

## Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for scanning. 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 scanning are checked below.

L'Institut a numérisé 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 numérisation 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
- Only edition available /  
Seule édition disponible
- 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.
- Additional comments /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Continuous pagination.

- 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
- Includes supplementary materials /  
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Blank leaves added during restorations may  
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these  
have been omitted from scanning / 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 numérisées.

*A. Patton*

# THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL.

I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me,  
and what I shall answer when I am reproved.—Hab. ii. 1.

REV. A. H. BURWELL, Editor.]

THREE RIVERS, FRIDAY, 8th APRIL, 1831.

[Vol. I.—No. 52.]

## WORKS OF BISHOP RAVENSCOFF.

The first volume (the second having appeared sometime since) of the works of this distinguished prelate has just issued from the Protestant Episcopal Press at New York. It embraces a memoir of the Bishop, several of his sermons, his charges, and some controversial tracts. We have not had time to examine it thoroughly, but from the hasty glance we have taken of it, we think our Church will find in this volume a rich source of instruction and edification. We have confined ourselves thus far, almost exclusively, to the memoir, and as we have run through it, the character of Bishop Ravenscuff has appeared to us as interesting as it was extraordinary. In another part of our paper will be found an account of his conversion, from his own pen. We learn from the memoir that it was with extreme reluctance that he consented to place it on paper, "lest the peculiar circumstances of his case might be used and perverted to strengthen the despisers of the means of grace, in their neglect of all the outward appointments of God's wisdom and goodness, to beget consideration in their hearts and lead them to repentance."

The subjoined extract is from a letter written by a personal friend of the Bishop to the editor of the work, and exhibits some of the peculiar traits of the Bishop's mind:—

"It is my good fortune to be intimately acquainted with Bishop Ravenscuff, and (I think I may say it without being accused of vanity) to enjoy his confidential friendship. Circumstances threw me more frequently in his company than either of his other clergy, and thus gave me an opportunity, enjoyed by few, of seeing him as he was in his parlour, in his study, and in all those retired relations of life, which, though not often taken into the estimate of character, serve, nevertheless, to show a man in his proper and distinguished colours. I might further say, that I knew him well in the unreserved moments of private intercourse. But never lived there a man in whom there was less reserve, and who was more perfectly the same in public and private. "I have no concealments," would be frequently say, "nor do I wish to know the secrets of others." And never did man act up more to his declarations. With a wasteful honesty (if I may so speak) he dealt out the truth to all, regardless of the fear or favour of any. He "kept back" nothing that he thought would tend to the right understanding of the truth. He was "determined" to use his own words, "to call things by their right names." In one word, he was far too honest for the age in which he lived. Had his lot been cast in the iron times of the reformation, posterity would have rejoiced in his name, and have ranked them with the Cranmers and Ridelys of those days. But being raised up, as he was, in the midst of an innovating generation, he felt called on, by every consideration of duty, to lift his voice against that strong tide of modern inventions and misnamed charity, which seemed about to drift the Church from the safe moorings of the reformation, and toss it without helm or pilot upon a sea of uncertainty and error. I have often looked with wonder at the man, whilst he has been declaiming with the zeal of an Apostle against modern pretences of charity, and have thought that if all heralds of the cross were filled with a like zeal for the truth, and reverence for primitive practice, what another aspect the Church of Christ would wear! And it has occurred to me at those times, that his fearless self sacrificing character could be summed up in no better language than that emphatic declaration of our Saviour, *Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up.* He might have taken it for his motto; for it was cer-

tainly the ruling principle of all he said and did. His honesty I believe no man doubted—the policy of his unreserved declarations was, however, questioned by many, who regarded, more than he did, established forms of speech, and the little courtesies of society which are too often made to conflict with that unbending honesty and sincerity which should ever characterize the Christian.

It fell to my lot to be the bearer of a letter from our Standing Committee, announcing his unanimous election as our first Bishop. And never shall I forget the solemn nature of that interview. I found him happily seated at his fireside, with the friend of his bosom beside him, and his Bible open before him. After the usual salutation and inquiries, the documents containing the certificate of his election, &c., were placed in his hands, and as my curiosity was strongly excited to witness the effect produced on him by this unexpected and solemn call, I narrowly watched the workings of his countenance; and there I read a lesson on the awful responsibility of the sacred calling, never to be obliterated. For some moments he seemed to read and read again as if loath to believe the startling proposition. At length a deep groan relieved the awful hearing of his breast. At this sound his wife looked up from her work and cast an anxious look upon us both, as if to inquire the cause of such emotion. Not a word, however, was spoken. An impressive silence reigned throughout the chamber, broken only by hard and long drawn breathings, which seemed to say audibly, "Lord, I am not worthy! What am I, O Lord God, and what is my house, that thou hast brought me hitherto?" At length after pacing the chamber for a few moments, as if struggling to keep down his emotions, he paused before me, and said in his peculiarly emphatic manner, "Brother, it must be so. The hand of God is in this thing, I see it; and with his help I will go where he calls me." Then putting the papers into the hands of her who was literally his help-meet, he endeavored to return to his wonted strain of cheerful and edifying conversation. But although he failed in no iota of attention to his guest, yet there was an evident weight upon him during the remainder of my visit, which made me wonder how "the office of a Bishop" could ever be the aim of worldly ambition. There was something ever to be remembered, in the expression of his countenance, at that time. It seemed to indicate the humility of *David* in the language just quoted, without the apparent reluctance of *Moses* when called into the dangerous service of his Master. All the trials, and labours, and responsibility of his apostolic office, appeared to array themselves at once before him, as if to intimidate him, and make him doubt the divine call. But like the great Apostle of the Gentiles, (whom of all preachers he most resembled,) he took refuge in the gracious promise of our Lord—*My grace shall be sufficient for thee.*

When I next saw him, it was in Philadelphia, standing before the altar of St. Paul's, and receiving from the venerable Bishop White his commission to rule as well as minister in the Church of Christ. And never while memory retains her seat, shall I forget the startling effect of his responses upon the multitude that looked on. It was as though an earthquake was shaking the deep foundations of those venerable walls. A breathless silence reigned during the whole of the sacred ceremony; and no one, it is believed left the Church that day without feeling as if he could pledge himself for the sincerity and zeal of him who was then invested with the apostolic office.

And yet that this man should have had his enemies, yea, bitter enemies and revilers! But it need not be wondered at, for he was the unsparing champion of truth—and ye hate me, says our Sa-

viour to his revilers, because I tell you the truth. That Bishop Ravenscroft had his faults, must be freely admitted by his greatest admirers. An unfortunate harshness of manner would sometimes repel the timid from approaching him; and an apparent impatience under contradiction, would deter free conversation in those who knew him perfectly. But these were blemishes of the outward man only, and reached not the "spirit of the mind." Of these weaknesses, however he was not unconscious; and oftentimes has he lamented over them before his friends, and prayed against them in secret. But a day or two before his death the writer of this was conversing with him on the solemn subject of the future, when he said; "My hopes on that score are without an intervening cloud. I know in whom I have believed, and I fear not to trust myself in his hands. But, bear me witness, I look for salvation only as a pardoned sinner. I have much to be forgiven of God, and I have many pardons also to ask of my fellow-men, for my harshness of manner towards them. But," said he, lifting up his eyes to heaven, and striking upon his breast, "there was no harshness here."

