

THE SYDNEY GUARDIAN.

A Journal of Religious, Literary, and Scientific Information.

UNDER THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF CLERGYMEN OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND.

VOL. II.—No. 7.

SYDNEY, DECEMBER 1, 1849.

PRICE—SIXPENCE.

THE SYDNEY GUARDIAN.

CONTENTS:

| | PAGE. |
|--|-------|
| 1. Lectures on the Papal Claim to Supremacy. No. 12 | 97 |
| 2. Michael the Chorister..... | 100 |
| 3. Annual Letter of the Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland at Jerusalem..... | 102 |
| 4. Bishops in the Reformed branches of the Church..... | 103 |
| 5. The Colonial Bishopric's Fund..... | 103 |
| 6. Conference with a Mussulman..... | 104 |
| 7. A Prayer for the Queen, the Church, and the People of England..... | 105 |
| 8. A Dream..... | 106 |
| 9. The Law of Marriage..... | 107 |
| 10. Poetry—Acrostic (Original)..... | 107 |
| 11. Original Correspondence—Andehist..... | 107 |
| 12. New College on the shores of New South Wales..... | 108 |
| 13. Testimonial and Address to the Lord Bishop of Sydney..... | 108 |
| 14. Health..... | 110 |
| 15. The Marriage Bill..... | 110 |
| 16. To Correspondents, &c..... | 112 |

Theology.

LECTURES

ON THE

PAPAL CLAIM TO SUPREMACY.

NO. XII.

St. CYPRIAN, A. D. 248—258.

(2.)

IV. THE adherents of the Roman Church attach very great importance to the terms "root" and "womb" of the Catholic Church, which St. Cyprian frequently employs, and they assert that he applies these terms to Rome and to Rome only.

The sense in which Cyprian employs these terms will be determined by examining the passages in which they occur.

During the schism in the Roman Church, occasioned by the election of Novatian by a faction in opposition to the lawfully appointed Bishop, Cornelius, some of the Bishops of the African provinces who had already sent letters of communion to Cornelius, began to waver in consequence of the calumnious reports which had been spread to his prejudice, by the followers of Novatian. During this state of uncertainty the Church of Adrumetum addressed a letter signed by her Bishop Polycarp, to the *Presbyters and Deacons*, and not to the *Bishop* of the Church of Rome. Upon this, Cornelius, justly regarding their proceeding either as an indication that they desired to draw back from his communion, or at least that they doubted, and were not perfectly satisfied that his election was strictly canonical, and therefore refused to commit themselves further until their scruples had been removed, wrote to St. Cyprian, the Metropolitan of the African Province, upon the subject. His letter has not been preserved, but we may gather its purport from the reply of St. Cyprian.

The anxiety displayed by Cornelius to have the recognition of an obscure Bishop

in Africa, the suffragan too of another metropolitan, is an illustration of one of the ecclesiastical rules of the Church which tended so greatly to the preservation of unity,—viz., the notification by every newly appointed Bishop of his election to his colleagues in the other sees, and their acknowledgment and approval of his election in return by sending to him letters of communion. This, and not the approval of any Roman Bishop, was the confirmation of the validity of their ordination, and of their right to discharge their sacred functions as Bishops of the Catholic Church; by this, they were approved and recognized as colleagues and brethren by the other members of the episcopate.

St. Cyprian appeals to this as the seal of his own authority in many of his epistles, and in the present epistle fully admits its importance, and explains to Cornelius the reason why the African Prelates had considered it necessary to act as they had done in regard to him.

Cyprian, to Cornelius his brother, greeting:—

1. I have read your letter, dearest brother, which you sent by Primitivus our fellow-presbyter, whereby I find that you are disturbed, that whereas, letters from the Adrumetum colony, in the name of Polycarp, were (formerly) directed to you, after Liberalis and I had met in that same place, letters from thence have been since directed to the *Presbyters and Deacons*. This I wish you to know, and be assured was not done from any levity or intended affront. But when several of our order, who had met together, had determined, after sending our co-prelates Caldonius and Fortunatus ambassadors to you, that in the mean time all things should remain as they were, until those same colleagues should return to us, having either restored peace among you, or ascertained the exact truth, the *Presbyters and Deacons* in the Adrumetum colony, in the absence of our co-prelate Polycarp, were ignorant of what we had determined among ourselves. But when we came amongst them, they too, as others also, having become acquainted with our purpose, at once coincided with it, that so there might be no difference of proceeding in any of the Churches settled there.

2. Certain persons, however, sometimes disturb men's minds by their reports, representing some things otherwise than the truth is. For we, furnishing all who sail hence with a rule, lest in their voyage they in any way offend, know well that we have exhorted them to acknowledge and hold to the root and womb of the Catholic Church. But as our province is of very wide extent (for it has Numidia and Mauritania annexed to it) lest the fact of a schism in the city might perplex with uncertainties the minds of those absent, we determined, having by aid of those Bishops ascertained the exact truth, and obtained better authority for approving your ordination, then at length all scruples being removed from the breast of every one, to send epistles to you from all every where throughout the province, as is being done, that so all our colleagues might approve of and hold to *thee and thy communion*, that is as well to the unity as the charity of the Catholic Church.

By exhorting all who went to Rome to hold to the root and womb of the Catholic Church, St. Cyprian evidently means that they should hold to the communion of the

Catholic Church, which is the root and womb of the faith. In this case, that they should hold communion with that branch of the Church in Rome which adhered to the lawful Bishop, Cornelius, and not with the schismatic Novatian;—by which unity would be preserved with the Catholic Church.

No one who will consider St. Cyprian's well known treatise, and often expressed opinions upon unity, can maintain, with any show of reason and argument, that by the root and womb of the Catholic Church, he here meant the Church of Rome. For if he had intended this, while professing to give to those that were going to Rome directions as to the course they were to adopt in order to avoid schism, he would have left them in as great, or even greater difficulty than he found them. For there was then an open and serious schism in the Church of Rome; two Bishops, Cornelius and Novatian, both claiming to be canonically elected, and holding no communication with each other; two congregations which respectively followed and obeyed them: So that these strangers journeying to Rome must have been perplexed as to which of the two rival Churches was the root of the Catholic Church, to which, by St. Cyprian's directions, they were to hold. But his advice was clear and simple; it was, that they should in this emergency hold to the unity and communion of the Catholic Church, the root and womb of the faith,—i.e., to that branch of the Church adhering to the Bishop recognized by the Catholic Church as lawfully elected; this was Cornelius to whom Cyprian writes, that having by the aid of the Bishops Caldonius and Fortunatus whom he had sent, satisfied himself that his election was canonical, and to be approved, the Bishops of the Province had decided to send letters to *him*, i.e., letters of communion, that so all might approve of and hold to *him and his* communion;—in other words, that they should hold to the unity and charity of the Catholic Church, for as they who joined with Novatian separated from the Catholic Church, and they who were in communion with Cornelius preserved the unity of it.

The same expressions are also used in another letter to Cornelius.

Cyprian to Cornelius his brother, greeting—

As became servants of God, and especially legitimate and peace-making Priests, we lately sent, dearest brother, our colleagues Caldonius and Fortunatus; that not only by the persuasion of our epistles, but by their own presence and the advice

of you all, they might endeavour, as far as they could, and labour effectually to bring back the members of the divided body to the unity of the Catholic Church, and to knit them together in the bond of Christian love. But since the self-willed and inflexible obstinacy of the adverse party has not only refused the arms and embraces of her who is their root and mother, but has also with discord increasing and widening worse and worse, appointed a Bishop for itself, and contrary to the sacrament of Divine order and of Catholic unity once delivered, hath set up an adulterous and opposed head without the Church; when we received both your and our colleagues' letters. . . . we have directed our epistle to you.

And then alluding to the wicked and calumnious reports which had been circulated respecting Cornelius by the followers of Novatian, and which had prevented Cyprian and the African prelates from sending him letters of communion as the lawfully elected Bishop of Rome, until they had ascertained their falsehood, he continues—

Wherefore, dearest brother, when such things were written to me against you. . . . I ordered them to be read to the clergy and people. But whereas we wished for written communications from our colleagues who were present at your ordination, we were not forgetful of the ancient practice, nor sought anything new; for it were enough that you by letters announced that you were made Bishop, had there not been a dissentient faction on the opposite side, who by their slanderous and calumnious fictions disturbed the minds and perplexed the hearts of many, as well of our colleagues as of our brethren. For composing which matter, we deemed it necessary to obtain thence in writing the sure and substantial authority of our colleagues; who, in their letters setting forth testimonials worthy of your conversation and life and discipline, have taken away even from your rivals, and from such as delight either in novel or crooked ways, every pretence of doubt or dissent; and according to my advice the minds of the brethren that were tossed on the sea, poised by this sound method, have sincerely and steadfastly approved your priesthood. For this, brother, very especially we both do and ought to labour; that we strive to hold fast, as much as we can, the unity appointed by the Lord, and through the Apostles delivered to us, their successors; and, as much as in us lies, that we gather into the Church the straying and wandering sheep, which the froward faction of some, and the temptation of heresy, separate from their mother; leaving those only to remain without who persist in their obstinacy or madness, and will not return to us; who will have hereafter to give account to the Lord of the division and separation they have caused, and of their abandonment of the Church.

"Cyprian," says the Bishop of Sydney, "is speaking of those presbyters at Rome who had elected Novatian to be their bishop, in opposition to Cornelius, the canonical occupier of the chair; and to them, no one disputes that the Church of Rome was the root and mother, because they were members of it. So was the Church of Carthage, so was Antioch, and so is every lawful Church to all who have been admitted into its connexion, and are residents within its limits. Yet these words are relied on as containing proof that Cyprian spoke of the Church of Rome, as the mother and root of all Churches; whereas nothing could be more alien from his meaning, as nothing was less within his contemplation at the time. 'The discord,' Cyprian proceeds, 'still spreading, and becoming more inflamed, they set up a bishop of their own; and in opposition to the once declared sacrament of the Divine order, and of Catholic unity, established an adulterous and hostile head outside of the Church.'

"That the abettors of Novatian believed they had made him the head of the particular Church at Rome, there can be no question; but that they ever contemplated making him thereby the head of the Church universal, there is not one word in any remaining authority to prove or to render probable. The sacrament of Divine order, and Catholic unity, which they were charged with violating, was that which forbade the appointment of a second bishop to a See which had already a canonical occupant. The words of Cyprian, here, have no reference direct, remote, or implied to any breach of unity but this; of which, (if the election of Cornelius were valid,) they were certainly guilty."*

St. Cyprian in this letter informs Cornelius that he had sent his legates Caldonius and Fortunatus to Rome to endeavour, by their own labours and the epistles of which they were the bearers from Cyprian, to bring back the members of that divided body to the unity of the Catholic Church—i.e., to bring back the followers of Novatian to acknowledge and communicate with Cornelius, whose ordination had been approved by the Bishops of the Catholic Church and to communicate with whom, therefore, was to communicate with the Catholic Church. That branch of the Church in Rome which communicated with Cornelius, as distinguished from the schismatical faction of Novatian, without doubt, was to the members of that divided body, in a peculiar sense, *their* root and mother; but St. Cyprian nowhere intimates that the Church of Rome was the root and mother of all other Churches. Tertullian, in the age before him speaks of all the apostolic Churches under the same expressions. They are, he says, the wombs and originals (or roots) of the faith, (*matricibus et originalibus fidei*) De præsc. Hær. xxi.

Again, Cyprian makes use of the same term in speaking of his own Church of Carthage. In writing to Quintus, a bishop in Mauritania, on the subject of baptism, a subject on which he was at issue with the Church of Rome, after having animadverted on the conduct of some of his colleagues in the matter, the chief of whom was Stephen Bishop of Rome, he writes—"This we too at this day observe, so that when any are known to have been baptized among us, and from us to have gone to the Heretics, if afterwards, acknowledging their sin, and laying aside their error, they return to the truth and to their mother (*matricem*), imposition of hands in token of repentance sufficeth."

So also in writing to Jubaianus, on the same subject, at a time when Stephen had refused to admit the legates of Cyprian into communion with his Church, and had denied to them the common rites of hospitality—Cyprian says: "*We who hold the head and root of the one Church*

* Appendix to two sermons, preached at St. Andrew's. p. 57.

know assuredly that the fountain of baptism, which is one, is with us."

V. In the year 254, two very remarkable instances occurred of application being made to Cyprian by certain Bishops of Gaul, and clergy and people of Spain, on subjects deeply affecting the interests of the Church and rights of the Episcopate. These applications are deserving of our attentive consideration, as throwing much light upon the question of the authority of the Roman Bishops, and the influence exercised by the prelates of the principal sees, and afford very apt illustrations both of the way in which intercourse and communion was maintained between distant Churches, and of that sound principle of ecclesiastical polity so constantly inculcated and acted upon by Cyprian, that when the doctrine or discipline of the Church was endangered it became the duty of each individual Bishop to regard himself as having a direct concern and interest in the whole fold of Christ, and therefore bound to extend his pastoral watchfulness and vigilance beyond the limits of his own particular flock, and to give his succour to his fellow-shepherds in the more distant pastures—

Both of these applications arose from circumstances connected with the discipline to be observed by those who had lapsed in the persecution.

I. The heresy of Novatian having spread into France, Marcianus, the Bishop of Arles and Metropolitan of the Vienne Province, openly embraced it, and in defiance of the remonstrances of his colleagues, refused to extend communion to penitents who had lapsed. His example and influence drew many after him, and as he had not been formally deposed, he continued to exercise his office, boasting that he had separated himself from all communion with the orthodox Bishops, and communicated with Novatian.

Upon this, the bishops of the neighbouring province, (*Lugdunensis prima*) together with Faustinus, of Lyons, their Metropolitan, not feeling themselves sufficiently powerful, in the divided and distracted state of the Church, to depose Marcianus, without the concurrence of the Prelates of the more eminent Sees, wrote to Cyprian and Stephen, the bishops of the two principal Churches in the west, for their advice and co-operation.

It was not that they acknowledged any supreme authority in their colleagues of Rome and Carthage to determine the matter, but they needed the weight of their influence and sanction to their proceeding; for they felt that a sentence of deposition or excommunication, pronounced by them upon Marcianus, would be of comparatively little force, if he should be countenanced by the Churches of Carthage and Rome, and continue to be in communion with them. The sanction of Cyprian and Stephen to their act would abate much of opposition, and contribute to the repression of the schism. In the case of Felicissimus we have seen

that Cyprian maintained the authority of the African Church to decide questions which arose in its own body, and denied the right of appeal to any foreign See; but the present case being one in which the aid and co-operation of other Churches was called for, in order to repress schism, and strengthen the hands of the orthodox party, he felt bound to exert himself to preserve unity; and anxious that the same course should be adopted by the Churches of Rome and Carthage, and that the same Bishop of Arles should be recognized by Stephen and himself, he wrote to that prelate, informing him what steps ought to be taken by him, and directing him to write in reply to the letter of the French bishops, that they ought to excommunicate Marcianus, and elect another bishop in his room, and that in so doing they should have the support of the Churches of Rome and Carthage.

