 27. (8)

18. What answer can you make to that?

That our Lord himself instituted different degrees of rank in his Church, by appointing the twelve apostles first, and afterwards and in a subordinate station, the seventy disciples. Luke vi. 13, and x. i.

19. What then do you understand from the passages referred to, and other similar ones?

Not that there were to be no differences of rank and station in the Church, but that it is the duty of all ministers, whatever may be their relative situations, to cultivate a spirit of humility, and to love and respect one another, without pride, envyings or jealousies.

20. What other objection is there to Episcopacy?

It is urged that the word "bishop," is used in many passages, as for instance, 1 Tim. iii. 1, and Phil. i. 1, to signify ministers or presbyters generally, and not any particular order of them, having a greater authority than the rest.

21. What have you to say in answer to this?

That although all presbyters might in those days have the name of bishops, all had not that superior office in the Church, which Titus and Timothy, and after them Clemens and Onesimus and others held. (9)

22. The objections, then, to the threefold order of ministers in the Church of England are unfounded, and she is right in maintaining these distinctions?

Assuredly.

NOTES ON CHAPTER III.

(1) There were many distinctions among ministers in the apostles' days. "There are, (says St. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 4,) differences of administrations," or ministries, as the margin has it. Comp. v. 28. Indeed, from the whole of this chapter, any unprejudiced person must see, that it is the appointment of God that in the Church there should be a variety of ministers, some holding a higher and more responsible, and some a lower and a less important office therein.

(2) The deacon among dissenters is an officer whose sole duty is of a worldly and secular nature, to attend to the wants of the poor, and to order the external affairs of the congregation; which is the duty of the Churchwarden among us.

(3) The secular part of their office lasted probably but a short time, only so long as the Christians at Jerusalem had all things common. The spiritual part to which they were ordained by the imposition of the apostles hands was to be always exercised. From these seven persons having been chosen by the people, the dissenters argue for the right of all congregations to choose their own ministers. Let us consider the facts of the case. The Grecian converts complained of partiality in the distribution of the alms of the Church, and that the widows of their nation were not treated so well as those of the Jewish people. The apostles being all Jews and the distributors of the alms, were tacitly the objects of these complaints. To stop the murmurs therefore, and ease themselves of a burden, they resolved and proposed to commit the business into other hands. But if they themselves had nominated persons to the office, the parties so appointed might have been supposed to act under their influence, and room for dissatisfaction and complaints would still have been given. So the people were allowed to elect to the office, and seem to have taken good care that the Grecians should no longer have any cause of discontent; most of those appointed being of that nation, as appears from their names. This transaction, then, may serve to prove the right of the people to choose a Churchwarden or overseer of the poor; but can prove nothing concerning the appointment of a spiritual pastor.

The only other passages which are adduced in support of this notion, are Acts i. 23, 24, where it is not clear, whether the eleven apostles or the whole body of the Church selected the two candidates for the vacant office, and the ultimate decision was left to God; and Acts xv. 22. But what this latter passage has to do with the point it is hard to say.

There is nothing, however, in the constitution of the Church of England, to prevent a parish from becoming the patrons of its Church, and thus obtaining power to appoint their own minister. All we contend for is, that the right to do so is not recognised in Scripture, and that the expediency of doing so is a question of doubt. The jealousies, disputes, and divisions produced in dissenting congregations by such elections are but too notorious.

(4) Though men are not unanimous in thinking, that whosoever ministers in the congregation, should be not only called of God, but ordained by man, i. e. by competent authority in the Church; as Timothy was, 1 Tim. iv. 14; as the elders or presbyters in Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch were, Acts xiv. 23; and as the ministers in the various cities of Crete were to be, by Titus, the bishop thereof, Titus i. 3, how many are found in the present day presumptuous enough to take this honour unto themselves, and to set up as Teachers, whose proper place would be the lower form in the school! It is said that a great blessing sometimes attends the labours of the uncommissioned and unordained preacher. It may be so; but this does not prove that this assumption of the office is in accordance with the will of God,

any more than the success of the person mentioned Luke ix. 49, in casting out devils, proves that he received his commission to do so from Christ, which he certainly did not.

(5) There were, for instance, many presbyters at Ephesus, Acts xx. 17, and 1 Tim. v. 17. If these were all of equal authority, why was any one individual specially singled out, and distinguished by the title "Angel of the Church?"