I cannot conclude these brief notices of my beloved diocesan, without adverting to what I conceive was one of his most distinguishing and lovely characteristics—I mean his devotion in private. On more than one occasion I have been unavoidably placed as an ear witness of his moments of retired devotion—a devotion to which I am sure that he thought there were no witnesses but himself and his God. And it was at such times that I wished a censorious world stood in my place. I distinctly remember the first time that I was so situated. Such were the strong wrestlings and deep groanings of that man of God in prayer, that my first impulse was to fly to his assistance, fearing lest some sudden and violent pain had seized upon him; but a moments reflection convinced me that it was not bodily anguish that wrung these complainings from him, but an agony of spirit, which seemed driven for relief to these plaintive moanings. Oh, how hard would he seem to wrestle with his God! Every groan that burst from his labouring soul seemed to say, *I will not let thee go unless thou bless me.* Nor was his a short-lived or transitory devotion. Three times a day like the prophet of old, did he kneel upon his knees; and unless pressed by other duties, he continued in prayer for the space of half an hour. His usual custom was to go from the reading of God's word to the seeking of his face in prayer. Indeed I never have known a more diligent reader of the Bible. It was ever open on his desk; and in the composition of his sermons, he seldom sought assistance beyond its pages. Enter his study when you would, there was the Bible on one side of him, and his Concordance on the other. And this reminds me of the wide-spread, but mistaken opinion of thousands as to his views on the subject of commentaries on the Bible. So far was Bishop Ravenscroft from desiring to disseminate with the Scriptures the interpretations of any man, or set of men, that I can truly say I never have known any one to hold commentaries in such light esteem. More than once have I heard the young and inexperienced Christian ask him: "What commentator shall I consult in reading my Bible?" And his reply has invariably been, "No one. Read it on your knees, and the Spirit of truth will make all necessary things plain unto you." Nay, I have heard him go further, and say, that "seldom if ever, had he been helped out of a difficulty by consulting even the most esteemed commentators." He delighted to drink out of the pure fountain of God's word; and his sermons and private discourses showed plainly that he was neither unlearned nor unskilful in handling its sacred truths. In his views of the Christian system, he seemed to stand on an eminence, with the whole Gospel spread out before him, in all its length and breadth. As a practical expounder of Scripture, I have never known his equal. He left to others the applause of critical acumen and deep research, and sought rather to bring every passage of God's word to bear upon the conscience of the sinner. And in the practical applications of Scripture he was peculiarly solemn and interesting. When in health, I have known him, after preaching twice or thrice in the day, lecture at family prayers for thirty or forty minutes, upon perhaps the first chapter that met his eye upon opening the Bible. And on these occasions, it has often been thought by his friends, that in point of force of manner, and rich-

ness of thought, he even exceeded his more deliberate pulpit exercises."—*Episcopal Watchman.*

FOR THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.  
AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.  
Tract No. 214.

The strictures of Nayland on this tract in some of the late numbers of the Gospel Messenger led the writer of this article to examine for himself that part of the tract to which reference had been made. The first view excited a suspicion that there had been a want of fidelity, if not of moral honesty in preparing the twenty-sixth page of that tract. The writer of it, by placing "Simpson's Plea" at the end of his extracts would leave his readers to conclude that he had been using the language of a clergyman of the church of England; for it is not known that there is any work designated by that title except "a plea for the deity of Jesus Christ, by the Rev. David Simpson, A. M. late of St. John's College, Cambridge; Minister of Christ's Church, Macclesfield, &c." A comparison of the historical notices which this author gives of the fathers, with the notices exhibited in Tract No. 214 as the language of this author, will show how far the suspicion of disingenuousness and dishonesty is supported by facts.

Simpson's Plea, according to the London edition of 1812.

"Ignatius was a disciple of John, was appointed Bishop of Antioch by Paul, was approved of by Peter, and had the honor of dying a martyr in the year of our Lord 107." Page 467.

"Polycarp was a disciple of John, and by him made Bishop of Smyrna, A. D. 82. He was burnt alive in 100th year of his age, and in the year of our Lord 166." p. 476.

"Justin Martyr is one of the most eminent christians and scholars in this period. He was born A. D. 103, and beheaded at Rome A. D. 167." p. 488.

"Theophilus being a studious inquisitive man—became convinced of the truth of Christianity, and was made Bishop of Antioch about the year of our Lord 168." p. 493.

"Irenæus, the Disciple of Polycarp, was made Bishop of Lyons in France, A. D. 178, and beheaded by Severus, A. D. 202." p. 495.

"I have given the testimony of this learned Bishop and martyr pretty much at large." p. 502.

"About the close of the second century, or the beginning of the third, flourish'd Clemens Alexandrinus, the friend of Irenæus, scholar of Panteonius and tutor of the famous Origen." p. 502.

Here are notices of six of the fathers,—four of them were Bishops of extensive churches and have received their appropriate titles from all writers ancient and modern who have any claim to fidelity as authors. All history declares what Simpson does, that Ignatius was appointed Bishop of Antioch. But Tract No. 214 makes this writer of the Episcopal Church say that Ignatius was pastor of the Church at Antioch. Simpson says that Polycarp was made Bishop of Smyrna A. D. 82.—The writer of Tract No. 214 omits this fact and chooses to make this churchman say he was born A. D. 82.

The whole christian world as well as Simpson has said that Theophilus was made Bishop of Antioch. The author of Tract No. 214 has not simply made the discovery himself, but he would make us believe that a writer of our own church says that Theophilus was ordained pastor of the church at Antioch. Simpson

Simpson's Plea, according to Tract No. 214.

"Ignatius was a disciple of John, and Pastor of the Church of Antioch, and honored with martyrdom in the year of our Lord 107." p. 26.

"The venerable Polycarp, a Disciple of John, born A. D. 82, and called to a martyr's crown at the advanced age of 100, finished &c." p. 26.

"Justin Martyr, born A. D. 103, and beheaded at Rome 167, has the following sentence,"—p. 26.

"Theophilus was ordained Pastor of the Church at Antioch about the middle of the second century." p. 26.

"Irenæus suffered martyrdom under Severus A. D. 202, was a Disciple of Polycarp, a Disciple of John and says &c." p. 26.