Cyprian to his brother Stephen, greeting—

1. Faustinus, our colleague stationed at Lyons, has more than once written to me, dearest brother, informing me of things, which I well know have been already reported to you, as well by him as by the rest of our fellow-bishops settled in the same province, namely, that Marcianus, of Arles, has joined himself to Novatian, and has departed from the unity of the Catholic Church, and from the concord of our body and priesthood. . . . Wherefore it is our part, dearest brother, to supply our counsel and assistance, who, considering the divine clemency, and holding the balances in the Government of the Church, do so exercise towards sinners a vigorous authority, as yet not to deny the medicine of the Divine goodness and mercy in raising the falling and curing the wounded.

2. Wherefore it is your duty to write a very explicit letter to our fellow-bishops in Gaul, that they no longer suffer the forward and proud Marcianus, an enemy both to the mercy of God and the salvation of the brethren, to insult over our College, because he seemeth as yet not to be excommunicated by us, who this long while boasts and publishes that, siding with Novatian and following his frowardness, he has separated himself from our communion; whereas Novatian himself, whom he follows, has been long ago excommunicated and adjudged an enemy to the Church; and when he sent legates to us in Africa, desiring to be admitted to our communion, he received in answer our sentence from a council of very many of us priests here present, that he had by his own act put himself without, and that by none of us could he be received to communion who had attempted to erect a profane altar, and to set up an adulterous chair, and to offer sacrilegious sacrifices in opposition to the true priest, to Cornelius, ordained a bishop in the Catholic Church by the judgment of God and the suffrages of the clergy and people. . . . How idle were it, dearest brother, when Novatian has been lately repulsed and cast back, and excommunicated by the priests of God throughout the world, were we now to suffer his flatterers still to mock us, and to judge respecting the majesty and dignity of the Church. Let letters be addressed from you to the province, and to the people dwelling at Arles, by whom Marcianus being excommunicated, another may be substituted in his room.*

3. For therefore, dearest brother, is the body of bishops so large, united together by the glue of mutual concord and the bond of unity, that if any of

our College should attempt to introduce heresy, and to rend and lay waste the flock of Christ, the rest may come in aid, and, as good and merciful shepherds, gather the Lord's sheep into the fold. For what if any port on the sea shall by breaches in its defences be laid open to storms and hazardous for ships, do not sailors direct their ships to other neighbouring ports, where is a safe approach and easy entrance, and a secure station? If on a road any inn is found to be beset and occupied by robbers, so that whoever enters is a prey to the attacks of those who there lay wait, do not travellers, when this its character is known, seek other safer inns in their journey, where are trustworthy hostelry and lodgings which betray not the wayfarer? This ought now to be so with us, dearest brother, that we should receive to us with kind and prompt humanity such of our brethren as, tossed amidst the rocks of Marcianus, seek the safe harbour of the Church, and that we provide such an inn for travellers, as is that in the Gospel, where they who have been maimed and wounded by robbers may be taken in and cherished and protected by the host.

4. For what greater or better office have bishops than by diligent solicitude and wholesome remedies to provide for cherishing and preserving the sheep? . . . Since the Lord threateneth those shepherds by whom the sheep are neglected and perish, what else do it behoove us to do, dearest brother, than to manifest all diligence in gathering together and restoring the sheep of Christ. . . . for although we are many shepherds, yet we feed one flock. . . . Since then Marcianus has joined himself to Novatian, let him not pronounce but receive sentence, nor act as the judge of the College of Bishops, for that himself has by all the bishops been judged.

5. For the glorious honour of our predecessors, the blessed martyrs Cornelius and Lucius, must be upheld, whose memory since we honour, much more ought you, dearest brother, to honour and uphold it by your weight and authority, who have been set in their stead and as their successor. For they, full of the spirit of God, and in the midst of a glorious martyrdom, pronounced that peace should be granted to the lapsed, and by their letters sealed it, that, penance done, the fruits of communion and peace are not to be denied; which same thing we all every where, every way pronounced. For there could not be a diverse sense among us in whom is one spirit; and, therefore, it is plain that he does not hold the truth of the Holy Spirit with the rest, who we see, thinks diversely. Signify plainly to us, who has been substituted at Arles in the room of Marcianus, that we may know to whom we should direct our brethren, and to whom write.

I bid you, dearest brother, ever heartily farewell.

It seems difficult to conceive how any one who has not a theory to support can read this letter, and consider the object for which it was written, and the tone which pervades it, without coming to the conclusion that it is utterly irreconcilable with the idea of any feeling of inferiority on the part of the writer to the person whom he is addressing.

1. Throughout the letter St. Cyprian speaks of himself as equally concerned with Stephen in maintaining unity and repressing schism.

It is ours, dearest brother, (not your duty only as Bishop of Rome, but the duty of all of us Christian Bishops,) to advise and come in aid, who hold the balances in the government of the Church.

For therefore, dearest brother, is the body of bishops so large, united together by the glue of mutual concord and the bond of unity, that if any of our College should attempt to introduce heresy, and to rend and lay waste the flock of Christ, the rest may come in aid, and as the good and merciful shepherds, gather the Lord's sheep into the fold.

This ought now to be so with us, that we should receive to us such of our brethren as seek the safe harbour of the Church.

For, although we are many shepherds, yet we feed one flock. . . . nor should we suffer our brethren to be despised.

And the reason which he assigns why the number of bishops was so great, viz., in order that if one of the body should attempt to introduce heresy, and to create division in the Church, the rest might

interfere, and thus truth and unity might be preserved by the exertions of the sound members of the Episcopal College, and the metaphors by which he illustrates his argument,—the safe harbours or inns to which ships or travellers might resort in seasons of perils,—are all opposed to the Roman Theory of any Supreme Head and Judge of controversy in the age in which Cyprian lived, for if he had recognised Stephen to be this Divinely appointed guide and pastor, it is inexplicable that in writing to him he should have omitted all reference to him as the Universal Pastor to whom was committed plenary power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church, and have addressed him as one of many shepherds, all having a common interest in, and equally bound to protect and succour the flock; if the Roman Theory be true, I see not how Cyprian can be vindicated from the charge of having addressed his Superior in terms most derogatory to his lawful authority.

2. St. Cyprian, so far from giving evidence of any thing like inferiority in this letter to the Roman Bishop, assumes a certain tone of superiority, not the superiority of one greater in office or authority, but the moral superiority of a man who is urging his equal to perform a duty which he had neglected.

It behooves you to write a very full letter to our fellow-bishops. Let letters be addressed from you to the Province and to the people dwelling at Arles.

Signify plainly to us who has been substituted at Arles in the room of Marcianus.

The imperative tone of these expressions would be strangely inconsistent and inexplicable, upon the supposition that St. Cyprian knew that he was addressing the Supreme Head of the Church, to whom he owed obedience as his Divinely appointed guide and superior, but it is quite consistent with the earnest and vehement character of St. Cyprian in writing to an equal and colleague who had been somewhat remiss in discharging the duties of his office.

3. The letter of St. Cyprian cannot fairly be construed to imply that in his opinion the deposition of Marcianus and the election of his successor depended on the will of Stephen, and was to be effected by the mere intimation of his will to the Gallic Bishops.

The co-operation and assistance of the Bishops of Carthage and Rome was solicited by the Gallic Bishops in the distracted state of their Church, in order that Marcianus, finding himself discountenanced and his communion renounced by such eminent bishops abroad, might be more easily deposed from his office at home; but that co-operation and assistance was equally sought in the Church of Carthage as of Rome. Stephen had neglected to send any reply to the application of Faustinus and the other Gallic Bishops; St. Cyprian had already done so, and had expressed his entire concurrence in the deposition of Marcianus, and his rejection of his communion; and upon Stephen's

* *Dirigantur in provinciam, et ad plebem Arelatensem a te litteræ, quibus abesto Marciano, &c.* . . . "It is plain," argues the Bishop of Sydney, "that *quibus* does not mean by which (letters), but by whom; i.e., the bishops, clergy, and people of the province. For are we to suppose Cyprian guilty of so much inconsistency as first to suggest that Stephen should by letters admonish the Bishops of Gaul that they should not permit Marcian any longer to disgrace their order (which is to say in other words that it was their duty to put an end to the scandal by excommunicating and deposing him) and yet, by the very same letters, Stephen should himself remove the offender, and institute a successor?"

delay he writes to him not to consult him in regard to the question of deposition, but to remind him of the duty which he owed to his fellow-bishops to assist them in their difficulty, and to urge him to lose no time in following the course which he himself had already adopted,—viz., to write to the Gallic Bishops expressing the judgment—the judgment of the Roman Church, that Marcianus ought to be deposed and another substituted in his place.

It is your duty to send a very explicit letter to our fellow-bishops in Gaul, that they no longer suffer the froward and proud Marcianus to insult over our College, because he seemeth as yet not to be excommunicated by us.

The letter of St. Cyprian implies no recognition of any paramount authority or supremacy in Stephen, nor does he call upon him to exercise any power which he himself could not, and had not exercised; his letter and application to the Roman Bishop is in exact accordance with our every-day actions, when we have recourse to others to promote our views, or to act in concert with us, without acknowledging in the slightest degree any right or power in them to control or dictate to us.

4. Great stress is laid by Romanists upon an expression in Cyprian's letter, in which he evidently attaches much weight to the judgment and co-operation of Stephen; and undoubtedly he does so, for the concurrence of the bishops of the principal Church, in the deposition of Marcianus, was of very great moment; but Cyprian furnishes another reason why Stephen should so particularly have been applied to, and that is, because he was the successor of Cornelius and Lucius, who had already condemned the errors which Marcianus was endeavouring to perpetuate, and occupied the chair of that Church which had suffered so deeply from these very errors.

While, therefore, it was the duty of all bishops to lend their assistance, it was particularly incumbent upon him, who, as succeeding to the episcopate of Cornelius and Lucius, was, beyond all others, bound to honour their memory by upholding their decision.

For the glorious honour of our predecessors, the blessed martyrs Cornelius and Lucius, must be upheld; whose memory, since we honour, much more ought you... who have been set in their stead, and as their successor.

In bringing my enquiries into this transaction to a close, I gladly avail myself of the observations of the two learned Romanist theologians, Dupin, and Rigalt. Dupin makes the following comments upon this letter of St. Cyprian.

"Baronius and some other writers make use of this letter to exalt the power of Rome, but it is not to the purpose; for,

"1. St. Cyprian directs Stephen to do what he himself could do and had done.

"2. The Bishops of Gaul had written to St. Cyprian, as well as to Stephen.

"3. They applied to them, because Marcianus alleged in his defence that these bishops, (Cyprian and Stephen,) had not excommunicated him.

"4. St. Cyprian does not direct Stephen

to cite Marcianus, or to depose him, but only to declare him separated from his communion, and to write to the people of Arles to elect another bishop, inasmuch as he was notoriously excommunicated and deposed, since he had joined himself to Novatian, who was out of the Church.

5. He does not base the obligation which was upon Stephen to write to the bishops of Gaul upon his authority, but only upon the brotherly love which all bishops ought to have for each other, and upon the unity of the episcopate."

Rigalt, in his notes on this letter, writes—

"In the case of Marcianus of Arles, if the right of excluding from communion or excommunicating pertained to the Roman Bishop alone, why does Faustinus, the Bishop of Lyons, signify once and again to Cyprian, the Bishop of Carthage, who lived at so great a distance, the things concerning Marcianus, which he with the Bishops of the province had already signified to Stephen, who was much nearer, and the first of all bishops: it must be answered, either that this was done on account of the negligence of Stephen, or, what appears more probable, on account of the discipline which was then in force in the Church, that all the neighbouring bishops, but especially the bishops of the most illustrious cities, should take counsel together for the common good of the Church, and see that Christianity received no damage. Hence it was, that, upon the wickedness of Marcianus of Arles, the Bishop of Lyons wrote letters to the Bishops of Rome and Carthage, and that he (Carthage) being the most remote, wrote to the Bishop of Rome, as being a brother and colleague, who, being nearer, might more easily take cognizance of, and determine, in the matter."

MICHAEL THE CHORISTER.

BY THE REV. F. E. PAGET.

MICHAEL HEATH, the little boy I am going to tell you about, was nine years old; and his father was a stonemason, living in the city of E—.

E— is a large place; and Michael's father had gone to live there, because he thought he should get more work there than he could in the little village where he had served his apprenticeship. There is a very fine cathedral at E—; and when James Heath had been living there some little time, it was determined to repair and put in order some parts of this cathedral; and James being known to be very clever about the fine parts of his trade, such as mending stone carving, and cleaning it, and making new pieces where any part was broken, was employed with some other workmen in this good work. I dare say you all know what a cathedral is; and perhaps some of you may have seen one, or a picture of one; but in case you should not, I will tell you a little about cathedrals. They are very large, and generally much finer and more beautiful than most other churches. Most cathedrals are built in the shape of a cross, and many are full of richly carved stone or wood work, and have the windows filled with painted glass, on which is represented the Life of our Blessed Lord, or the holy Apostles and Saints. In the towns where the cathedrals are, the bishop of that part generally lives; and in the cathedrals he ordains priests and deacons. Some of the cathedrals in England have not been in years past always properly taken care of, and their beautiful ornaments have become decayed and broken; and so it was in E— cathedral, when James Heath was set to work to repair some of the stone work about the altar. Now Michael was one of a large family; and though he went to a Sunday-school, he was so useful to his mother

in looking after his little brothers and sisters, and in turning the mangle which she kept, that he did not go to any school in the week. One little sister, about two years younger than himself, he loved above all the rest. Poor little Annie was quite blind; and the doctor had told Mrs. Heath that he did not think she would ever see. It made Michael very unhappy when his mother told him this, because he had always hoped that some day little Annie would look up at him, and know his face, as she now knew his step and his voice. But when his first sorrow passed away, he said, "Well, Annie, when I grow up, you shall live with me, and I will work for you; for you will never be able to go to service like cousin Sarah." And though Michael was as fond of play as most boys, and perhaps rather fonder, he would sometimes stay for hours with Annie, and try his best to amuse her, and take her out into the fields to walk, rather than play about with his friends. And Mrs. Heath said she did not care where Annie was, if Michael was with her.

When his father went to work at the cathedral, Michael often went to him to walk home with him; and he used to admire the beautiful building, and walk about, wondering at its size, whilst he was waiting for his father. Sometimes Annie went with him; and then he used to long more than ever that she could see, because he could not make her understand what it was he admired so much.

One day his mother said to him, "Michael, go to father and tell him Mr. Hadden wants to see him about the font he is making for him, and he is to go there when he leaves work; if you run quick you'll get there before service-time; your father works on the outside while service is going on, and then you can't get at him, he's up so high in the tower, he tells me."

"But, mother," said Michael, "is there service every day at the cathedral? Father said something about stopping work for the prayers yesterday."

"Yes, to be sure there is," said Mrs. Heath, "and when I lived with Mr. Hadden's mother, I used to go pretty often, and I wish I could now; but I haven't time. Now run along, Michael, and make haste back; for I want you to mangle a bit."