(6) In the epistle of Ignatius to the Church of Magnesia, written A. D. 107, he mentions with approbation Demas its bishop, Bassus and Apollonius two of its presbyters, and Sotio one of its deacons. There then we find the same threefold order of ministers which is established among ourselves, existing in a Christian Church only seventy-four years after the death of Christ, and recognised by Ignatius, a cotemporary of St. John.

(7) Would any wise King send his armies to battle without appointing leaders and commanders among them, to direct and regulate their movements? Otherwise, every man would do that which was right in his own eyes, and loss and defeat would be the almost certain result.

According to the notions so generally held by dissenters, that every Church is wholly independent, and subject to no human control in religious things but that of its own members, what possible right had the Church at Jerusalem to issue authoritative precepts for the direction of the Church at Antioch, Acts xv. 22?

(8) It might just as fairly be argued from Matt. xxiii. 9, 10, that a father has no authority over his children, or a master over his scholar.

(9) There seems good reason to believe that the title which was originally given to the presiding minister in each Church, was "the angel" or "apostle," and that afterwards the name "bishop," which had been before used to designate all presbyters indiscriminately, was applied exclusively to the chief or head presbyter, instead of the other titles, which fell into disuse.

PRIVATE TUITION.

A MARRIED CLERGYMAN of the Church of England, who has taken the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and whose Rectory is situated in one of the healthiest parts of Upper Canada, is desirous of receiving into his house four young gentlemen as pupils, who should be treated in every respect as members of his own family, and whom he would undertake to prepare for the intended University of King's College,—or, if preferred, give such a general education as should qualify them for mercantile or other pursuits. The strictest attention should be paid to their morals and manners, and it would be the endeavour of the advertiser to instil into the minds of his pupils those sound religious principles, which form the only safeguard in the path of life.

Testimonials as to the character and qualifications of the advertiser will be shewn, to any persons who may wish to avail themselves of this advertisement, by the Lord Bishop of Montreal, the Hon. & Ven. the Archdeacon of York, the Rev. A. N. Bethune, Cobourg, the Rev. H. J. Grasett, Toronto, and the Rev. J. G. Geddes, Hamilton. 22-1f.

MISS FENWICK'S
ACADEMY FOR YOUNG LADIES.
ST. JAMES STREET, MONTREAL.

TERMS.

| | Per Annum. |
|---|------------|
| Board, | £25 0 0 |
| Education—including Instruction in the English Language, History, Chronology, Geography, Astronomy and the Use of the Globes, | 6 0 0 |
| Writing and Arithmetic, | 3 0 0 |

BY APPROVED MASTERS, WHO ATTEND THREE TIMES A WEEK.

| | |
|--------------------|--------|
| French, | 4 0 0 |
| Drawing, | 6 0 0 |
| Music, | 12 0 0 |

The Boarders to furnish bed and bedding, towels, knife and fork, table and tea spoon.

A Quarter's notice is required previous to a Young Lady's leaving the Academy.

REFERENCES.

- The LORD BISHOP of Montreal,
- The Rev. Mr. BURRAGE, - - Quebec.
- The Hon. JOHN STEWART, - - Quebec.
- T. A. STAYNER, Esq. - - Quebec.
- The Rev. Mr. BETHUNE, - - Montreal.
- Mrs. SUTHERLAND, - - Montreal.
- The Hon. P. VANROUGHNET, - Cornwall, U. C.
- The Rev. G. ARCHBOLD, - - Cornwall, U. C.

4w36

The Church

Will for the present be published at the Star Office, Cobourg every Saturday.

TERMS.

To Subscribers resident in the immediate neighborhood of the place of publication, TEN SHILLINGS per annum. To Subscribers receiving their papers by mail, FIFTEEN SHILLINGS per annum, postage included. Payment is expected yearly, or at least half-yearly in advance.

COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT.

The Hon. and Ven. The Archdeacon of York; The Rev. Dr. Harris, Principal of the U. C. College; the Rev. A. N. Bethune, Rector of Cobourg; the Rev. H. I. Grasett, Asst. Minister of St. James's church, Toronto;—to any of whom communications referring to the general interests of the paper may be addressed.

EDITOR for the time being, The Rev. A. N. Bethune, to whom all communications for insertion in the paper (post paid) are to be addressed, as well as remittances of Subscription.

[E. D. CHATTERTON, PRINTER.]