"Clemens Alexandrinus the friend of Irenæus, says &c. This later flourish'd about the close of second century." p. 26.

says Irenæus was made Bishop of Lyons in France A. D. 179. But the writer of Tract No. 214, though he uses the other facts in the same sentence, omits this, and then tells us he uses the language of Simpson.—And this is the Tract that is thrust into the houses of Episcopalians: this is the tract that Episcopalians are called upon to assist in circulating. This is the tract for the not circulating of which they are declared to be wanting in Christian zeal, in charity, in love to their Redeemer, and in desires to extend his spiritual kingdom, and are condemned and anathematized from one end of the continent to the other. But this is not all. There seems to be a settled purpose of producing an entire change in the language of ecclesiastical history, and instead of giving to the saints of other days, the names and titles by which they were then designated and have been still known through all succeeding ages till the bursting forth of the light of the 19th century, we are now to hear of these worthies only under such names and titles as are adapted to the modern heretical notions of the institution of Christ's Church. In any other department of letters, these inroads would not be tolerated for a single day.—Suppose some political enthusiast should take a fancy that the King of England, limited as his power is by the British constitution, was no more than a president in the sense this word is used in civil government, and should write a history of England, altering the present style, as in the example below:

Edward VI. crowned King of England, A. D. 1547.	Edward VI. inaugurated President of Great Britain, A. D. 1547.
---	--

Such a change in civil history would neither be justified nor allowed; yet it is precisely such a change as is attempted to be made in ecclesiastical history:

"Theophilus was made Bishop of Antioch A. D. 168."—Simpson.	"Theophilus was ordained Pastor of the Church at Antioch A. D. 168."—Tract
---	--

Nor is this attempt confined to a few individuals. An immense Society, actually embracing some of the largest denominations in this country, and professing to embrace all, possessing means to an indefinite extent, and issuing some millions of tracts which are distributed through every part of the country from Maine to Florida and from the Atlantic to the Mississippi, with a zeal as persevering and untiring as ever distinguished the Jesuits of the Roman Church, has given its sanction to this perversion of language to party purposes, and lent its aid to endeavor to produce a change of opinion on an important ecclesiastical question by such means. Episcopalians should learn a lesson from experience. They should hereafter guard against the ill timed and unjust intrusions of others, and defend with awakened energy the Church of the living God.

C. D. J.

Paris.—A separation has taken place in the Catholic Church, and a portion of them have established a form of worship grounded upon views and principles near to Protestantism. I send you a copy of the articles of Faith adopted by the Separatists, who style themselves the *Orthodox Catholic Church*. There is a wide field opened for action in this country, where the Bible is scarcely known, and so little of real religion exists.

1. The Word of God is our only guide of Faith.
2. We admit the three symbols of the Apostles, of Nice, and of Athanasius.
3. We recognize as canonical all the Books of the Old and New Testaments that the Reformed Church admits as such, and we consider the reading of them as of indispensable necessity.
4. We believe that there are two Sacraments of divine institution—the Baptism and the Holy Supper. We admit the others only as pious ceremonies that have existed from the earliest period of the Church.
5. The service of the Sacrament will no longer be performed in Latin, but in a familiar tongue, after the ritual of the Church.
6. Auricular Confession is not of divine precept; we do not require it of any one, but the faithful before approaching the Holy Table, should prepare themselves to receive general absolution.
7. We do not recognize any days of abstinence. As to fasting, we submit it to the piety of the faithful.

8. We admit a Hierarchy in the Church, and this Hierarchy is to be composed of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

9. Our veneration for the Saints consists in thanking God for the grace he bestowed on them.

10. Religious instruction being of the first necessity for the people, we consider it the most important part of our duties to disseminate freely the Bread of the Word of God.—*Protestant*.

Spain.—It appears that the king of Spain has performed an act of bravery which is calculated to excite surprize in the minds of those acquainted with his previous character. Most people thought that he manifested the utmost servility to the priesthood, and that he would go almost any lengths to subserve their interests. But it appears that he has had the courage to banish without trial the Archbishop of Toledo, the Primate of Spain, the richest ecclesiastic in the world, and the idol of innumerable mendicants. His revenue is stated to be no less than £250,000 Sterling per annum. Charles V., who captured Rome, and besieged the Pope in the Castle of St. Angelo, always paid the greatest respect to Cardinal Ximenes, then Archbishop of Toledo, and would have long paused before taking such violent measures against such a powerful subject armed as he was with the paoply of Ecclesiastical influence and authority. This was certainly unexpected. What may be its value in connection with recent transactions in France is hard perhaps to determine; but this it seems to indicate, namely, that the king of Spain regards the priesthood as his subjects, and will maintain his own supremacy in his own dominions.

Later from Europe.—By the arrival of the Clematis at Boston from Havre, European dates to the 9th Feby. have been received of which the following is an abstract:

The Duke de Namours, second son of Louis Phillipe, King of the French, aged 17, was chosen King of Belgium, in the National Congress on the third of February. The votes were, for the Duke de Namours, 97; for the Duke de Luchtenburg, 74; for the Arch Duke Charles of Austria, 21; being a majority of two over both the other candidates in favour of the Duke de Namours. It was reported at Paris and at Havre, that Louis Phillipe would not accept the throne of Belgium for his son.

The throne of Poland is declared vacant, the Russian army was advancing, and little hopes were entertained of the success of the Polish Patriots.

The Paris papers brought by the Clematis bring London dates to the 3d February. The question of reform was fixed on the order of the day in the House of Commons for the third of March.—There had been another conference at London of the Plenipotentiaries of the five great powers on the affairs of Belgium.—*C. Cour.*

## SCRAPS OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY No. 1.

### Of the Martyrdom of James the Apostle.

About that time (that is under Claudius) Herod the king stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the Church, and slew James the brother of John with the sword. Of this James, Clemens in the seventh of his Hypotyposes, reporteth a certain history worthy of memory, which he received by relation of his predecessors, saying: He truly which drew him before the tribunal seat, when he saw that he would willingly suffer martyrdom, was therewith moved, and voluntarily confessed himself to be a Christian. Then were they both brought together, but he in the way requested James the Apostle to pardon him, which, after he had paused a little upon the matter, turning unto him answered: Peace be unto thee, and kissed him, and so they were both beheaded together. Then Herod, as the Holy Ghost witnesseth, perceiving the death of James to have pleased the Jews, laid wait for Peter, whom when he had taken, he cast into prison, whose death he had procured had not the angel of the Lord by divine apparition assisted him by night, miraculously loosing his fetters, and restoring him to the office of preaching.—*Euseb. Ecc. Hist. Book 2. Chap. 9.*

## THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL.

THREE-RIVERS, FRIDAY, 8th APRIL, 1831.

## PAPAL SUPREMACY.

In all questions of controversy, there is a certain *first principle* upon which all subordinate ones are suspended; and which, if taken away, leaves them in ruins. We shall therefore, in this article, reach forth our right hand, and boldly take hold of the CHAIR OF ST. PETER, and try the title of his ostensible successors.