So Michael ran off; but it was a hot day, and soon his running became walking, and then he met George Taylor, a boy whom he knew, and began talking to him; and I am sorry to say he forgot all about his mother's hurry; and when at last he did remember it, he began to think that he must be rather late; so he went on as fast as he could. He found the door of the cathedral shut, but it opened when he pushed it; and then he knew the service was begun, for he heard no hammers, but the voice of the clergyman, and the sweet tones of the choristers, as they repeated the Confession after him. The part of the church where the service is performed in cathedrals is screened off from the rest, so that unless you go inside that part you do not see the congregation or the ministers; and Michael was in this outer part. If you look at your Prayer-book you will see that some parts of the service are ordered to be said or sung, as, for example, the psalm, "O come, let us sing unto the Lord" (and all the psalms), and these are sung in cathedrals; and besides that, there is an old custom, which is still kept up, by which the prayers are said in a way which is called plain chanting. It is a sort of singing, but with scarcely any tune, and without any organ or other instrument being played at the same time. It is very beautiful to hear; indeed, I think if you were to hear the psalms and hymns chanted, you would agree with me that it puts one in mind of what we read in the Bible of the angels singing praise to God in heaven.

Michael had never heard any thing like it before; and as he stood still, hushed and quiet, he felt as if he could have listened for ever. Presently the organ began to play, and the noise roused him. He forgot all about his message, and crept quietly up the church to the gate of the choir, as the part where the prayers are said is called. There he stood looking in, and longing to be one of the little boys in white surplices, who sung so beautifully. Michael knew how to behave at church; for Miss Hadden, the lady to whose class he belonged in the Sunday-school, had tried to make him and the other children understand how wicked it is to laugh, and talk, and play, when we are in God's house; so he knelt down outside, when he saw the people in the choir kneel, and tried to follow with his voice as they chanted. He did not go in, because he was ashamed to be seen coming in after prayers had begun. When the people came out, he stood on one side, and presently he saw Miss Hadden, for she always went to prayers when she could; and she came to him and said, "I am glad to see you at church, Michael;" and then she passed on; for she did not like to talk in church.

Michael, who loved his kind teacher, longed to go after her, and ask her about the little boys in white; but he thought he must tell her of his having disobeyed his mother, and of his being in church by accident, as it were; and he was ashamed of that. He went out, and found his father, and gave his message: then he said, "Oh, father, I've a deal to ask you; may I come, and Annie too, and walk home with you from Mr. Haddon's?" His father said, "Yes, you may;" and then he ran home as fast as he could. He found his mother very angry with him for staying away so long; for he had been gone nearly an hour and a half. But he told his mother every thing, even about the talking to George Taylor; and Mrs. Heath knew that Michael always told the truth, so she believed him. And when he said, "Mother did you ever hear that singing? It made me feel so odd here, mother, in my throat," she did not laugh at him, but said, "Yes, I've heard it many a time, and I like it too; but I never thought of the angels as you did; and it didn't make me feel so; but then I haven't the liking for music that you have, Michael." For Michael had been telling Annie, he thought when the angels came to the shepherds of Bethlehem, they must have sung like what he heard. In the evening he went to meet his father, and asked him, "Why there was not singing like that in all churches?" And his father said he could not tell; but he thought one reason must be, that it must cost so much money to have boys and men taught to sing so well; but that he believed there was generally money left by the good bishops, and people who built cathedrals, to keep up the singing, and to pay for having the singers taught.

The next Sunday, when the school was over, and Miss Haddon and her brother, Mr. Haddon, (who was curate of the parish were the Heaths lived,) were locking up the books, and preparing to go, Miss Haddon observed that little Michael Heath was waiting at the door, as if he wanted to say something. So she called him in; and then he said, "Please, ma'am, it is hard to sing like the boys do, down at the great church?" Miss Haddon smiled, and then said, "Why, it depends, Michael, a good deal on whether a person has any notion of singing; if he has, with a little trouble he may soon chant as the choristers do at the cathedral. But why do you want to know? do you want to learn? I should think you might, without its being very hard to you, for I believe you sing a good deal now."

"And do you really think, ma'am," said Michael, "I could sing like them? Oh, if I could, how happy I should be!"

"Well, Michael," she said, "I can't stay now, because, you see, my brother is waiting for me; but I will talk to you about it another day." So Michael went home very happy, and told Annie that Miss Haddon thought he could in time sing like the choristers; and that if he could be a chorister,—oh, he'd rather be that than any thing on earth! but there was no chance of that.

Meanwhile, Miss Haddon and her brother walked home, talking of Michael, and his wish to learn singing; and Miss Haddon said, she had always remarked, when the children sung their hymns, what a sweet clear voice Michael had; and she wished he could be one of the choir at the cathedral; "for he was," she said, "such a good boy, and yet such a delicate one, that she feared he would never stand hard work; and his mother had told her they must send him to learn some trade, and that a brother of her's had offered to take him on his farm." Miss Haddon added, "Robert, you can't think how beautifully Michael watches and tends his little blind sister, and teaches her every thing he learns himself."

"Oh, Mary," said Mr. Haddon, "I know he's a great pet of yours; and if you really think he has a turn for singing, I believe I could get him into the choir; for the organist told me one of the boys was going to leave in a few months, and if I had any boy in my school whose name I should like to have put down to be tried at the end of that time, there was a good chance of his getting in. And so, if you like to train Michael a little, I will have his name put down; for I agree with you, that he is not strong enough for a labourer, and I should like to do a good turn by James Heath. I have a great respect for him; he's one of the best men in the parish, and has a large family."

And so it was arranged. The next day Miss Haddon went to Mrs. Heath, and told her what she and her brother proposed to do, if they liked it. The Heaths were very glad to have it so, as they had not intended Michael to go to his uncle till after the winter, and no time was lost if he did not

get into the choir. Michael's delight was too great for him to say much; but Miss Haddon saw by his flushed face and sparkling eyes how much he felt. It was now August, and in October the trial for the place among the singing boys was to take place. Michael was to go to Miss Haddon's two or three times a week to be taught till that time.

Happy weeks those were for Michael; the more he learnt, the more did he love what he was learning; and even Miss Haddon was surprised to find how clever he was. But though she saw that he got on much better than she expected, Miss Haddon talked very often to him about its only being a chance after all, whether he got in or not; and she tried to prepare him for being disappointed, because, she told him, many other boys would most likely try too, and they might know much more than he did. From the day that Michael went to the cathedral, as I have told you, he was to be seen at prayers, whenever he could get his mother's leave to go; and little Annie was always with him. Some of Mrs. Heath's neighbours said to her, "They wondered she liked her children to be always going to church so; they thought such children never lived." But she said, "she did not see that going to church could kill them a bit sooner; and as for the rest, Michael was quite a different boy lately to what he used to be. He was not half as passionate, and much more careful of what was said to him; and she thought going to church had made the change." And so it was. Often when a hasty or passionate word or thought came across Michael, some verse in a Psalm or in one of the Lessons would come into his mind and stop him from saying it.

October came, and the day of trial. There were three other boys besides Michael, who wished to be choristers, but Michael was taken; for his voice was so sweet, that it made up for his not knowing quite as much as one of the others. When he was told this, he was so happy that he could hardly believe it; and he could not make up his mind which way to run first—to Miss Haddon, or home. But happily he had not to choose; for he met Miss Haddon just at the door. "Oh, ma'am, Miss Haddon, I shall be a chorister after all!" he said; turning very red as he added, "and all through you. Oh, if I could thank you properly! but mother will; for I don't know how to say it."

Miss Haddon looked almost as pleased as he was, and said: "Well, Michael, I am very glad you have not failed in the trial; only prove to me that you remember what I have taught you, by being a good boy, and I shall be quite thanked enough." Mr. Haddon came up as she was speaking, and said, "And remember now, Michael, that you are going to be one of the servants of the church, take care you never disgrace your station by behaving badly in church."

"No, sir," said Michael; "I will try not."

"Now run home as fast as you can, with the good news to your mother," said Miss Haddon; and he was off like a bird directly.

You may suppose Michael's news made them all very glad at home; and he could hardly keep quiet till his father came from work; he was so anxious to tell him. So when it was nearly time, his mother said he might take Annie, and go to meet him. And when he saw his father a good way off, he was very much tempted to leave Annie standing, and run on; but he thought that was not what his mother meant, when she told him to take care of her; so he led her gently on, and in a few minutes he had told it all, and felt much the happier when it was off his mind. The next day Miss Haddon came to see Mrs. Heath; and she said that as Michael would not be able to come to the school on Sundays for the future, if he liked, she would teach him a little some evening in the week; and this pleased him almost as much as being a chorister; for he thought he should miss the kind words, and plain teaching, which he had always been used to with Miss Haddon. From this time Michael went every day for some hours to the organist of the cathedral to be taught singing with the other boys; and he very soon got to feel easy with him, and to enjoy that time very much. Besides this, there was the service twice every day, to which all the boys went; and there he sometimes saw Miss Haddon. And very often he took Annie and placed her on a bench next an old woman, who was always there, and who was very kind to her. This she liked exceedingly; and as Michael had taught her many parts of the service by heart, such as the *Te Deum*, and the Psalm, "O come let us sing unto the Lord," and the one beginning, "O be joyful in the Lord, all ye lands," she soon learnt to join when they were singing them. Miss Haddon told Michael one day that she knew an old blind lady who could say all

the Psalms; and this set him thinking that if he took pains, Annie might do it too; so every day he tried to teach her one or two verses; and she was so happy when those she had learnt came in the service, and would sing them out quite loud.

By Christmas, Michael had got on so well, that he was thought fit to sing a verse by himself in one of the anthems. That day (it was Sunday) his mother said she should go to the cathedral; but she did not tell him, because she knew it would make him so anxious to do well, that perhaps he might break down; so it was a great surprise to him when he got into church to see her sitting not far off. When his part came to sing, he felt almost choked; and something dazzled his eyes so, that he could hardly see; and he began so low, that he could hardly be heard; but the boy next him, whose name was Morris, touched him, and whispered, "Sing out, don't be afraid," and he recovered himself, and went on; his voice getting stronger and sweeter every moment. After service, his mother waited for him at the door, and told him she hardly ever felt happier in her life.

Things went on very smoothly all the winter and spring, and Michael became quite famous for his singing. This was a bad thing for him in many ways: it made him certainly a little proud, to have people asking, who that boy was who sung so beautifully; and to know that particular anthems were chosen that he might have parts to sing alone; and most likely he would have been much more so, but that his love and gratitude to Miss Haddon made him listen to all she said, and to think about it afterwards; and she told him that instead of being vain of his voice, he ought to thank God for having given him something by which his praise and glory could be shown forth. Michael was a good boy in the main, and he struggled with himself a good deal, till he got to care less for being praised about his singing.

Before he became a chorister, he used to think it would be almost impossible for him to be naughty if he were one; and how good those boys must be who were going to church twice a-day, and belonging to that beautiful cathedral. He said this one day to his father; but he answered, "Ah, Michael, I wish it were so indeed; but I think you will find out that is a mistake: I have seen some of them behave in such a way as I should be very sorry to see any of my children behave. Why, it was only yesterday Mr. Haddon and Mr. Armstrong passed close to me as they came out of Church, and I heard Mr. Haddon say he must speak to the dean about the way in which the boys laughed and talked in church-time; and that Brown, that's one of the biggest, ought to be turned out, if he did not mend." Michael thought this very shocking; and when he was first chosen, he often thought of what Mr. Haddon had said about his being a servant of the church, and not disgracing his station; for he found that some of the boys were bent on making him as bad as themselves. James Brown in particular was always laughing at him, and saying he was afraid to look off his book, which was very true; for it was only by keeping his eyes fixed there, and not looking round, that he could help seeing the faces which Brown made, to try and make him laugh. Henry Morris, the boy who had encouraged him the first day he sung alone, always stood by and defended him from Brown, who, being a great coward, was not ashamed to bully a little boy like Michael whenever he could. This went on all the summer; and sometimes Michael was very unhappy, and once or twice Brown succeeded in putting him into a passion; but he never could make him laugh in church, or draw in his Prayer-book, or take sweet-stuff into church, or do any other of the naughty things which he and some of the rest did. This made them dislike him; and besides that, they all knew he was a favourite with their teachers, and sung better than any of them. This made them envious; so that, except for Henry Morris, poor Michael's life was not so pleasant as he expected. One evening in the autumn, after he had been made a chorister, when he was with Miss Haddon, she saw that something was the matter with him; he did not answer her questions in his usual bright way; and even when she asked him what he was learning with the organist, Mr. Lawrence, he did not seem to like to talk about it, as he had been used to do. So she said, "I hope, Michael, you are not getting tired of singing; are you as fond of it as you used to be?"

"Tired of it? oh no!" he said; "when I am singing those chants, I am happier than I ever thought of; only it is not like what I used to think the boys are quite different." Then she asked him about it, and it all came out; how they teased him, and tried to make him laugh; and that particular

day Brown had torn out the leaf of his Bible which had his name in it, and which Mr. Haddon had given him when he left off going to the Sunday-school. Miss Haddon was very sorry to hear this; she had seen sometimes that the boys did not behave as they ought; but she did not know they were so bad. "About the Bible, Michael," she said, "I think I shall tell my brother; that might easily be prevented, for he would speak to Brown himself."

Mr. Haddon was a prebendary of the cathedral; that is, one of the clergymen belonging to it.

"Oh, no; pray don't, ma'am," said Michael; "I had rather not; for they would call me tell-tale, and hate me; and it would be worse than ever: besides, Henry Morris would not like me then,—no one likes a tell-tale." So for that time Miss Haddon said that she would not mention it, but that she should ask her brother to tell the singing-men, who sat just behind the boys, to look better after them.

(To be continued.)

ANNUAL LETTER OF THE BISHOP OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND AT JERUSALEM.

SAMUEL, by divine permission, bishop of the united church of England and Ireland at Jerusalem, to all the brethren, who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and especially to those who mourn over the desolation of Zion, whose heart's desire and daily prayer to God for Israel is, that they may be saved; grace, mercy, and peace be multiplied.

The numerous tokens of Christian love and benevolence which I have received, in answer to my letter of last year, encourage me again to address you in the love of our common Lord and Saviour, and to commend our work among the Jews and the Gentiles, and our infant church, to your remembrance and believing prayers, especially on the usual day, the 21st January, 1849, being the seventh anniversary of the entrance of the first Protestant bishop into this, the city of the great King.

From this retired, and during this year much favoured place, we have been contemplating the awful events taking place in Europe; and, in expectation of all the evils which must necessarily result from the enthronization of godless mobs and decidedly anti-Christian principles, we cannot but deeply sympathize with, and pray for, our Christian brethren, that God may give them patience to endure and wisdom to improve the trials to which, if faithful witnesses for the whole truth of God, they must be exposed. And, while we humbly thank God for having thus preserved and blessed England, we mourn to see so many, especially at the two extremities of the social scale, stretching forth their hands after the cup which has intoxicated other nations to their ruin. O my brethren, let us watch and pray that God may keep us from the evil, and preserve his church undefiled during this and the coming hour of temptation, and that, while the judgments of the Lord are upon the earth, men may learn righteousness. Whilst we were looking on the storm which is ravaging Europe, the rod of the Almighty was stretched out for months over our heads. Thousands and tens of thousands have fallen on our right hand and on our left, under the strokes of the cholera, in Egypt, Syria, and Palestine. It has been for weeks raging at our door at Nablous; but, thanks be to God, Jerusalem has been spared, and we still live to bless the name of the Lord.

Another cause of thankfulness, which surely many Christians will share with us, is the reconciliation and mutual recognition of the three patriarchs, the Greek, the Latin, and the Armenian, in the early part of this year. Although I am ignorant of the motives of the pasha in bringing it about, I rejoice at the consequences of that reconciliation; for, except a few disputes and blows between the Greek and Latin monks, the Christians have since abstained from those disgusting scenes of hatred and contention which characterized them in former years, to the disgrace of the Christian name. As far as we are concerned, we enjoy more and more the esteem, good-will, and confidence of the different parties. With respect to the heads of the several churches, matters stand very much as last year. The Greek patriarch and his clergy keep as far from us as they possibly can; with the Latin I am on a footing of polite reserve, and have no reason to complain of enmity, although he began, as I was told, by excommunicating those who came to us. With the Armenian, and even with the united Greek patriarch and the Syrian bishop, a friendly intercourse has been continued.

Our new church, to be called Christ Church, on Mount Zion, could not be consecrated, as was anticipated, on the 19th of April; unexpected causes of delay having occurred, which it took some time to remove. But now, I believe, there is no other impediment to the consecration taking place within a short time. It has no organ; but I take this opportunity of stating that, in case any well-wisher to Jerusalem should wish that a joyful noise be made unto the Lord on Mount Zion with that instrument, and feel disposed to furnish the church with one, I believe the measure for its dimensions may be had by applying to one of the secretaries of the Jews' Society.* I need not mention that we should all feel most thankful.

During the last year we have been allowed to pursue our labours quietly, each according to the gifts he has received. We have had much intercourse with the Jews, many of whom, in time of trouble and want, seem to consider us as their best friends; which, indeed, we endeavour to be. The services at the chapel have been as usual, viz., Hebrew service every morning, two English services on the sabbath, and one on a Wednesday, except during the hot summer months, and one in German on the Lord's-day; when I trust we have all often experienced the presence of the Lord with us, and tasted his goodness: although I am bound publicly to confess with shame, what I too often feel with sorrow to be my own case, viz., our want of spirituality, of faith, love, and devotedness to him who has loved us unto the death; and hence, no doubt, the frequent want of holy love and forbearance among our proselytes, notwithstanding the sincerity of their profession. O that God might bless us all with a greater abundance of his Holy Spirit, that his name and his truth might be glorified by us in the sight of all those to whom we have been sent!

The Jewish hospital continues to prove a bodily blessing for thousands; and it has now been placed on such a footing, that I hope it will prove also a blessing to the souls of many suffering sons and daughters of Abraham.

Although we have again had to struggle with difficulties in providing for a good number of poor inquirers, and assisting the poorer proselytes, yet thank God, through the liberality of many friends of Israel, whom we pray God abundantly to reward for it, either through the channel of the Jews' Society or otherwise, we have been enabled to supply all the most pressing wants with much less anxiety than last year. And now I am most happy to state that, through the liberality of the Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, the House of Industry will immediately be re-opened; from which, with God's blessing, I expect the most beneficial results; while we shall be relieved from one of our heaviest burdens, although there will still be many cases which the necessary rules of an institution must exclude from the benefit, and which must, therefore, be remedied in another way.

We have now fourteen inquirers, who have already left the Jews, most of whom are now receiving regular instruction, preparatory to their being baptized. Five of them, who had no means of earning their livelihood, have been placed with trades-masters as apprentices, in consequence of a resolution I was obliged to adopt, viz., that no adult person, in the enjoyment of health, is to be baptized until he can earn at least a part of his daily bread. A shochet, Shufawi, the only Jew baptised here during the year, has given a good example by his willingness to learn a trade. Two others, inferior to him in every respect, who had been prepared for baptism with him, I refused to baptize, because they refused to learn any trade practicable here; and they went away, one to Constantinople, in search of some person willing to baptize him on different conditions; the other, rabbi Jacob, has since returned, and is now apprenticed with a tailor. Now, I hope it is a thing understood by the Jews, that those who become Christians, must "eat their bread by the sweat of their faces."

Besides the two Bible-readers employed by the Jews' Society, who have the charge of the ever more important Bible-depot at Jerusalem and Jaffa, I have continued to employ three others; one among the Christians of Jerusalem, and one among the Arabs of different places. I am expecting a fourth from Beyrout, chiefly to visit the towns of this country. This work has not been without fruits in Jerusalem, in removing prejudices both from the Jews and the Christians. But it is chiefly at Nablous and on the mountains of Samaria that the labours have been

blessed. In those parts there is a great movement, hunger, and thirst, after the word of life, from which I cannot but expect happy results. When one of these scripture-readers was at Nablous, about a year ago, a few individuals began to read and to search the scriptures; and in the spring, last Easter, several of them came to witness our church services; but they were rather reserved. However, a few weeks later I received a letter from Nablous, signed by many individuals, who stated that they had resolved to come out of the Greek church (or, as they said, the church of the patriarch), in which if they remain they and their children must perish for lack of knowledge, &c., and that they had agreed to constitute themselves into an evangelical church, taking the word of God for their guide, and to place themselves under my superintendence. To this I replied that, although I was most willing to help them on as far as practicable in their search after the truth of the gospel, I could not approve of their leaving their church at present; that the only advice I could give them was for them to continue reading the word of God with prayer, taking it for the guide of their whole life; and thus to abide in their church until they be driven out for the gospel's sake, if it should come to that. After exchanging a few more letters, one of the missionaries went with an intelligent native Christian to investigate the matter; and they found, as was to be expected, that the people had, as yet, but a scanty knowledge of scriptural truth; of which, however, they seem to be deeply sensible; and that the heads of families, representing about seventy souls (of the 400 Greek Christians of the place), had signed a mutual promise to keep together in searching the scriptures, and especially in endeavouring to have their children educated according to the pure word of God; and that there were others similarly disposed, but who, from motives of prudence, had not yet been requested to sign the paper. A little later they addressed to me a petition, signed by above a dozen heads of families, breathing a modest and altogether scriptural spirit, in which they intimated that they would remain in connexion with the Greek church; but praying most earnestly that I would pity their children, and provide them with the means of giving them a scriptural education, the want of which they so deeply felt for themselves. Upon this, considering all the circumstances, I was led to and did immediately purchase a house sufficiently large for a boys' and girls' school, and a dwelling for the master's family; and I appointed an intelligent, promising young man, originally from Nazareth, but living at Nablous, as schoolmaster, under the superintendence of the two most influential Christians of the place.

On the 5th of September the school was opened, with twenty-one boys. But on the next following Lord's-day a most fulminating excommunication was read in the church, in the name of the Greek patriarch, against all those who should continue to send their children to what was called the English school, with the threat that, although they should afterwards repent, they could never be re-admitted into the (so called) orthodox church. (I have some reason to suppose that the patriarch was not aware of all the bitter contents of the excommunication, since he understands but little Arabic; but why does he not learn the language of his flock?) The effect of the anathema, which in fact was against the Bible alone, was different from what had been expected; for the next day several persons joined our friends, and asked leave to send their children to the school. At that time the cholera appeared at Nablous; and all correspondence has been all but interrupted. I learn, however, that the school has continued uninterrupted, although the father of the schoolmaster has died, with two other of our friends. I hear also that several isolated Christians inhabitants of the mountains of Samaria are about to remove to Nablous, in order to have their children educated in our school, which now numbers twenty-five boys.

I have thus dilated on this subject, not only because incorrect reports may be spread and reach England, but chiefly in order to commend those poor people, of whom I will affirm nothing, except that they are earnestly seeking God and his truth, to the intercession of God's believing people. I must also, on this occasion, state my conviction that, whatever theoretical difference there may be between the Greeks and the papists, practically the former have quite as many errors as the latter, and much less of gospel truth. However, it is not chiefly with errors, properly so called, that we have to struggle among the Christians of this country; but it is with the grossest ignorance, in which priests and laymen are allowed to live and to die.

In my letter of last year, I observed that we were about to open a diocesan boarding and day school at

* Since the above was written, a Christian friend has signified her intention to give an organ to the Church.

Jerusalem, under the care and tuition of an excellent English lady. The school was opened on the 10th of November, 1847, with ten or twelve children of both sexes. It has since increased to the number of twenty-six on the list; but there have never been more than eighteen at once. The reason of this is, that the Jewish parents who wish to have their children instructed send them to our school for one, two, or four months, until they are prevailed upon by their friends and rabbies to take them back; but, as this is invariably done against the will of the children, I am confident that the impression they carry home with them will one day prove not to be altogether lost, and that some of the seed sown will bring forth some good fruits. The eighteen children who have composed the school regularly for several months are—nine of Jewish proselytes, four of Christian, and the rest of Jewish parents. Their progress has been very satisfactory; although it was no small matter to bring them under some order and obedience. Hitherto we could only receive girls as boarders, nor had we ever more than five at one time; the Jews not being willing that their children should eat Christians' food. In order to keep the boys in order, and the whole day under the teacher's eyes, most of them, being poor, get their dinner at the school.

After several years' endeavour to obtain permission from the Turkish government to have a walled burial-ground, we have at last succeeded, chiefly by the exertion of Colonel Rose, the British consul-general, and Mr. Finn, our consul here. And in the spring of this year I purchased a spacious field for that purpose, on the southern declivity of Mount Zion, a few paces S.W. of the tomb of David, which is now being enclosed with a solid wall; and, when finished, it will be a splendid one, as well on account of its classical, commanding, and yet retired situation, as also on account of its size and form; so that our house for the dead, will, in some measure, correspond to our house for the living, Church Church.

But I perceive that this, which I intended to be a friendly letter to keep up a Christian intercourse with our believing brethren abroad, has grown to the size of a report; to which I might add, that of late I have received several applications to open scriptural schools for the rising generation in divers places; but I must wait for the means, still more for the proper men to be appointed as schoolmasters, who are very rare in this country. The school which my bible-reader opened last year at Selt (Ramoth Gilead) continues to be well attended; but I have no means of ascertaining the progress of the children. But I must hasten to one of the chief objects of this letter, viz., to express my most sincere thanks to all the Christian friends who, during this year, have strengthened our hands by their prayers and liberal contributions. My warmest gratitude is due to the committee of the Jews' Society for their untiring care, and the active attention they pay to this mission in general; for the improvement introduced by them into the hospital; for their liberal contributions to the diocesan school; and, above all, for their very liberally allowing the means of re-opening the House of Industry. I regret not having it in my power publicly to record the names (which I pray may all be recorded in the book of life) of all those friends of Zion, in England, Germany, and India, who by their liberal donations have enabled us to carry on the work entrusted to us, in its different branches; both in those branches more directly under the direction of the Jews' Society, and those which are less so, as, *e. g.*, the school, the scripture-readers, &c. But I feel bound to mention one class of Christian friends who have greatly contributed to strengthen our hands and hearts, both by means of their advice as also by their liberal contributions, and the indirect testimony which such contributions carry with them—I mean the travellers who have visited us during the course of this year; and who, I trust, will remember us as we remember them, in the love of Christ. May God Almighty, the God of Israel, abundantly bless all those who do good to Zion; and may he give temporal and spiritual prosperity to all those who love and pray for the peace of Jerusalem!

Although we have hitherto been graciously permitted to serve the Lord with gladness, and to enjoy peace in our labours, with less of systematical opposition on the part of the Jews than in former years, yet we cannot look to the future without mingled feelings of fear and hope. For we cannot but think that, by means of his actual judgments, and the wrath poured upon the nations, God is paving his way for his people Israel back to Zion; but a way, probably, strewn with thorns, through "the wilderness of the people" (Ezek. xx. 35), which will prove the grave of the rebels and transgressors (v.

38), where scorpions and serpents abound, the stings of which many Israelites have felt already, in France, Germany, &c., and the result of which falls most heavily upon the poor Jews of Mount Zion, whose wonted alms from Europe are failing.

(Having solicited aid towards relieving the temporal necessities of the poor, and contributions for schools, &c., the bishop thus concludes):

And now again commending our church, our work, and all the objects of our solicitude, Jews and Gentiles, to the love and the prayers of all those who received a like precious faith with us, and in it expect to see Jerusalem become again "a praise in the earth," I subscribe myself, my dear brethren, your humble brother and servant,

S. ANO. HIEROSOL.

Jerusalem, Oct. 28, 1848.

BISHOPS IN THE REFORMED BRANCHES OF THE CHURCH.

MANY of our readers are not aware of the extent to which the Reformed Episcopate has now reached. Many also will be glad to have a list of the names and titles of the Bishops, for occasional reference. The following list has been made as brief as possible to answer this double purpose. Where a Bishop occupies more than one See, the name of that one only is given by which he is generally known.

EUROPE.

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Dr. J. B. Sumner .. | Canterbury. |
| Dr. Musgrave | York |
| Dr. Blomfield | London. |
| Dr. Malby | Durham. |
| Dr. C. R. Sumner .. | Winchester. |
| Dr. Kaye | Lincoln. |
| Dr. Bethell | Bangor. |
| Dr. Percy | Carlisle. |
| Dr. Murray | Rochester. |
| Dr. Copleston | Llandaff. |
| Dr. Bagot | Bath and Wells. |
| Dr. Monk | Gloucester. |
| Dr. Phillpotts | Exeter. |
| Dr. Longley | Ripon. |
| Dr. Denison | Salisbury. |
| Dr. Stanley | Norwich. |
| Dr. Davys | Peterborough. |
| Dr. Thirlwall | St. David's. |
| Dr. Pepps | Worcester. |
| Dr. Gilbert | Chichester. |
| Dr. Lonsdale | Lichfield. |
| Dr. Turton | Ely. |
| Dr. Wilberforce | Oxford. |
| Dr. T. V. Short | St. Asaph. |
| Dr. Lee | Manchester. |
| Dr. Hampden | Hereford. |
| Dr. Graham | Chester. |
| Dr. Eden | Sodor and Man. |
| Dr. Beresford | Armagh. |
| Dr. Whately | Dublin. |
| Dr. Stopford | Meath. |
| Dr. Tottenham | Clogher. |
| Dr. Leslie | Kilmore. |
| Dr. R. Knox | Dunmore. |
| Dr. Ponsonby | Derry. |
| Dr. E. Knox | Limerick. |
| Dr. Tonson | Killaloe. |
| Dr. Plunket | Tuam. |
| Dr. O'Brien | Ossory. |
| Dr. Daly | Cashell. |
| Dr. Wilson | Cork. |
| Dr. Skinner | Aberdeen. |
| Dr. Torry | St. Andrew's. |
| Dr. Low | Moray. |
| Dr. Terrott | Edinburgh. |
| Dr. Ewing | Argyll. |
| Dr. Forbes | Brechin. |
| Dr. Trower | Glasgow. |
| Dr. Tomlinson | Gibraltar. |
| Dr. Southgate | at Constantinople. |
| Dr. Coleridge | late of Barbadoes. |

ASIA.

| | |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Dr. Wilson | Calcutta. |
| Dr. G. Spencer | Madras. |
| Dr. Carr | Bombay. |
| Dr. Chapman | Colombo. |
| Dr. Smith | Victoria. |
| Dr. Boone | at Shanghai. |
| Dr. Gobat | at Jerusalem. |

AFRICA.

| | |
|----------------|-----------|
| Dr. Gray | Capetown. |
|----------------|-----------|

AMERICA.