I. The Supremacy of the Pope of Rome stands upon the very threshold of the disputed patrimony of the successors of St. Peter, the same as the supremacy of the King of England over the British empire stands first in a question of his right as king to govern it. If the supremacy in either case be clearly made out, all subordinate questions are merged into that one. If, on the contrary, that claim be set aside, there the controversy ends.

II. The abstract notion of supremacy is the same in either case, because it simply concerns government over men in a state of subordination, and nothing else. Each case embraces the same general and leading features in the detail of the exercise of power. 1. The King, as head of the nation, is the fountain of all authority, and alone possesses the power of *mission* to the discharge of official functions. 2. He alone has power to assemble the great Council of the nation, and every council assembled is a *general* Council. 3. He is the head of the Council when assembled, and his assent as such is essential to the legality of all its decrees. 4. He alone is the umpire of legal controversies and the interpreter of law, which he does by his Judges, and to all practical purposes, in a loose sense, he is infallible.

III. Papal supremacy, with its General Councils, as it is claimed over a great body politic, the Church Universal, should of necessity embrace, as to substance, the four great features above named, in nearly the same terms as those stated. To these four rules we will add a *fifth*, namely, That this state of things must have existed entire in each case from the very beginning: in the one, from the time that King and Parliament first ruled England: in the other, from the constitution of the Church by our Lord in the Apostolic commission. The trial of these four first rules by the last, will, as we conceive, decide the controversy, at least as far as supremacy, infallibility, and *oral tradition* are concerned.

IV. Before proceeding, let us examine the claim made on Peter as the *rock*, and our Lord's address to him in the last of John's Gospel. 1. "Thou art *Petros*, and upon this *petra*, I will build my Church:" as the two words in *italic* stand in the Greek; *Petros*, a masculine noun, signifying a *stone* which a man might handle; and *petra*, feminine, a *rock* of any supposable magnitude. But it is claimed that, as our Lord spoke *Syriac*, and used the single word *Cephas*, which has but one gender, it identifies *Peter* with *rock* in its largest sense. This, however, amounts to a claim that impeaches the veracity of the sacred penman who gave our Lord's *meaning* in Greek. But taking for granted the truth of the Greek text, we may read the words thus: "Thou art a *small stone*, and upon this *great rock* I will build my church." Paul, however, asserts, that it is built upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; and Peter, it appears, but one among many: which is supported by St. John in the Revelation xxi. 14: "The wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the *twelve* Apostles of the Lamb." 2. It is true that our Lord promised Peter the keys of the Church, and he opened it to the Gentiles, and no man shut it. 3. "Feed my lambs—feed my sheep," is claimed as a commission of supremacy over both laity and clergy. But all sheep are once lambs, and all lambs are fed expressly that they may become sheep. Hence, unless it was intended that all the laity should become clergymen, women as well as men, this makes nothing for the supremacy of Peter.

V. To apply the *first* rule.—The Pope, as head of the Church, is the fountain of authority, and alone possesses the power of *mission* to execute the clerical functions. The Right Rev. Dr. Mil-

ner, in his "End of Religious Controversy," part 2, p. 149, says: "Every Catholic pastor is authorized and enabled to address his flock as follows: The word of God which I announce to you, and the Holy Sacraments which I dispense to you, I am QUALIFIED to announce and dispense by such a Catholic Bishop who was consecrated by such another Catholic Bishop, and so on, in a series which reaches to the Apostles themselves: and I am AUTHORIZED to preach and minister to you by such a prelate, who received authority for this purpose, from the successor of St. Peter in the Apostolic See of Rome." But here, while the Doctor admits the commencement of a *multitude* of lines of descent from the persons of the Apostles for the tradition of the power of *ordination* down to posterity, he confines the power of *mission to exercise the clerical functions* to St. Peter and his successors in the papal chair. But how would such doctrine appear in regard to the King's supremacy as being both the fountain of authority and mission to exercise it? How many independent lines of descent for constituting the subordinate official character in the servants of the crown does the British Constitution recognize? And if more than one could exist, what would become of the unity of the empire as under one personal supremacy? And what again would be the value of the numerous lines of descent from the Apostles independent of each other and of the line of St. Peter, having power to *convey Holy Orders*, if none but the possessor of the chair of St. Peter could grant permission to *exercise Holy Orders*? The thing is a self-evident absurdity. Again, at page 157, he says: "The case is, the same necessity of an Apostolical succession of *mission*, or authority to execute the functions of Holy Orders, as of the Holy Orders themselves. This *mission*, or authority, was imparted by Christ to his Apostles, when he said to them: '*As the Father hath sent me, I also send you.*'" — But this is fully granting the power of *mission*, as well as of *ordination*, to EVERY ONE of the Apostles, and in fact admitting that each one was an *absolute* Pope, and fully qualified to transmit the plenitude of his powers of *ordination* and *Mission* (which constitute ecclesiastical supremacy) in a line of descent to future ages: which is nothing short of a virtual, though unintentional, surrender of the whole Papal controversy. The wise are sometimes taken in their own craftiness. In virtue therefore of this commission, which was common to THEM ALL, they went forth to spread the Gospel, to plant Churches, and to ordain and send others to the work, with full powers to transmit their own commission unimpaired of its essentials to posterity. Paul, besides exercising the powers of *ordination* and *mission*, all over Asia Minor and Greece, left one line of descent in Timothy and one in Titus. James left one in the see of Jerusalem, which, as the primary head-quarters of Christianity, ought to have been governed, as the *seat of empire*, by none but the "prince of the Apostles" and the universal Bishop himself, instead of one of his subjects, while he was employed as a *Missionary* "of the Circumcision." In short, primitive Church History gives us lists of episcopal successions from the persons of the different Apostles, of a *MULTITUDE OF SEES*, which exercised every function ever known in the Church without let or hindrance. And it was the universal custom of the whole Church, for neighbouring Bishops to consecrate new ones, and give them authority, charge, and power of *ordination* and *mission* over vacant or new sees, which the new Bishops accordingly exercised, precisely as the Bishops now do in England and the United States of America. But for the claim of a universal Bishop to be valid, or even to wear the face of probability, our Lord should have consecrated and sent BUT ONE INDIVIDUAL endowed with those plenary powers instead of THIRTEEN (including Paul), and that one should have been exclusively furnished with the means of perpetuating his individual line of descent; and from that line alone should those powers have emanated not only from each individual Apostle, but from all the lines of Apostolic succession which they established; the same as the Crown of England furnishes and sends all its public functionaries. And common sense teaches us that the powers of *ordination* and *Mission* should reside together. A careful perusal of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus must convince even the most credulous, that Paul commissioned both of them with full authority to *ordain* to the ministry, to *send* to the discharge of the clerical

functions, and to govern those so sent by them.—The *See* of Rome is *far too shallow* to cover these stones of stumbling which the *Bible* has placed at the very threshold of her haughty claims; and until they are effectually removed, and the way to the Chair of St. Peter made as smooth as the surface of the unruffled deep, intelligent Protestants cannot return to her authority.