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Dr. F. Chase | Illinois. |
| Dr. Brownell | Connecticut. |
| Dr. Meade | Virginia. |
| Dr. Johns, Assist. .. | Virginia. |
| Dr. H. U. Onderdonk | New York. |

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| Dr. Ives | North Carolina. |
| Dr. Hopkins | Vermont. |
| Dr. Smith | Kentucky. |
| Dr. McIlvaine | Ohio. |
| Dr. Doane | New Jersey. |
| Dr. Otey | Tennessee. |
| Dr. Kemper | Wisconsin and Iowa. |
| Dr. McCoskry | Michigan. |
| Dr. Polk | Louisiana. |
| Dr. De Lancey | Western New York. |
| Dr. Gadsden | South Carolina. |
| Dr. Whittingham .. | Maryland. |
| Dr. Elliott | Georgia. |
| Dr. Lee | Delaware. |
| Dr. Eastburn | Massachusetts. |
| Dr. Henshaw | Rhode Island. |
| Dr. C. Chase | New Hampshire. |
| Dr. Cobbs | Alabama. |
| Dr. Hawks | Missouri. |
| Dr. Freeman | Arkansas and Texas. |
| Dr. Potter | Pennsylvania. |
| Dr. Burgess | Maine. |
| Dr. Inglis | Nova Scotia. |
| Dr. Mountain | Montreal. |
| Dr. Strachan | Toronto. |
| Dr. Feild | Newfoundland. |
| Dr. Medley | Fredricton. |
| Dr. Anderson | Rupert's Land. |
| Dr. A. Spencer | Jamaica. |
| Dr. Parry | Barbadoes. |
| Dr. Davis | Antigua. |
| Dr. Austin | Guiana. |

AUSTRALASIA.

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Dr. Broughton | Sydney. |
| Dr. A. Short | Adelaide. |
| Dr. Perry | Melbourne. |
| Dr. Tyrrell | Newcastle. |
| Dr. Nixon | Tasmania. |
| Dr. Selwyn | New Zealand. |

THE COLONIAL BISHOPRICS FUND.

REPORT FROM THE TREASURERS TO THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS.

"To the Most Reverend the ARCHBISHOPS, and the Right Reverend the BISHOPS of the United Church of England and Ireland.

"We, the undersigned, being the Treasurers of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund, beg leave to submit to your Lordships the following statement:—

"I. At a Meeting of Archbishops and Bishops, held at Lambeth Palace on Whit-Tuesday, 1841, your Lordships accepted the Trusteeship of a Fund to be raised for the Erection and Endowment of Additional Bishoprics in the Colonies and Dependencies of Great Britain. Three of us were at that time appointed Treasurers of the Fund, and the fourth has been subsequently added to our number.

"II. The total amount which has been contributed for these purposes is £133,600, which sum has been employed in the Endowment, either wholly or in part, of Nine new Episcopal Sees, and in allowances for the Outfit and Passage of Ten Bishops proceeding to their new Dioceses.

"III. Upon reference to your Lordships' original declaration at the Meeting before mentioned, and an examination of the principal items of expenditure made under your orders from time to time, we trust it will appear that the moneys entrusted to your Lordships have been wisely and faithfully appropriated to the purposes intended; and we gratefully acknowledge that, by the blessing of God, the good results which were anticipated have followed as largely as could reasonably have been expected in the time that has elapsed.

"IV. It cannot fail to strike the mind of any intelligent and candid person comparing the amount of the Fund with the Offices and Endowments permanently established thereby, that great and perhaps severe economy has been pursued in fixing the rate of Episcopal Incomes; no one can object that anything has been indulged to luxury or splendour; yet rather believe it has been thought that scarcely enough has been given to the reasonable claims for decent hospitality, and the still more urgent calls for Christian charity. Your Lordships, however, reduced the scale so low, not without regret for the necessity; but you trusted that this would have no effect in diminishing the power of the Church to call on men of the highest intellectual mark and brightest worldly prospects, to devote themselves to her call, and it is a subject of unspeakable gratitude, that your confidence has never yet been disappointed.

"V. But the work, as you originally planned it, is still unfinished, and Emigration goes on, and may be expected to go on so rapidly to increase the population of the Colonies, that we must look forward

not only to the formation of new Dioceses, but to the subdivision of Dioceses now formed, and that without the possibility of dividing at the same time the Endowment. It is our duty to inform your Lordships, that the Fund may now be considered as exhausted. Your Lordships are the best judges whether the previous observations are well founded; and your Lordships are also best able to suggest the mode, and perhaps in great measure to carry it out, by which fresh Funds may be raised, and the still subsisting, and continually increasing, wants of the Church in the Colonies in this respect be in some measure supplied.

"VI. It is important to remark, that of the whole sum already raised, as much as £45,000 has been contributed by three subscribers, one of them having, with princely munificence, endowed two Bishoprics, while 'a Brother and Sister' supplied more than half the endowment of a third. About £40,000 more was given by 160 persons, and £17,500 by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. These facts seem to show that comparatively few of the more opulent class have contributed anything, and that the class, as such, has not at all contributed in proportion to its means, nor, it may be hoped, to its benevolence and sense of Christian duty. Probably the reason is, that the attention of the public has not been sufficiently called to the existence and purposes of the Fund, nor to the decisive authority under which it came recommended to them.

"VII. We venture to make this representation to your Lordships, in the hope that you will be enabled to devise some plan, whether by concurrent Pastoral Letters or otherwise, whereby means may be obtained for completing the work so happily commenced,—of imparting the full benefits of our Church Policy to every dependency of the British Crown.

"VIII. The recurrence of the season of Whitsuntide, at which eight years ago this great movement commenced, a recurrence to be signalized, if God permit, by the consecration of two additional Bishops to govern our Church in the extreme East and West, presents, we conceive, a favourable opportunity for bringing this subject before the country, under the sanction of your Lordship's recommendation.

"We beg to subscribe ourselves,
"Your Lordship's obedient and humble Servants,
J. T. Coleridge, W. E. Gladstone,
W. H. Hale, J. G. Hubbard.
"79, Pall Mall, May 14, 1849."

"Lambeth Palace, Ascension Day, 1849.

"The undersigned Archbishops and Bishops, having received the foregoing Report, do not hesitate to lay it before the members of the Church of England, in the confident expectation of a renewal of that liberality which has already been so largely shown, and which has produced such abundant fruits. By a careful appropriation of the funds entrusted to them, they have been enabled to provide competent endowments for the five Colonial Sees—

| | |
|----------------------|-------|
| 1. Gibraltar | 1842. |
| 2. Fredericton | 1845. |
| 3. Capetown | 1847. |
| 4. Adelaide | 1847. |
| 5. Victoria | 1849. |

Four more Bishoprics have been in part endowed from the same fund, viz:—

| | |
|----------------------|-------|
| 1. New Zealand | 1841. |
| 2. Tasmania | 1842. |
| 3. Melbourne | 1847. |
| 4. Newcastle | 1847. |

And within the same period of eight years, four additional Bishoprics have been endowed from other sources, viz:—

| | |
|--|-------|
| 1. Antigua | 1842. |
| 2. Guiana | 1842. |
| 3. Colombo | 1845. |
| 4. Rupert's Land (Outfit provided by the C. B. Fund) | 1849. |

"There is still an urgent demand for resident Bishops in Sierra Leone, Western Australia, and the island of Mauritius. It is also to be borne in mind that no provision is yet made for the Sees of Nova Scotia and Montreal, after the incumbency of the present Bishops; and that in respect both to these and many other existing Dioceses, their vast extent and increasing population will soon render subdivision indispensable.

"From the statement which we now lay before the public, we trust it will appear that they to whom the contributions of the Church have been confided, have been enabled to render a good account

of their stewardship. We ask now for a further supply of means, that the work may still proceed. We ask this with the more confidence, because the measure which in 1841 was comparatively untried, has been proved by experience to answer the warmest hopes of those who then devised it. The creation of Bishops for the several Colonies has been found immediately to promote the interests of religion, by concentrating the efforts of Christian zeal, both for the welfare of the heathen and of our own countrymen; by increasing the number, the influence, and the usefulness of the Clergy, and by establishing the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, in countries where previously its existence was practically almost untried.

"With this conviction 'of the sacredness and importance of the work, and in the hope that Almighty God may graciously dispose the hearts of His servants to a corresponding measure of liberality, we' once more 'earnestly commend it to the goodwill, the assistance, and the prayers of all the members of our Church.'

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| J. B. Cantuar. | E. Sarum. |
| T. Ebor. | E. Norwich. |
| J. G. Armagh. | Thos. Tuam. |
| Rd. Dublin. | G. Peterborough. |
| C. J. London. | C. St. David's. |
| E. Dunelm. | H. Worcester. |
| C. Winton. | A. T. Chicester. |
| J. Lincoln. | J. T. Ossory and Ferns. |
| C. Bangor. | J. Lichfield. |
| H. Carlisle. | R. Cashel and Emly. |
| G. Rochester. | T. Ely. |
| E. Llandaff. | S. Oxon. |
| R. Derry and Raphoe. | T. Vowler St. Asaph. |
| R. Bath and Wells. | J. P. Manchester. |
| J. H. Gloucester and Bristol. | R. D. Hereford. |
| H. Exeter. | J. J. Sodor and Man. |
| C. T. Ripon. | R. Chester. |

"The following Donations have already been received:—The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, £500; Canterbury Cathedral, Whit-Tuesday, 1849:—Offertory at the Consecration of the Bishops of Victoria and Rupert's Land, £170 8s. 4d.; Z Anonymous, 34 per Cents., £2000."

CONFERENCE WITH A MUSSULMAN.

THE following interesting Report by the Rev. S. Slater, in charge of the Calcutta Hindustani Mission, maintained by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, has been recently published by the Calcutta Diocesan Committee. We print it entire. Such discussions, when ably reported, besides their general interest, are of the utmost importance to young men who are being trained for the missionary work of the Church.

My object in going to Oolahberria was to present to the Moonisiff of that place a copy of the Questions which I have lately written on the connexion of the Gospel with Islam. A friend of mine had told me, that the Moonisiff was desirous to see these Questions, and I thought it better to present them in person, than to send them by the post. The Rev. Professor Street, and the Rev. W. O'B. Smith accompanied me. We arrived at Oolahberria in the afternoon, and immediately went to the Moonisiff's house. He seemed to understand our errand before we could address him, and asked for a copy of the Questions. As the discussion which followed was founded entirely on those Questions, I had better translate them here.

1. How does it appear that the Christian religion was an imperfect, and therefore not a final Revelation?

2. What was there deficient in the Christian Religion which Islam has supplied?

3. Is there in Islam any doctrine which may strictly be called a Revelation, other than those doctrines which had been already revealed in the Christian Dispensation? I ask this question with reference to the fact that the Christian Religion contains doctrines which are strictly the subjects of Revelation, and which had not been already revealed in the Jewish Dispensation.

4. Has the Muhammadan code of morals improved upon the Christian, as the Christian has done upon the Jewish? Please to state all the particulars fully.

5. What circumstances could have led to the belief of all Christians, that Christ is both God and man?

6. You say that Muhammad acts as Mediator in your system. Can the idea of mediation exist independent of the idea of atonement?

7. During the first few years after the promulga-

tion of a new religion, is a corruption of it the creed of the majority, or of the minority? I ask this question in reference to the undoubted fact of the doctrines of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, and the Atonement, being the Creed of the majority immediately after the promulgation of Christianity, as also at the present day.

8. If (as you say) the Christian Scriptures have been corrupted, in what books, or in what age (previous to Muhammad) may we find a correct statement of Christian doctrine? Or has this been lost?

9. Was it pardonable ignorance, or wicked presumption, that elaborated the doctrine of the Trinity out of the New Testament immediately after its promulgation? If you say ignorance, is it likely that the immediate followers of Christ should have mistaken His meaning after they had been by Him appointed teachers of the religion? If you say presumption, what was the motive to it?

He stopped at the fifth question, and asked what it meant. I explained how Christians believe the Perfect Divinity and Humanity of the One Person Christ to be the key-stone of Christianity. He made no remark, and went on reading.

The sixth question seemed to puzzle him very much. He asked the meaning of the word *kifarat* (atonement). When I explained what was meant, he said I had not used it in that sense in the question. In order to prove that I had used it in its proper sense, I made him give me the meaning himself, which he did, and then I showed how that meaning agreed with what I had written in the question. However, he denied all necessity of an atonement. I asked whether he administered justice without any reference to an atonement, or an equivalent of some sort? He said this was not in point, but did not press the matter very closely. He went on to say that, whatever might be the meaning of atonement, it was quite certain that mediation did not imply it, and was not dependent upon it. The way, of course, to make him give up this point, was to ask him, whether he would admit any such thing as mediation at all? At first he wished to deny it, saying, that Muhammad himself, before his death, was ignorant of what his lot would be in the next world. He considered this as tantamount to a denial of all mediation. I immediately quoted sufficient to prove even to his satisfaction, that the Qur'an expressly recognises Muhammad as a Mediator for his people. He tried to get out of his difficulty by saying, that mediation was only for the righteous. This was the most unfortunate thing he could have said for his argument, for I immediately asked, "How can the perfectly righteous require mediation? You admit some deficiency, and you recognise something (namely, mediation) as able to supply that deficiency, and that that deficiency can be made up by another. Now this is atonement and expiation, in the strictest sense of the terms, though nothing has been said of the matter, the nature of the atonement. So that by your own showing, mediation does imply atonement. And yet the Qur'an teaches one and denies the other." The Mussulmans are so confident of their own goodness, and so sure of obtaining the favour of God on account of that goodness, that they seldom or never think of atonement. So that when they come really to argue upon it, it is not very difficult to make them contradict themselves. This whole argument, which I have recorded in this form, was not quite so systematic and logical as it appears on paper. But I have added nothing that was not said at one time or other in the course of the discussion.

The Moonisiff passed on very abruptly to the seventh question, and showed how keenly he felt the defeat he had just suffered by turning up his nose at it, and declaring it to be written in such bad Urdu as to be quite unintelligible. The questions had been thoroughly examined, both before and after they were printed, by competent Munshis, and I felt quite certain that the charge was only made to put me out of temper, or to draw me aside into a grammatical discussion. Both attempts failed, for I merely said, that a first-rate Munshi was responsible for the language, and then allowed him to go on as he pleased. Another reason for this attack, besides his being vexed at his defeat, was, that the question required an appreciation of historical evidence, which he certainly does not possess.

When he came to the eighth question, he asked, whether we could show him the original Gospel. I asked in what language he would like to see it. The language in which it was written, he said—*Hebrew*. I put him right for the benefit of the hearers, and said I could show him a Greek Testament if he wished to see it. But he could not read Greek. He produced a copy of Martyr's Urdu New Testament, and said that it was not the genuine

Gospel. I asked him to give me one or two of the reasons that made him decide against the genuineness of the Gospels now in our hands. He would not answer this question directly, but began talking about the very partial reception it had met with. "If," said he, "it were universally received by our learned, after careful examination, I would receive it." I stipulated, that our learned also should be admitted to examination and decision, not because I thought it would lead to any practical result, but merely as a protest against such vague and meagre argument. To bring him to the real point at issue, I asked whether universality of reception was the only test of truth; whether he would believe nothing that was not universally admitted. He must have seen how his argument was getting into an inextricable confusion, for he would not answer the question at all. If he had answered it, he must have admitted that universality of reception is not the only test of truth, and then he would have no reason remaining for his rejection of our present Gospels. This would have hampered him, as he seems to have seen, during the whole of the discussion; for to say, I reject, without being able to give one single positive reason for rejecting, is the very height of absurdity. He turned off the difficulty by asserting, that we have not got the original Gospel, and that, as my questions went upon the supposition that we had got it, he could not receive them or argue upon them.

On the ninth question he again objected to the language. I allowed him to say all he chose, scarcely interrupting him at all, although he made his remarks in the most impertinent manner.

On leaving, I gave him a copy of Mr. Pfander's *Tariq-ul-Hayati*, which he promised to read.

Two days after—we had been to Panchala in the meanwhile—we called again on the Moonisiff. He was in his Cutcherry at the time, and we waited till the case under consideration was disposed of. After making the usual inquiries of ceremony, which he abridged in a very unamiable manner, he took my Questions out of his pocket, and asked how I could ask the *Mussulmans* such a question as the fifth. He said, "We ask you why the Hindoos worship idols. You may answer, that their doing so is wrong. And so do we say of the article of Christian belief referred to in this question."

"But," I urged, "you have not touched the real question. I should not give such an answer as you have supposed. I should endeavour to show what reason the Hindoos have for their practice. And the answer is obvious, viz. the express command of many of their religious books, and the constant teaching of their spiritual guides. This, however wrong it may be, is certainly a good reason for their doing what they do. Will you do the same for the article of belief mentioned in my fifth question? Do not Christians hold it because it is to be found in the Scriptures, and has always been taught by the teachers of our religion?" To one unacquainted with the Muhammadan character it will appear almost incredible, that instead of answering so plain an argument, he pretended that I had said nothing to the point, and turned away to talk to Mr. Smith in Bengali, which he knew I did not understand. And more, instead of carrying on the discussion of the same subject, he opened a totally distinct one, viz. the genuineness of the Gospels. Our previous discussion about the integrity of the Gospels had convinced me that nothing could be got out of the Moonisiff by asking him for his reasons for rejecting our present books, so I immediately interrupted the conversation, and quoted passages of the Qur'an which plainly recognise their existence, integrity, and authority. But my opponent would not listen. The argument came home more than he liked. His aim was to get us into a discussion on the most general principles he could think of. Any particulars, or quotations, he shirked immediately.

The next point was the *abrogation* of the Gospel. The introduction of this point, immediately after the former, does certainly make it appear that the Moonisiff reasoned in his mind in some such way as this,—"If I cannot prove that your Gospels are altogether corrupt, I will prove that they are abrogated, which will suit my purpose just as well." He did not say as much, but I believe this is the truth of the matter. He put the argument this way: "As the law was abrogated by the Gospel, so was the Gospel by the Qur'an." I immediately denied the *as*. The law was not abrogated but fulfilled. He affected not to understand the distinction. I quoted our Lord's express words, "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil." He urged, "Are there not commands given in the law which you do not hold yourselves bound to obey?" "There are," I said, "and your argument is good if there is no

difference between the *spirit* and the *letter* of a law, nor between a *positive* and a *moral* precept." To express this last idea I used the common words *fardan* and *wajibon*. He said there was no difference between them, that they both meant that which was *very necessary*. He must either be very ignorant or very wicked, for these two words are in constant use to express what is meant by a positive and a moral precept. However, this caused a break in the argument, for the Moonisiff was talking about the distinction of meats, &c., recognised in the Old Testament, being omitted in the New: which, he insisted, was sufficient to prove that the Old Testament had been abrogated. As he was evidently incapable of entering into argument on the subject, I contented myself with asserting, that the New Testament declared otherwise, and that his notion of abrogation was hardly compatible with our ideas of God's perfection. And in order to show him that the subject was a much deeper one than he had imagined, I pressed him to say whether he thought *all* the Old Testament had been abrogated. He said, "all." Even the prophecies, I asked. "Yes, the prophecies also." "Then," said I, "you are using abrogation in more senses than one. For it is impossible that a prophecy can be abrogated in any natural sense of that word. It may be, and must be fulfilled, and until it is fulfilled it is incomplete, and after it is fulfilled it stands as a monument of God's omniscience. But abrogated it can never be." The Moonisiff was silent, and began to read over again some of the Questions that he had not particularly mentioned before. He said, the second question was very easily answered, and he gave, as an instance of the superiority of the Qur'an over the Gospel, the minute laws respecting meats, &c., the amount of dowries, arms, the care of orphans, &c., &c. I tried to answer him, but he talked me down. I asked him to put down all these things upon paper. He promised to do so, and said, that some of the Maulvis of the Madrasa were already engaged in answering my Questions.

Before the discussion ended, he again said, that I could neither speak nor write Urdu. As there were two or three other Mussulmans present, who were more candid than the Moonisiff, I thought it as well to put a stop to this seeming superiority. I watched my opportunity to catch him in false grammar. I had not long to wait, for he made a gross blunder in the very first sentence he uttered after I had determined to expose him. I called his attention to it, and he tried to deny that he had said anything wrong. However, I made him confess it, but he was evidently very much annoyed. In a minute or two afterwards he made another mistake as gross as the first. I repeated his words immediately, and he admitted that he had used them. His excuse was, that he was constantly in the company of Bengalis and Europeans, and that their society had corrupted the purity of his language. I turned round to the Darogah who was sitting by, and asked whether he did not think it very likely that the purity of my language might be very much corrupted if I remained long in the company of the Moonisiff. He laughed heartily, and the Moonisiff seemed much disconcerted. At last he relieved his feelings by saying that *his* were no mistakes, because he had admitted them, that *mine* were greater, because I denied that they were mistakes!

Thus ended our discussion. It is worth recording, inasmuch as it supplies a good specimen of the unprincipled manner in which the Mussulmans argue with us. The reasoning of the Moonisiff recorded above, is the reasoning of a man who has made up his mind not to be convinced. And this is the case with the majority of the Mussulmans with whom I have ever conversed. Argumentation will never convert them, but still it is necessary. Our plan, I think, should be to beat them out of every argument they have been accustomed to use against us, and then to commit their conversion, in faith and prayer, to the Holy Spirit of God.

It may not generally be known, that at Atchipore, nearly opposite Olahabberia, there is a Chinese temple. We went there during our visit, and found a Mussulman in charge as the Durwan. I asked him what duties he had to perform. He told me he had to light the joss-sticks with which the Chinese make *puja* to the idol. I accused him of apostatizing from his own religion. His excuse was, that he got four rupees a month for his labour! "But," I urged, "your religion certainly would not allow you to assist at idol worship. How many times a day do you say your prayers?" "Only twice." "But you are ordered to pray five times a day. You are certainly an apostate." Our Mussulman boatman thought so too, but they only laughed at his apostasy. In fact, they thought nothing of his assisting at idol

worship. Their only objection against him was, that he had given up the appointed prayers. I found it impossible to make any impression upon the man. He seemed to think his four rupees a month a sufficient set-off against any amount of moral obliquity. I could not get him to tell me whether any of his religious superiors knew of his being in charge of an idol-temple.

A PRAYER FOR THE QUEEN, THE CHURCH, AND THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

At a time when the face of the land is covered with the expelled soldiery of Loyola; when the pestilence of Roman corruption is advancing its ravages among both clergy and laity; when the councillors of our Queen are dallying with the popery, and plotting the national endowment of its hierarchy, and the wiles of that hierarchy make Ireland to be a hindrance to the love and unity which should bind the British people together as one man; at such a time it may well become us to repeat daily in our hearts and on our knees the subsequent portion of a public prayer "used on Sundays," in the year 1580. (Two or three words in it have been altered to render it suitable for the present day.)

O GRACIOUS God and most merciful Father, thou that art the God of all comfort and consolation, we, poor and wretched sinners, acknowledge against ourselves that we are unworthy to lift up our eyes to heaven, so great are the sins which we have committed against thee, both in thought, word, and deed. But thou art that God whose property is always to have mercy; and thou hast extended thy mercy unto us in thy beloved Son, our Saviour Christ Jesus, in whom thou hast loved us before the foundation of the world was laid, and, to the end that thou mightest advance thine own mercy, in a good and happy time, hast called us by the preaching of thy blessed and holy gospel to repentance, preferring us before many and great nations to be a people consecrate unto thee, to hold forth thy righteousness, and to walk in obedience before thee all the days of our lives. In this persuasion of faith, and by him, good Father, we present ourselves before thee, renouncing all our sins and corruptions, and trusting only in him and in his righteousness; beseeching thee, for his sake, to hear us and to have mercy upon us. Go forward with that excellent work that thou hast begun in us; and never leave us till thou have made it perfect, till the day of Jesus Christ. Increase our knowledge, and give us a lively sense to discern sweet from sour, and sour from sweet, good from evil, and evil from good; that sin and superstition deceive us not under the cloak of religion and virtue. O Lord, this must be thy work; for we confess that our reason is blind, our will is froward, our wits crafty to deceive ourselves, our understanding and all our natural powers quite alienated and estranged from thee. It must be the seed of thy word, by the quickening of thy Spirit, that must lead us to newness of life, that must work in us the excellent hope of immortality, and make us to live to righteousness. And, therefore, put-to thy helping hand. Let thy gracious goodness never fail us, to the increase of all heavenly virtues and continual growth and gain to godliness. And, because the ministry of thy word is the ordinary means for the attaining of this unspeakable blessing, we beseech thee let us never lack that excellent help: let our bodies rather famish than our souls; yea, let us rather lack all worldly things than that most precious jewel of thy holy word and comfortable gospel preached to our salvation.

And now, Lord, particularly we pray unto thee for the church of England, that thou wilt continue thy gracious favour still towards it, to maintain thy gospel still amongst us, and to give it a free passage. And to this end save thy servant Victoria, our queen; grant her wisdom to rule this mighty people, long life and quietness round about her: detect all the traitorous practices of her enemies, devised against her and thy truth. O Lord, thou seest the pride of thine enemies; and, though by our sins we have justly deserved to fall into their hands, yet have mercy upon us, and save thy little flock. Strengthen her hand to strike the stroke of the ruin of all their superstition, that she may give that deadly wound not to one head, but to all the heads of that cruel beast; that the life that quivereth in his dismembered members yet amongst us may utterly decay, and we, through that wholesome discipline, easy yoke, and comfortable sceptre of Jesus Christ, may enjoy his great righteousness; that thy church may flourish, sin may abate, wicked men may hang their heads, and all thy children be comforted. Strengthen her hand, and give her a swift foot to hunt out the bulls of Basan, and the devouring beasts that make havoc of thy flock.

And, because this work is of great importance, assist her with all necessary helps; both in giving her godly, wise, and faithful counsellors, as also in ministering to her such inferior rulers and officers as

may sincerely, uprightly, and faithfully do their duties; seeking first thy honour and glory, then the commonwealth and quiet of this realm; that we may long enjoy thy truth with her, and all other thy good blessings that in so great mercy thou hast bestowed upon us, with growth in goodness, gain in godliness, and daily bettering in sincere obedience.

Be merciful unto thy people of England which confess thy name, and make us not a byword among the heathen, as our sins have deserved. Turn away thy wrath, which thy terrible tokens do threaten towards us; and turn us unto thyself; remove us not out of thy presence, but let thy fatherly warnings move us to repentance. And thus, good Lord, commanding our several necessities unto thee, who best knowest both what we want and what is meet for us, with giving thee humble and hearty thanks for all thy mercies and benefits, we knit up these our prayers with that prayer that Jesus Christ our Lord and Master hath taught us: "Our Father, which art in heaven," &c.

A DREAM.

It was a stormy November evening, the wind was howling in fitful gusts round the corners of the house, and whistling through every accessible crevice, when, fatigued with my parish duties, I drew a sofa table towards my snug fire, and having carefully folded across the heavy curtains of my study windows, to exclude all unnecessary amount of sound and cold, I sat down to study some of the most remarkable of the prophecies in the book of Jeremiah, and having long pondered on the xxii. chapter, the combined influences of the wind's boisterous song, my own fatigues, and deep thought, lulled me to drowsiness, and with those solemn words of warning, "Oh, earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord,"—filling my thoughts and ringing through my brain, I fell asleep, . . . and lo! I was in the city of Jerusalem! It was now high noon, and multitudes were hurrying to and fro, pursuing their various "ends of life": some bent on fulfilling their errand of pleasure, more there were with the careworn, busy, anxious glance, that attends on the acquirement of gain; and many, many more, intent on deeds of violence and sin; and my mind became troubled, for I saw the Lord was far from all these.

The streets became more and increasingly thronged, and a countless multitude now passed and re-passed before me, with a restless excitement which seemed to tell of unusual event, when a form appeared! how different from those of the gay crowd that surrounded him, clad in sackcloth, with ashes on his head, crying "Woe, woe, woe to the City—thus saith the Lord, For who shall have pity upon thee, oh Jerusalem, or who shall bemoan thee, or who shall go aside to ask, how thou doest? Thou hast forsaken me, saith the Lord, thou art gone backward, therefore will I stretch out my hand against thee, and destroy thee—I am weary with repenting."

At first none heeded, but as he continued crying his tone of lamentation changed to denunciation, and now some few turned to listen awhile, but these were seeking pleasure, and such sounds of woe disturbed them; others again lent attention to the prophecy of ruin and desolation, and hastened to complete their profits, lest that man of woe should have spoken truth, and they should lose lands and houses. Those who panted after iniquity, cast on him a look of mingled dread and abhorrence, and so passed on. But the man of God, his mind was filled with the fulness of the Lord's spirit, which had given him such bitter, such awful prescience of impending evil on those who would not hear, and again he uttered the imploring appeal, so solemnly impressed on my mind, and extending one hand to Heaven, and the other over towards the city and the people, he cried: Oh earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord.

The Prophet spoke by faith, he saw with the clear vision of one taught of God, the threatened desolation and ruin of that City of Palaces, the City of the Temple—the Temple of God, His chosen seat—where He has even desired to dwell that Temple which had long been the glory and the wonder of the world. Once indeed, sanctified by the worship of a true God, and the exercise of a pure faith, but now how debased! Idolatry had usurped the throne of Jehovah's worship, and the fair edifice was depraved by the presence of the scorners and rejecters of a God of Holiness and truth, of long suffering and rich in pardon and promises, One too who had never failed in one tithe of his revealed word—they had forsaken Him and become servants of Baal.