VI. The second rule regards the prerogative of calling Councils, and the *generality* of every Council. The King, as head of the state, has this power, and he alone. This, in the abstract, is essential to supremacy; and in practice it cannot be departed from without a full and absolute surrender of all claims thereto. If such a power is essential to the constitution of the Church universal, as it undeniably is to the constitution of every state, we ought to find it as distinctly recognized in the commission of St. Peter to rule the Catholic Church, as we find it given to the King in the British Constitution. If it has a necessary existence in the Church, it must reside in the supreme head of the Church, or the Church can have no such head. No Council should ever be called without his doing it, and every council thus called should be a *general* Council representing the Universal Church, the same as the British Parliament assembled always represents the whole United Kingdom. Supremacy evidently requires this as its sole prerogative—its *PECULIUM*: and the possession and exercise of it from the beginning in other lines of descent than that of St. Peter, annihilates the claim of supremacy at a blow. But the papal system, as held by many, makes such a general Council essential to the existence of the Church, and co-existent with her, because in it, with the Pope at its head and mouthpiece, they place infallibility; and infallibility they make essential to her existence. This should have been asserted and acted on by St. Peter, and all his successors; and it should have been a universal article of faith, that no ecclesiastical Council could be assembled except by the Pope; and that all Councils but his should be held as treason and rebellion. But what says history?

1. The first Council we read of, namely, in Acts xv. seems to have been convened by common consent, probably at the request of St. Paul, who, with Barnabas, had come up to Jerusalem about the question of circumcision, and not by command of any one. "The Apostles and Elders came together for to consider this matter," but no intimation is given of Peter's authority as supreme head of the Church. He appears in the Council, but barely as *par cum paribus*—one among his equals. But then was the time, if ever, to place his supremacy beyond dispute, that the Church universal might recognize him in his high character of "Prince of the Apostles" and head of the Church.—His modern successors would never be guilty of such death-doing sins of omission.

2. Eusebius tells us, Eccl. Hist. Book iii. chap. xi. that, "after the martyrdom of St. James, and the captivity of Jerusalem, the report goeth, that the Apostles and Disciples of our Lord, which were then alive, (whereof many yet remained) gathered themselves together, with the kinsmen of our Lord according to the flesh, to consult whom they should think worthy to succeed James: so that all in one voice judged worthy of the See of Jerusalem. Simeon the son of Cleophas, mentioned in the Gospel, and called the cousin of Christ, for Hegesippus writeth that Cleophas was the brother of Joseph." But by this it does not appear that the Bishop of Rome had any concern, either in calling this council at the seat of the *Mother Church*, or in authorizing Simeon to discharge his episcopal functions; both of which, as universal bishop, he should have done personally or by special commission.—In Book v. Chap. iii. he intimates a council, held by "the brethren inhabiting France," who censuring the errors of Montanus, "laid down in writing their godly and CATHOLIC censure of them, and withal, alledged sundry epistles of the holy Martyrs that suffered among them, which being in close prison, they had written unto the brethren throughout Asia and Phrygia, in the which also they called and provoked Eleutherius then Bishop of Rome, to the defence of the ecclesiastical peace." Here, observe, a *Provincial Council* laid down a *godly Catholic* censure of heresy, and called and provoked the SUPREME HEAD OF THE CHURCH to do the same!—In Book v. Chap. xxi. he relates the meeting of councils concerning the keeping of Easter, and has these words: "Their epistle is at this day extant, who at that time (about 193.)

for this cause assembled together in Palestine, of whom Theophilus Bishop of Casarea, and Narcissus Bishop of Jerusalem were chief. At Rome likewise there was a synod gathered together for the same cause, of the which Victor their Bishop was president. Again there was another of the Bishops at Pontus, where Palmas, as the most ancient, did govern. Another of the Bishops throughout France, which Irenaeus did oversee. To be short, another of the Bishops throughout Ostroena and the cities therein contained, and specially of Banchillus Bishop of Comuth, with many others: all which with one and the same sentence and judgment ordained the same decree, and their uniform assent was thus made manifest unto the world."

In the next Chapter, xxii. Eusebius records the epistle of Polycrates Bishop of Ephesus to the same Victor and his Church at Rome, in which he says that *notable pillars* of the Christian Religion had rested in Asia, from whom they held the custom of keeping Easter—"according unto the Gospel, in the fourteenth Moon, swerving no where, but observing the rule of faith. To be short," continues he, "and I Polycrates, the meanest of you all, do retain the tradition of my forefathers, of which also I have imitated some. For there were seven Bishops before me, and I am the eighth, which always have celebrated the feast of Easter on that day in which the people removed the leaven from among them. I therefore (my brethren) which have lived three score and five years in the Lord, have conferred with the brethren throughout the world, and have read, and over read the Holy Scripture, yet will not be moved at all by those things, which are made to terrify us. For my ancestors and elders have said, that we ought to obey God, rather than man..... I could repeat the Bishops which were present, whom you requested me to assemble..... they have consented unto this epistle. They also know that I bear not this gray hair in vain, but always have had my conversation in Christ Jesus."—Immediately upon this (saith Eusebius) Victor Bishop of Rome goeth about to sever from the unity in the communion all the Churches of Asia..... But this not pleasing all the Bishops, they exhorted him to seek after those things which concerned peace and unity, and love among brethren. *His words are at this day extant, that sharply reprehended Victor; of which number Irenaeus in the name of all the brethren in France that were under his charge, wrote and allowed the same sentence.*—We will pass over the councils till the time of Constantine the Great, in whose life, Book i. Chap. 37. Eusebius saith of him—"as if God had ordained him to be AN UNIVERSAL BISHOP, he called a synod or council of the Clergy,"—and that round the very seat of Papal Supremacy!

3. As to *general* councils, the doctrine of Supremacy and Universal Bishop requires, that all councils to decide on the doctrines and practice of the Catholic Church should be general, and that no *partial* council could be lawful. This is plain upon a constitutional comparison with the *nature*, and with the *facts* of Supremacy, as we find them in every government under heaven. But what says history? The first that is claimed as a general council is that of Nice, in the year 318, not assembled by the *Pope* of Rome, but by Constantine the *Emperor* of Rome. Hence the Supreme Head of the Church, even had he asserted his claim, and called the Council of Nice, must have been unparadonably neglectful of her true interests and his own lawful power, to allow 250 years of heresy, schism, and *Nocesan* episcopal usurpation to desolate the Church without

• The reader will please observe the value of this evidence in favour of Episcopacy. He declares Scripture to be the rule of faith, and professes to follow the customs of the Church as the Apostles followed them; and in asserting his lawful claim to the Episcopate, he declares it better to obey God than man, making his episcopal functions a part of his duty to God. All these he couples together. His defence of keeping Easter involves the certainty of an Episcopal succession for *eight generations*, to which he made a public appeal before his enemies and the whole world; and he could not have appealed to a *known falsehood* for the confirmation of a *disputed truth*. The world before which he made the appeal certainly knew whether he was what he claimed to be.—This happened in the year 195. Allowing that the first of the succession was appointed in 65, during Paul's life, it leaves 130, which, divided by eight, gives an average of sixteen years for the episcopate of each Bishop, including himself; and he was then an old man.

even a reproof, much less a general Council to assert his power, and maintain *papal* unity.