Days passed on, and still the man of God cried woe

in their streets, but no longer unheeded as before. I saw for the time with his vision, and feeling the impending destruction, my spirit struggled to warn those heedless ones, but my tongue refused utterance, no word escaped my lips,—I felt they must all perish.

Then the Prophet turned towards me and beholding a moment my anguish, he said, "God does not willingly afflict the children of men. Follow me, and see now the things that I shall show thee."

And now I had left the thronged streets, and stood in a room, where all that imagination could devise of luxury was in costly profusion, and the merry voice of laughter greeted my ear, mixed with light songs and sounds of revelry. And they spoke in murmurings and revellings, and called upon gods that could not hear, and could not answer them; and they spoke mockingly of the servants of the Lord who cried in their city, and said, "have we not the temple of the Lord among us—do not our priests still offer their sacrifices? Have we not retained the form of worship, why then should we fear?"

Then arose one from among the number, and he rebuked them with gentleness, setting forth the goodness and power of the Lord, and how His Prophets had ever spoken truth, and that it behoved them to repent, and no longer shut up their hearts against the warnings God had sent; for the day of the Lord is very terrible, and who can abide it? Therefore turn ye unto me with weeping and fasting, and bitter mourning, saith the Lord; and some drew nearer to the young man, and blessed the Lord, lifting up their hearts in prayer, and so separated themselves from the company of unbelievers, and they believed the threatenings of God's word; and the Prophet said to me, "he has still a remnant of the true seed reserved unto himself."

And once again we stood in a room, but here all was lowly, and beside the small casement knelt a young girl, exceeding lovely, and sorrowful, and she prayed with her face toward Jerusalem, and as she prayed we heard her say, "O God, thy city, the Holy City must be destroyed; Thy temple must be levelled with the ground, but must all perish? And the man of God spake comfort to her, and bade her remember the Messiah which should restore the kingdom of his Father in the Holy City. And the young girl smiled brightly as she said, "In the midst of judgment he remembereth mercy. Surely for our iniquity hath this judgment been threatened, but the people will hear; oh thou man of God, therefore cry again, cry aloud, spare not—for me, I fear nought, but my Father, must he be swept away in the desolation of the City as a transgressor? but no, he will die if the glory of Jerusalem pass away;" and the Prophet said, "he shall die first; before these things come to pass, he shall worship the Father in presence in the New Jerusalem."

Again we were with a mother and her child, and the boy spake saying, "Mother, what said the man of God in the streets?" and she answered, "my child, he warned us to repent; this city will be levelled with the dust, and the temple of thy God will be burned with fire, and the chosen people of the Lord must be led into captivity. And thou too, my child, wilt be numbered amongst the captives, but thou wilt never forget the worship of the true faith—thou wilt not forget that He is faithful who promised a Messiah—that a Christ will arise and that He will redeem thy soul, though thy body in death should mingle with the dust of a strange land. For me, I shall ere long realise by faith those glorious promises which are precious even far off, and for which my soul has panted in the midst of perverse people, and which thou too must grasp, and cherish in the midst of thy unbelieving captors. My child, my child, look to the promised Saviour; years may pass before the time of his advent. Oh, that we had lived after his coming, when the world must surely be converted!" And the man of God said, "thou hearest her lament, see now if the multitude will accept their Saviour when he is indeed amongst them."

And by a vision of futurity—I stood in silence gazing with him on the chequered scenes of the Great Redeemer's earthly career. I saw Him, hungered, athirst, fasting, fainting, weary,—yet patient in ministering—I saw Him tempted with subtle questions, shunned, reviled, rejected, despised, and betrayed—I saw that amongst the thousands who heard, twelve of that multitude alone had courage to follow him openly—I seemed to hear him say—"The Son of man hath not where to lay His head"—and my spirit ached with anguish, as I sighed, verily thou hast hardened man's heart, and his eyes are blinded that he cannot discern the good.

The Prophet spake to me yet once again, and in spirit I stood with him on Mount Calvary; I gazed on that awful procession which led forth the Son of

man, condemned by sinners, appointed to die. Amidst the execrations of a sinful multitude, stood the Saviour, whose life had been one long work of mercy and forgiveness; treated with contempt, unpitied, even in this tremendous scene. But here my sight reeled, my thoughts became stupendous, and I said in my agony, "Oh, God, avenge thy Son on such a people, leave them to their condemnation; when the man of God said, "Hear now the words of the Saviour." Then said Jesus, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The people shouted again, crucify Him, crucify Him!—but my spirit struggled so powerfully to give utterance to my grief, that I awoke, and after a time my mind became calmed, and I could trace the cause of my distressing vision as my terror passed slowly away.

But did the lesson inculcated pass from me? Oh, no, God, in His great mercy, enabled me to apply to my own and the present state of others the scenes I seemed to have witnessed, and I asked myself, "In what are we differing from the people of Jerusalem? Are we not alike given over to iniquity? Are we not sunk low in transgression? Have we not disregarded the prophecy, made light of the warnings of Prophets? The world is still immersed in pleasure, in care, in sin, heedless of God's word. Man is still pursuing his own unstable theories, offshoots of ambition, vanity, self-delusion, or ignorance, refusing to harken alike to the warnings that are even now daily crying in his cities (for we have our warnings,—warnings by lives, by deaths, by fulfilment of prophecy, by times, and by seasons,) and to the invitations of his Saviour's love; clinging to empty forms, he despises the simple faith of a crucified Lord, contending and wasting his precious opportunities of salvation, by raising prejudices of parties or opinions, imaginary as to their worth, but gigantic in the strength by which they grasp and grapple with his better judgment, holding his free thoughts as with an iron rule, warping his kindly feelings, extinguishing the Divinity within his soul as it exists in that first principle—love—and thus quenching the only human sentiment which, under heavenly guidance, bears an impress of holiness; rejecting the broad benevolence of his great Mediator, who taught us to deem all one in Christ.

How many are even now saying—The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are these! Is not our world as surely passing to an end, as did the first Jerusalem? What are the signs of the times? Are we going as they of old, to a strange city, a prospect of gloom and bondage, or pressing forward to the New Jerusalem, where God Himself will be our light, and we shall, at length, be able to understand the deathless, unchanging love, which would redeem us in spite of ourselves, and bring us safe to a haven of rest.

And who are now the prophets crying in our streets? Those who preach warning, repentance, the promised life eternal, Jesus Christ and Him crucified; those who would call to our minds that we must seek a better country, that here we are and must be pilgrims, sojourners for a season, full of travail and sorrow, that this could never be to us a home; those who point to us the glory of the "beloved city." Rev. xx. v. 9; before whose beauty all that is earthly must appear as dross, and who would urge us on to this everlasting tabernacle, where God Himself will dwell with man.

May, then, that Lord God of Israel who redeemed us, who comforted his former people in their long wanderings and captivity, who kept them always in His sight, and has promised to make them the end of prophecy, that they shall be in His remembrance *first and last*, may He watch over and direct those who are now urging on to their eternal abode, may Christ strengthen the languid steps of those who from long though sanctified sorrow are ready to faint on their way, confirm the doubting, restrain the joyful, guide the erring, and fill the desolate heart with his presence and fulness, and hasten that blessed time when it shall be no more needful to proclaim a cry of desolation, when our prophets shall speak only of peace, when there shall be no more curse; Rev. xxii. 30; when the incense of universal prayer shall ascend up to God, by an angel's hand, Rev. viii. 3, 40, and return upon our own heads purified by fire from heaven—hasten that time when the chief Shepherd shall appear, and the redeemed of the Lord shall return, and come with singing unto Zion, and everlasting joy shall be upon their head; when they shall obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and lamentation shall flee away—hasten the time of which the Lamb testified, saying, I come quickly; and give us grace to answer from the depths of renewed hearts,—even so, come Lord Jesus. Amen.

THE LAW OF MARRIAGE.

(From a London paper.)

No person can read the public journals without being struck with the ingenious manner in which the advocates for legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister contrive to make their views and arguments public. The opinion of clergymen in favour of the change in the law sought to be effected is advertised and placarded, and innumerable pamphlets are put forth for the purpose of removing religious scruples and smoothing moral objections. We have nothing to do with the parties who are at the bottom of this movement, but the most casual observer must be satisfied that there is a powerful organization in existence to force the bill now before the Commons through Parliament, and, that that organization will succeed in its object, unless the mind of the country shall be awakened to a sense of the dangerous character of the measure, and public opinion be roused to oppose itself to interested advocacy.

We are happy to receive from the vigorous pen of Dr. Croly a pamphlet on this question, in which the whole subject is discussed with equal fairness and knowledge. It opens with a general view of the original institution of marriage, passes to a close and critical examination of the Mosaic code, and then notices the degrees prohibited by the Christian Church, offering some considerations equally philosophical and Christian on the reasons which render these prohibitions essential to the happiness and welfare of society.

On each of those heads the pamphlet may be consulted with advantage, but, as better suited to our columns, we extract some passages on "The Expediency of the Existing Law." Should the language of Scripture be disregarded, and the authority of the Church be denied, the question would still remain whether it is expedient to sanction marriage between persons so intimately connected as a man and the sisters of his wife. Taking the argument in this simple shape, at the conclusion of his tract, Croly conclusively confutes all the reasons alleged on the score of expediency, and shows that even as a social question involving the peace of families, and the happy and familiar intercourse of dear relatives, there are unanswerable objections to any such change in the marriage law as is sought to be effected:

"If the prohibition of marriage with a wife's sister had been neither suggested by Scripture nor supported by law, it would have been established by the common sense of civilization. Marriage is the great support of society. Whatever tends to create suspicion, to excite jealousy, or to justify alienation, must be condemned at once. The harmony of wedded life must be sustained at all risk; or marriage, from being the happiest condition of human nature, must become the most miserable.

"But woman requires companionship with her own sex as well as with ours. The pursuits of husbands, occupied in the various professions and labours of life, necessarily leave her much alone. And, of all companions, in health and wealth, in sickness and sorrow, the most natural is a sister. As the law stands, of all companions she is also the safest. But change the law, and of all she might be the most dangerous. Even without the intention of evil, in all the innocence of familiarity, she might become a rival, and one of the most distressing kind. The unsuspecting kindness and reliance of that familiarity might influence the rambling eye and capricious heart of a husband unguarded enough to contemplate the possibilities of a future marriage. Doubtless there are many husbands who have too high a sense of principle to give way to those hazardous contemplations; and as many wives incapable of distrusting a husband's fidelity. Still the contrast between the wife, perhaps worn down by domestic cares, and a young person, perhaps lively, handsome, and without any care to enfeeble her health and dim her eye, might act strongly on an unfortified mind. But the slightest suspicion of a growing attachment on either side would be enough to destroy the peace of any wife of common sensibility.

"The case might be more painful still. A fickle husband and an artful sister are not characters wholly out of nature; and the wife might feel herself the object of contrivances (to use the gentleman's) which she could neither prevent nor punish. She might exclude any other intruder at once. But she cannot expel a sister without assigning reasons, which may produce all the miseries of a family quarrel, awake the tongues of the crowd who delight in family difficulties, and degrade the sister, whose conduct she would wish, in all her unhappiness, to keep from the eye of the world. There

may be women of strong temperaments who would meet this offence with indignation; but the general nature of women is of a finer order; and I know no probability more true to experience than that an amiable and gentle wife, stung by a sister's ingratitude, and pained by the loss of a husband's affection, might be speedily *reeved* into her grave.

"The effect on the condition of sisters if the law were changed, might be scarcely less distressing. To the females of a family, the house of a married sister may be much more than a place of pleasing intimacy; it may be a place of shelter and support. There are hundreds of instances where the whole comfort of an orphan family depends on an unmarried sister with a generous heart and a certain position in the world. That intercourse is now free and safe. But, change the law, and the intercourse will become chilled by a sense of delicacy, until it may often die away in total alienation.

"On the part of the husband, too, the natural good offices of relationship might be restricted, through a similar wish to avoid an unsatisfactory feeling in the mind of either the wife or the sister.

"And for what object is all this embarrassment, suspicion, and vexation to be hazarded? Merely to allow a few men in mature life to marry a few women equally mature. The impetuosity of youthful feeling, weak as is its excuse for folly, has no share in the chill connection. There is scarcely an instance in those marriages which exhibits any more plausible apology than *convenience*. The general reason assigned in the report is, 'The want of somebody to take charge of the widower's children.' The man was at a loss what to do with a family, and the woman was at a loss what to do with herself. So the bargain was struck; not the less gross for its gravity, nor the less criminal for the absence of all passion. It is curious to find the sectaries generally describing those parties as peculiarly 'respectable in their conduct,' as if respectability were compatible with legal offence, or morality consisted in stiffness of spine.

"The much more practical account of the case is this—the man wants a cheap housekeeper, the woman wants a cheap house. Both are conscious transgressors; both make up their minds to defy the law, to dare public opinion, and to bastardise their children. They then coolly settle down into a state of sin, which they have the effrontery to call matrimony!

"But the favourite subterfuge now is, 'the necessity of the poor man. If the poor man is not to be allowed to marry his wife's sister, cohabitation must be the only consequence.' Thus there is to be no alternative between insolent profligacy and lawless marriage! If vice is not legalised for him, he is to legalise it for himself! Such is the grave absurdity of modern Liberalism; we are to be threatened with a flood of vice, unless the floodgate is thrown open. To escape guilt, we are to sanction it!

"Advocacy of this kind can receive but one answer—that to make vice virtue is beyond the power of man; that to abolish a divine command is beyond the power of Parliament; and that the object of all legislation is to suppress, not to shield criminality. If profligacy exists among the crowd, it must be punished, not permitted. Law can yield nothing to the clamour which demands the degradation of principle. Instead of lowering the law to the multitude, it is the duty of legislation to strengthen the law, to enforce the law, and to raise the multitude to the law."

As a complete and scriptural view of the whole question, the pamphlet cannot be too earnestly recommended. The matter is important and momentous; if the bill before Parliament is to be resisted, no time should be lost in the work of remonstrance: and the soundest arguments for its rejection, based on the spirit of the Christian dispensation, as well as on the conclusions of pure reason, will be found in this masterly exposition of the subject.

Poetry.

ACROSTIC.

[ORIGINAL.]

Hail! glorious day, what joy thou dost afford,
A hoard'd be all my mind in the sweet thought,
Peace's proclaim on earth, "Glory to God,"
Peace and good will to men by Jesus bought;
Yield now ye powers of darkness, Satan wail,
O rush'd be thy kingdom now Immanuel reigns,
Hark! what glad sounds angelic hosts proclaim,
Be silent glory fills the heav'nly plains—
Justice and truth now meet, mercy and grace
Shine forth united in the Saviour's birth,—
Tell all the glad news to all of Adam's race,
Mankind know the joyful tidings, o'er the earth;
Among the nations long by sin enchain'd;
Sing the glad song of "Paradise regained."

R. J.

Original Correspondence.

[The Editors are desirous that this portion of the *Guardian* should be made a channel of communication between Churchmen on all subjects of general interest. It is, therefore, not their intention to reject any letters that may be forwarded to them, on the ground that the sentiments expressed in them are not in accordance with their own.]

ANTICHRIST.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE "SYDNEY GUARDIAN."