VII. The *third* rule is quickly dispatched; namely, that the Pope is the head of the council when assembled, and that his assent as such is essential to the validity of all its decrees. But as no council among the many that were assembled before the council at Nice, (except the one mentioned in Acts xv. be such)\*, is claimed to be a *general* council: and as the Bishop of Rome presided at none but such as were held in his own diocese, there is no place for the application of this rule, and it remains a point blank evidence against the *papal* claims.—It is true that the Bishop of Rome did promulgate a sentence of excommunication against the Eastern Churches who affirmed that they followed the Scriptures and the Apostolic custom in keeping Easter, and who declared that from such authority they collected their rule of faith; but for this his presumption he drew upon himself the decided censure of the Catholic Church.—Moreover, under this third rule we may notice, that, on the scheme of supremacy and a Universal Bishop, with his general council, it were his duty or prerogative, to frame all creeds, and to regulate and appoint all Liturgies and modes of public worship, and to enforce *Catholic Uniformity* in every thing. But what says *written Tradition*? There were *various* Creeds, adopted by various Churches in various times; though in substance they all agreed, as being drawn from a common source; and their Liturgies or forms of public devotion were still more various. The Creed was first introduced into the daily service of the Greek Church by Tullio Bishop of Antioch about 471, and adopted at Constantinople about 511. From the East this custom travelled West; and about 589. the third Council at Toledo ordered the Constantinopolitan Creed to be recited before the Lord's prayer in divine service in the Churches of Spain and Galicia, or Gallia. Pope Leo III. directed to lay aside a practice not then admitted in the Papal See: But the Church finding that the Spanish and Galician Churches would not relinquish the custom, introduced the Creed into her Liturgy about 1014—"that there might be no disagreement in the Church."—(See Shepherd on the common prayer, Vol. i page 244.) Thus the East gave law to Rome.—We repeat it;—Supremacy requires, that from the beginning, all Creeds, Confessions, Litanies, Liturgies, &c. &c. should have proceeded from the Court of Rome, and from it alone; and none should have differed from her but by her express permission. But does she now grant permission of diversity and disagreement? It is singularly worthy of remark, though this may not be the most fitting place to introduce it, that Paul, that apostle who received his commission sometime after Peter was constituted the Supreme head of the Church on earth and endowed with such astonishing powers, and who was as one born out of due time, should have penned so great a proportion of the New Testament, and commented so largely on the Old, and dealt so much in controversy and dogmatical divinity, while the *Universal Bishop* did so little in establishing the rule of faith.—"Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus," the boasted motto of the Roman Catholic Church, has but a *very circumscribed* application to primitive times.

VIII. The *fourth* rule remains. As the King is the interpreter of law and umpire of controversies, (by his Judges) in like manner the successors of St. Peter, from the very beginning, should have decided all controversies for every Bishoprick in Christendom. But was it so? The documents and proofs which we have laid before the reader CLEARLY DEMONSTRATE THE CONTRARY. The various *partial* councils which met consulted the *written word of God*, and the *recorded practice of the Apostles and their successors*, unless very near their times, so that *oral* testimony might be depended on. Such a method may, at all times, bring men sufficiently near to infallibility to answer all practical purposes.

IX. The examination of these four rules has settled the question of *oral Tradition*, by confronting it with *written History*, connected with *Sacred Scripture*. The reader will also observe, that it has precisely the same bearing on the doctrine of *Infallibility*.

\* Of this James, Bishop of Jerusalem, appears to have been president, as his sentence furnished the substance of the decree: but it was sent in the name "of the apostles and elders and brethren" in one body.

X. In conclusion, we beg leave to remark, that by the foregoing arguments Episcopacy is supported and settled on the authority of Scripture and primitive history in the same degree that the *PAPACY* is unsettled by them. In fact, Episcopacy is so woven into the early history of the Church, that to study the Fathers and not find it at every step, is about as rational as to study the Bible and not find the divinity of our Lord. And we humbly trust that if the above article be thought worthy of being copied into other periodicals, that it may not pass through the *Tractmongers' purgatory*, which is reviewed in another part of this number of the Sentinel.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL.

### REFORMATION IN FRANCE.

Rev. Sir,

I apprehend that all your readers will agree with you in the importance and interest which you attach to the late intelligence of a religious Revolution proceeding in France. The information is, indeed, imperfect; but enough has reached us to make us fervently bless God for the triumph of His truth, and to warn from it that out of the elements of trouble which now agitate the world, "His own arm will bring salvation, and his fury will uphold him" in the work. The signs of the times portend great things, and the eye of FAITH looks to glorious results. But "The Kingdom of God," according to its usual course, "cometh not with observation." We are too apt, when a bright opening develops itself to indulge in the most sanguine anticipations, and to pronounce hardily and presumptuously that some great and general consummation is close at hand. We ought to be disciplined to more humility, and to remember the charge of our Lord, "In your patience possess ye your souls," as well as his caution, that it is not for us to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. Unquestionably the late occurrences in France are most highly encouraging in their aspect, but they may be checks and reverses, disappointments and conflicts to be encountered in the progress of the cause; and before "the great day of God Almighty" in the earth, to which the Protestant world looks forward, a struggle must be anticipated in which "the powers of heaven shall be shaken."

I have been immediately led to submit some observations upon this subject for your acceptance, by the recollection of a portion of Ecclesiastical History to which the present French Reformation gives a more than ordinary interest. You will perceive it, even that I allude to the overtures made by the Roman Catholic Clergy of France, (who have always been distinguished among the subjects of the Papal Supremacy for their resistance to its more excessive encroachments,) upwards of a century ago towards a union with the Church of England. A very interesting account of this negotiation, with copies of the correspondence of the truly excellent and learned Archbishop Wake,\* is to be found in Dr. Maclaine's translation of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History. Dr. Maclaine, not himself of the Church of England, most warmly and triumphantly vindicates the Archbishop from the charge of compromising the pure Protestantism of that Church. The account of the correspondence, and its issue, with copies subjoined of many interesting letters, constitutes his Appendix, No. III, to the History of Mosheim, and I suggest it for your Editorial consideration, whether a place might not be judiciously given in the Sentinel to some extracts from that Appendix.

It is rather a remarkable, although a trifling circumstance, that one of the principal parties in this correspondence was a highly distinguished author of the name of *Du Pin*—a name which again prominently figures in the recent French Reformation; and there is also a kind of coincidence perhaps not wholly undeserving of notice, that the negotiation with the Archbishop in 1711 and 12 took place under the regency of a *Duke of Orleans*.

One of the most valuable fruits of the overtures then making,

\* It is delightful to reflect how many great and good men, how many burning and shining lights in the Church of God, have occupied the Metropolitan See of Canterbury, since the time of the Reformation.

was a work by a Roman Catholic Priest in defence of the validity of our Ordinations. He is spoken of by Dr. Maclaine (in his Appendix, No. 2, on the present state of the Reformed Religion, &c.) as "the learned and worthy Dr. Courayer, whose upright fortitude in declaring his sentiments, obliged him to seek an asylum in England, and who notwithstanding his persuasion of the absurdities which abound in the Church of Rome, never totally separated himself from its communion. And such," he adds, "is known to be the case with many men of learning and piety in that Church."

In passing the solemn cloisters of Westminster Abbey, when I happened to be in my native country a few years ago, my attention was arrested by the name of COURAYER on a plain flat stone in the pavement, and I found that I was treading over the ashes of a man, whose work may yet be of eminent service in satisfying the minds of Roman Catholics, awakened to religious enquiry, (as far as the Episcopal Churches are concerned,) upon the sole point on which they can have any reasonable and well-founded scruple respecting the system and constitution of the Protestant Church. I am in possession of an English translation of the work of Courayer forming one volume, and of his Defence of his original Dissertation, in four volumes, in French. This last came casually to my hand, intermixed with an accumulation of literary rubbish, and a quantity of *tombs déparcillés* which were exposed in preparation for an auction.—I caught a sight of one volume, and by perseverance in diving discovered and extracted the others, one by one, from the superincumbent mass of confusion. The work is unanswerable: the chain of evidence respecting one unbroken succession, resting upon an appeal to unquestioned documents, is complete; and, among other points, the ridiculous fabrication of the *Yag's Head Ordination* is noticed as it deserves. O that it might please God that occasion should one day be given to use this testimony to our cause in the land in which we live! It is a most encouraging feature in the accounts as yet received of the Reformation proceeding in France, that the standing-line of the Clergy is preserved intact, and the primitive constitution of the Church retained—I ought to say restored, for that is not a primitive Episcopacy which is subject to Papal rule. We live in the reign of schism; and in plain defiance of Scripture we glory in it, and think that it is no matter how multifarious a face the Church of God exhibits, nor how infinite are the varieties among the professors of the single truth of God, provided we "agree to differ."—It is difficult to withstand at any time the torrent of favourite and prevailing notions, and there never was a case which better served to exemplify this truth than that of the Latitudinarian notions of the present day. But those who are not blinded by all this dust of miscalled liberality, look with assured hope, to better times. Christianity in a truly prosperous condition, would exhibit something like Roman Catholic unity and coherence, with Protestant worship and doctrine; i.e. the doctrine of the Reformed National Churches, and of such sects as may agree with them in points usually distinguished as doctrinal. In the mean time let us fervently pray God that the increase of zeal and piety and the correction of all abuses or neglects in our own body may serve to recommend and advance the cause of Episcopacy; and let us adopt with regard to others the sentiments of the great and amiable Archbishop already mentioned: "I bless God," says he, in a letter addressed to Father Courayer, "that I was born and have been bred in an Episcopal Church, which I am convinced has been the government established in the Christian Church from the very time of the Apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm that where the Ministry is not Episcopal there is no Church nor any true administration of the Sacraments. And very many there are among us who are zealous for Episcopacy, yet dare not go so far as to annul the ordinances of God performed by any other Ministry."

For the present I conclude with this extract; but it is possible

\* An unauthorized Ministry, in regard to ecclesiastical validity, is purely a human Ministry. Hence the Church organized, and the ordinances administered by it, can be nothing but imitations of the true. It is freely admitted that pastors and societies in this condition, may fully believe that they possess, valid churches, ministry, and ordinances. But that their error in this case shall be to their condemnation.—God forbid that we should say it. They still may be dealt with "according to their faith."—EDITOR.

that I may offer to you some slight further observations connected with the subject of this communication, for the next Sentinel.

I remain, &c.

A LABOURER.

*The Season.*—The late warm weather and rains have caused a considerable rise of water in the small rivers in the country. On the 1st inst. the ice in the Nicolet gave way at several leagues from its mouth, and after breaking for some distance came to a stop, until the accumulation of water forced it onward, till the ice again made another pause, and finally stopped about a mile from the Lake. The river being highly swollen, the rush of the ice was tremendous. In an instant it demolished Mr. Feraey's new Mills, and swept away all his lumber, both logs and boards. Capt. Chandler's canal and floom were destroyed, four dwelling houses at Nicolet were carried away, with several out-houses and barns; and a number of houses not otherwise injured are left about half-covered with water. Much wheat is under water in the barns near the river. The surface of the river is about ten feet higher than common high water mark, and is covered with broken ice, rails, boards, timber, barn-litter, &c. in strange confusion. In some places the ice is piled up like huge broken rocks, being from two to four feet thick. No human lives were lost, though a few cattle and sheep perished. Had the rush taken place in the night, the inmates of the demolished houses might have been buried beneath their ruins, or carried off by the flood.—On the 5th, the ice in Lake St. Peter moved; say twenty or thirty rods, perhaps more, and stopped. The movement sent down several large pieces of ice, one of which demolished a store house belonging to the Hon. M. Bell. The river St. Lawrence is so high as to cover the wharfs, which floated the ice above them. Other buildings are exposed, as the river is so high, and there is so much ice to be disposed of. The ice in the river is still firm a few leagues below St. Ann's.

A letter recently received at this place from the Lord Bishop of Quebec, dated March 24, at sea, announces that he had sailed that morning, and was in the enjoyment of good health.

*Life.*—Life is a fountain fed by a thousand streams that perish if one be dried. It is a silver cord twisted with a thousand strings that part asunder if one be broken. Frail and thoughtless mortals are surrounded by innumerable dangers, which make it much more strange that they escape so long, than that they almost all perish suddenly at last. We are encompassed with accidents ever ready to crush the mouldering tenements that we inhabit.

*Greece.*—There are now in the Peloponnesus 18 schools for the Greek language, with 624 pupils; 25 schools on the Lancasterian plan, with 1786 pupils. In the Isles of the Archipelago there are 31 schools for the Greek language, with 1712 scholars; and 27 schools of Mutual instruction, 3650 scholars, including the House of Orphans, and the Central School. In continental Greece a school for the Greek language has been established at Lepanto, and a house is now building at Missolonghi for the same purpose.—Globe.

St. STEPHEN. (December 26.)

This festival, and the other two succeeding, are placed immediately after Christmas, to intimate (as is supposed) that none are thought fitter attendants on Christ's nativity than those blessed martyrs who lost their temporal lives for him, from whose incarnation and birth they received life eternal.

As there are three kinds of martyrdom; the first in will, and in deed; the second in will, but not in deed; and the third, in deed, but not in will; so our Church commemorates these martyrs in the same order. St. Stephen therefore is placed first as he suffered death both in will and deed; St. John the Evangelist next as he suffered in will but not in deed; and the Holy Innocents last, who suffered in deed, but not in will.

## CHILDREN'S DEPARTMENT.

THE TEACHING OF THE HOLY GHOST.  
(A Dialogue.)

*Child.* Now, dear mother, are you at leisure to answer my questions.

*Mother.* What have you got to ask me?

*Child.* You said to me the other day, that I must not only read the Bible to learn how to please God; but that I must ask for his Holy Spirit, to make me good, and to help me. How does the Holy Spirit help me: and how does he make me good?

*Mother.* My dear child, I told you—that you must pray to God for his Holy Spirit, because you need his grace, and his teaching, and his help, to change your heart, to make you a true child of God, and to keep you in his way; and the way he does this, is by opening your understanding to understand his Holy Word, by inclining your heart to love it, by bringing it to your remembrance as you need it, by coming down from heaven and taking up his abode in your heart, filling it with peace and joy, as you are found observing his kind and gracious rules, and walking in the ways of God.

*Child.* Does God's HOLY SPIRIT come down from heaven to teach me, mother? and yet I cannot see him! he helps me and I never see him! This is very wonderful to me—I do not understand it.

*Mother.* It would be much more wonderful to me, if you could see God's Holy Spirit.

*Child.* Why so, mother?

*Mother.* My dear child, do you not remember when we were conversing a long time ago about my soul and your soul, that is, my spirit and your spirit, we both agreed that we could not see each other's spirit, with these our bodily eyes? we only see the body in which the spirit dwells.

*Child.* Yes, mother, I remember it quite well—I see your body, but I cannot see your spirit; nor you mine.

*Mother.* Then, my child, reflect; think for one moment: if you and I cannot see each other's spirits, which are confined to this one little spot, how shall we see the SPIRIT of ALMIGHTY God, which being everywhere fills the universe? God is everywhere, God is always with us—He surrounds us with his presence—in him we live and move and have our being: no human eye can look upon him; how shall we see God's Holy Spirit, when we cannot our own?

*Child.* Mother, I cannot understand how this is.

*Mother.* There are many things which you cannot understand, which you do nevertheless see with your eyes each day you live. Can you tell how it is that the corn grows when we cast the grain into the earth? Can you understand how the clouds roll along in the heavens such a great body of water in the form of vapour, until at last it falls upon the earth in showers of rain, and moistens and refreshes its surface? Can you understand how it is the dry and leafless tree puts forth its buds and blossoms in the spring, and is soon seen covered and adorned with that green and lovely foliage. We see much to admire and wonder at, in all the works of God; his works are great and glorious, and we perceive that He who made them, and who still upholds them in being, must be very great and very glorious too:—wise, and good, and mighty, above all that we can think. But it is very plain that if you can understand little or nothing of the works of God, which you can see, still less can it be possible for you to understand about God, whom you cannot see. (To be Continued.)

[From the Atlantic Souvenir.]

## THE PASSION FLOWER.

BY J. H. BRIGHT.

After the crucifixion of the Lord, the eleven disciples retired to one of the mountains about Jerusalem, where they remained all night. In the morning they discovered a flower before unknown to them; which from its singular conformation and mysterious appearance, they denominated the passion flower.

—Letters from Palestine.

Gone was the glory of Judea's crown,  
And quench'd that promised star,

Before whose light the nations should fall down,  
And worship from afar.

And night came o'er Judea; deeper gloom  
Shadow'd that feeble throng.

That now to Carmel, from the Saviour's tomb,  
Wound mournfully along.

Through the long, moonless hours, they linger'd there,  
Wet by the dews of even,  
And on the viewless pinions of the air,  
Their prayers went up to heaven.

And ever when the shifting breezes stirred  
The pliant bows of palm.

Or nestled in her tree th' unquiet bird,  
Breaking the midnight calm,

Their quick ears caught the melancholy sound,  
And a dejected eye

Amid the deepen'd shadows wander'd round,  
As if the Lord drew nigh.

And then upon their aching sense would press  
The loud unearthly cry,  
Wrung from their master in his last distress  
Of Mortal agony.

Morn glowed upon the mountain; strange bright flowers,  
Like diamonds chased in gold.

That ne'er before had shone in fields or bowers,  
Their mystic leaves unfold.

And in each blossom lo! the cross appears,  
The thorny coronal,  
The nails, the pillar and the Roman spears,  
A glory, circling all.

Then sacred flower! their grief was changed to praise,  
And drooping sorrow fled,  
Since he who bade thee bloom, they knew could raise  
Their Saviour from the dead.

Three days within the grave's unbroken gloom,  
The hope of Israel slept,  
The mournful days around his guarded tomb,  
The holy watch was kept.

And from that hour where'er thy buds expand,  
Thou art the flower of pride,  
And nature's witness to all time, dost stand,  
Of Him the crucified.

*Terms of the Christian Sentinel.*—Fifteen Shillings per annum, (postage included), if paid within six months from the date of the first number taken, which will be considered the time of subscribing; if paid after that time, four dollars per annum. Subscriptions for less than six months cannot be received; as the cost of attending to such small things eats up more than the profit. After our Subscriptions are brought in, and the first Subscription supplied with files from the beginning, it is our intention to give to our voluntary agents one copy for gratis distribution for every twelve Subscriptions procured in their immediate neighborhoods.

## AGENTS FOR THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL.

The CLERGY generally throughout the Diocese of Quebec.  
Mr. T. CARY, Bookseller, Quebec.  
Mr. H. H. CUNNINGHAM, Bookseller, Montreal.  
GUY C. WOOD, Esq., Postmaster, Cornwall, U. C., and Vicinity.  
Mr. GEO. F. CORBETT, Bank Office, Kingston, U. C.  
R. STANTON, Esq., His Majesty's Printer, York, U. C.  
JAMES STUART CLARKE, Esq., Halifax.  
W. B. PHAIR, Post Master, Fredericton, N. Brunswick.  
THOMAS HEAVISIDE, Esq., St. John's, New Brunswick.  
Rev. LUCIUS DOOLITTLE, Paspebiac, Bay Caleur.  
Messrs. T. & J. SWORDS, 127, Broadway, New York.

All Communications to be addressed to the Editor, post paid.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY G. STORES, AT THE OFFICE OF THE  
CHRISTIAN SENTINEL, THREE-RIVERS.