GENTLEMEN,—In the August number of the *Sydney Guardian* you favoured us with an extract from a Sermon, on 1 John, ii., 18, by the Rev. H. Melville. The conclusion at which that learned divine has arrived is, that the conjecture that the Pope is THE ANTI-CHRIST of St. John "is not merely unsupported, but is palpably and literally refuted by the Bible."

My attention has been lately drawn to the subject in a correspondence with a clerical friend, who considers—or at least, *considered*—that Mr. M.'s arguments are unanswerable.

I have, however, with some care studied the whole question, and am compelled to come to a very different conclusion. And with your permission I shall briefly state the arguments on which I rest my belief, that the conjecture above referred to is not only not "palpably and literally refuted by the Bible," but that it necessarily follows from a candid examination of the exact meaning of the passages which speak of that great enemy of Christ and his Gospel.

The criteria by which we may discover Antichrist are four:

- (1.) The name *αντιχριστος*.
- (2.) His denial of the Father and the Son.
- (3.) His not confessing that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh.
- (4.) His existence when St. John wrote his epistle.

These criteria I shall attempt to discuss separately, but briefly.

(1.) The name *αντιχριστος* is ambiguous, the more so as it occurs nowhere else than in St. John's Epistle. In composition *αντι*, generally signifies "opposition," implying either "strife or hostility," or "taking the place of another" person. (See Donagan's Lex. sub voce *αντι*.) The term *Antichrist* may therefore mean, "one who opposes Christ," or "one who emulates or takes the place of Christ," or "one who does both;" who in one sense puts himself in the place of Christ, and at the same time in another sense opposes him. And I am very strongly inclined to the latter explanation of the name, because I think that the choice of an ambiguous word by the inspired Apostle justifies us in seeking an ambiguous character in the person spoken of.*

If therefore I can find a person who puts himself in the place of Christ and yet in reality opposes him, to that person I may directly apply the term, *Antichrist*.

Now, this character can never apply to infidelity. In that fearful opponent of revelation there is no ambiguity. It never even by profession acknowledges Christ: and therefore it can never put itself into his place.

But the Pope calls himself the "Vicar-general of God on the earth," or "the Vicar of Christ." He puts himself and his priesthood into the place of Christ by making them the mediators between God and man, the dispensers of God's pardon and mercy. He professes to acknowledge Christ—he puts himself in His place, and yet in spirit and doctrine he is utterly opposed to him. In both senses he is *Antichrist*.

The second criterion is that he "denies the Father and the Son." How? In word? or in deed? Verbally? or Virtually? St. John does not directly say. Mr. Melville takes it for granted that the denial must be in word. But he gives no cause for this assumption. I am strongly inclined to think that Antichrist's denial must be in deeds; a virtual denial. And for these reasons:

(a.) If Antichrist is to put himself into the place of Christ, he must to a certain extent (in words, at least) acknowledge him. Therefore his denial cannot be in words;

* Since writing the above my attention has been directed to the mention of Antichrist in Bishop Newton's Dissertations on the Prophecies. With regard to the name, what he says is very striking. "The name is proper and expressive enough, as it may signify both the enemy of Christ and the Vicar of Christ; and no one is more the enemy of Christ than he who arrogates his name and power, as no one more directly opposes the King than he who assumes his title and authority." I may add that *Vicar of Christ*, or *Vice Christ*, is as close a translation of *αντιχριστος* as vicerey is of *αντιβασιλευς*.

(b.) And, what will words and professions avail in the sight of God, if the conduct proves their insincerity?

(c.) The word used in i. John, ii. 22, is *ἀπογορεύω*, "he that denieth." The same verb is used in a most apposite passage in Tit. i. 16: "They profess that they know God, but in works they deny Him." See also 1. Tim. v. 8, where the denial of "the faith" by a professor is *by his deeds* and not by his words. Thus in this instance the denial of the Father and the Son may be in deeds and not in words. We may adapt St. Paul's language. *He professes that he knows the Father and the Son, but in works he denies them both.*

But does the Pope even virtually deny both the Father and the son? I answer, unequivocally, Yes.

In the Pope's letter, lately written at Gaeta, (published in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, October 23, 1849,) we have the following. In the conclusion, after a prayer that God would spread tranquillity, &c., he adds, "In order that God may become propitious to our supplications, let us have recourse to intercessors; and, above all, to the immaculate Virgin Mary, who is the mother of God and our mother; the mother of mercy. . . . She finds what she seeks, her demands cannot be rejected. Let us call down the suffrages of the Holy Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and of St. Paul the companion. . . . in order that by their intercession, and their prayers the Lord may deliver his faithful people. . . ."

Now the mediator of the New Testament is neither the Virgin Mary, nor Peter, but JESUS, (see Heb. ix. 15,) of whom, however, no mention is here made as a Mediator. And, He "who ever liveth to make intercession for us" is the same Jesus. (See Heb. vii. 25.)

Again, Jesus is the only mediator, (1. Tim. ii. 5.) Therefore, he who applies to the Virgin Mary "above all" to intercede, and who after her applies to Peter, Paul, &c., and who does not apply at all to Jesus, plainly denies Him in His mediatorial and intercessory character. (Refer also to the encyclical letter of the Pope, on the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, published in the August number of the *Sydney Guardian*; and particularly to the quotations introduced into it from the writings of St. Gregory and St. Bernard, and the other passages.) This specimen of the virtual denial of the Son might be strengthened by the quotations of hundreds of similar passages occurring in official documents. Hence I conclude the Pope, (not professedly but) virtually denies the Son.

But does he also deny the Father? Let St. John's words answer the question. He says, (1 Ep. ii. 22, 23) "He is Antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son; whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." This 23rd verse seems to have been added to explain how the Father would be denied by Antichrist. It is as if he had said, Antichrist denies both: but his denial of the Son will be more evident than his denial of the Father. Notwithstanding, if any one deny the Son, you may be sure he hath no real knowledge of the Father, you may be sure that he denies Him.

(3.) The third criterion is that "he confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh."

Mr. Melvill's idea of this characteristic is, that "there must be (in Antichrist) an open refusal to confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. . . ." But where he got his idea of an open refusal to confess the doctrine of the incarnation he does not say. St. John says nothing about it. His words simply are, "every spirit that confesseth not, &c." These words appear to imply something quite distinct from a refusal to confess. I take the Apostle's words to mean, every spirit which does not make the Incarnation of the Son of God the foundation and chief corner-stone of its doctrine and practice, is not of God; and Antichrist is such a spirit. Confession of Christ's Incarnation is not a mere assent, but a public acknowledgment, an active work.* "Whosoever will confess me before men, said Christ, him will I also confess before my Father which is in Heaven." In this passage (where the same word is used) the confession of Christ by his people is not the mere profession of the lips,—but the giving up the whole man body, soul, and spirit to his glorious service. And Christ's confession of his people is not the mere verbal assent to the declaration that they are His, but that active energetic acknowledgment which will result in their eternal glorification.

If this be the meaning of the phrase to confess Christ,—not to confess him, must mean (not openly to refuse to acknowledge him, but) to avoid

acknowledging him in life and conversation. So in the case before us, the spirit which confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, must be a spirit which is influenced in doctrine and practice by other principles than those of that Gospel, of which the Incarnation is the distinguishing feature.

Mr. M., in torturing non-confession into an "open refusal to confess," has not shown such critical accuracy as might have been expected from a divine of so much learning.

Does then the Pope (as the representative of the Roman Catholic system) make the glorious fact that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, the foundation or chief corner-stone of doctrine and practice? No. The grand doctrines of the Gospel are notoriously kept back—a "reserve" is maintained on such glories by him and his imitators; and the lives and merits of the Saints, the value of human righteousness, and the saving efficacy of the Sacraments, are given to the people instead.

(4.) The fourth criterion is to be found in the words "Even now already is it (the spirit of Antichrist) in the world."—1 John, iv. 3.

This plain mark excludes Mahomedanism—also all future combinations of Popery and infidelity—in short all future opposers of Christ and his Gospel.

I compare with this the expression of St. Paul (2 Thess. ii. 7), "The mystery of iniquity doth already work." This is almost universally applied to the Romish apostasy—the seeds of which had been sown and had begun to germinate in the days of the Apostles. This mark, therefore, does not exclude Popery from the interpretation of St. John's Antichrist. While, on the other hand, it does exclude that infidel kingdom or community, "which towards the close of the dispensation shall vehemently oppose the Lord of the whole earth."

For the above reasons, I am inclined to believe that the Antichrist of whom St. John speaks is none other than that Romish apostasy of which Daniel prophesied under the title of the little horn, "which cast down the truth to the ground;" against which St. Paul warned his converts as, "the mystery of iniquity"; of which St. Peter spoke as a "damnable heresy"; and which, if brought in, leading to a denial of the Son of God; of which St. John afterwards wrote, as, "Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, and abomination of the earth;" and as "the great city which reigneth over the Kings of the earth."

Under these impressions, I cannot conclude without reminding my readers of the solemn language of the Book of Revelations with reference to that apostasy: (Rev. xviii. 4, 5) "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached unto heaven; and God hath remembered her iniquities."

I remain,

Gentlemen,

Your obedient Servant,

K.

Sydney, November 19, 1849.

NEW COLLEGE

ON THE SHORES OF NEW SOUTH WALES.

THE Church of England, through its indefatigable Bishop of Newcastle, the Right Rev. Dr. Tyrrell, have bought that delightful property, Roslin Castle, Raymond Terrace, formerly belonging to Mr. Henderson, for the purpose of establishing thereon a college; and it is reported that the Lyndhurst establishment is to be broken up, and transferred to the new one at Raymond Terrace. A more favorable position or a more judicious selection for such an establishment could not be made in the colony than this Roslin Castle property; it is away from the evil influences of the metropolis, morally and physically, but near enough to be reached from thence in a few hours, the steamers stopping there daily. The situation is commanding and healthy, supplying good water, fresh air from the sea, and all kinds of colonial produce remarkably cheap. Raymond Terrace will now be resorted to by families from all parts for the education of their sons, the position being central and convenient for the whole Hunter, Paterson, and William districts, Port Stephen, the Manning, New England, Liverpool Plains, &c., and will be preferred all over the colony for that purpose to a residence in Sydney.

The late proprietor of this splendid and beautifully situated property is a Scotchman, of considerable celebrity in the colony—being the first individual who paid his passage to Botany Bay, and although advancing to eighty years of age, he is still as wild and nimble when roused by allusion to his early days, as any mountain clansman of Prince Charles's brave but unfortunate army. Mr. M. Henderson, made a

large fortune, and not many years ago built a noble pavilion-roofed mansion, but like many, both here and in the mother country, has been unable to complete it. It was thrown into the market, by a Sydney company, to recover a mortgage—and the Lord Bishop of Newcastle having previously seen it, on passing up the Hunter to his residence at Morpeth, caught the happy idea, and bought it, for the purpose of founding a college, and a more elegant or appropriate site for such an institution is not to be met with any where, not even in England. The Right Reverend Dr. Tyrrell has shown great discernment in the selection, and deserves the thanks of the whole of Northern Australia.

TESTIMONIAL AND ADDRESS TO THE LORD BISHOP OF SYDNEY.

ON Thursday, All Saints' Day, the members of the Church had the pleasure of presenting to his Lordship, by the hands of a deputation chosen for the purpose, the following address, accompanied with the Model of St. Andrew's Cathedral, as an humble testimony of their sympathy, respect, and attachment; and of receiving from his Lordship the very kind and gratifying reply subjoined.

The deputation consisted of five clerical and five lay members, viz:—The Venerable the Archdeacon; The Reverends—R. Allwood, J. C. Grylls, W. H. Walsh, and G. King; Sir Alfred Stephen; J. W. Jones, R. Campbell, C. Lowe, and M. Metcalfe, Esquires, of whom, however, the Chief Justice and Mr. Allwood were precluded from personal attendance by imperative duties.

The intention of the original propounders contemplated a strictly private presentation of the model, restricted to a very few friends personally connected with the erection of the Cathedral; but when many other members of the Church expressed a desire to be permitted to unite in the pleasing work, a general invitation was issued, which was promptly and universally responded to by the heads of families belonging to the Church in the City. The long columns of signatures would occupy too much space for insertion in this paper.

THE ADDRESS.

To the Right Reverend Father in God, WILLIAM GRANT, by Divine permission, Lord Bishop of Sydney and Metropolitan.

We, the undersigned, members of the Church of England, beg leave to express our sincere gratification and heart-felt thankfulness to Almighty God on account of His gracious restoration of your Lordship to us, after the severe illness with which you have been afflicted. The cheering intelligence announced to us day after day of your Lordship's convalescence, and gradual advance towards health and strength, sustains us in the hope that ere long your presence may again encourage and comfort us, and your counsel and direction again strengthen and bless us.

In the heavy dispensation with which it hath pleased God to visit you, by taking unto Himself the soul of our dearly beloved and much respected Mrs. Broughton, we beg to express our deep condolence and Christian sympathy, but we sorrow not as those without hope, knowing assuredly that she rests in Jesus, and now rests in joy and felicity.

It gives us much pleasure on this occasion to be permitted respectfully to present to your Lordship the Model of St. Andrew's Cathedral, which has been so beautifully and elaborately constructed by J. C. White, Esq., as an humble testimony of our sincere love, admiration, and esteem for you, in your walk amongst us in private life, as well as in your exalted capacity as our father in God in the Church.

[Here follow the signatures.]

His Lordship replied as follows:—

DEARLY BELOVED IN THE LORD,

Most sensibly do I feel that our meeting this day is an occurrence which must give rise to very solemn reflections. You come to welcome me back from that which seems to God's appointment to be the bed of death; but from which, through His tender mercy, I have been restored. You surround me as friends, bound to me and to each other by that spiritual bond which has made us one in Christ. As members of the Church of England you express your thankfulness on seeing me return to my appointed share in her services, and to discharge the duties which I owe to her; let me then in return convey to you my acknowledgment of the strength and solidity of the tie which thus connects us. With most cordial gratitude I thank you for that manifestation of brotherly kindness by which the Address you have presented to me is distinguished. It is among the happiest of the privileges attached to Church communion, that it does thus render men "kindly affectioned one towards another," and if one member suffers, disposes "all the members to suffer with it." Believe me I have felt, and do most deeply feel all the consolation arising from the expression of this blessed disposition on my behalf on the occasion of my yet recent sorrow. Never, I am convinced, could such a tribute as you now offer, and as has been spontaneously paid by every class in this community, have been more justly rendered to departed Christian excellencies. But this is a sacred subject on which I must not be so vent to my own feelings, and I cannot find words worthy to express my thankfulness for your sympathy. Silence will best convey to you what I would say if it were in my power. But let me offer this remark, that the day on which we meet seems to be hallowed as it is by the appointment of the Church, that by reminding us how God has knit together his elect in communion and fellowship in the mystical body of His Son, it may give us reasonable assurance of the limited power of death; and fill us with joy and peace in believing that there

* These are called confessors (as distinguished from professors) who gave up their lives rather than deny Christ.

W. G. SYDNEY.

But care is necessary also out of doors, round the house. No heap should be kept against the house—no slops thrown out at the door—the drains should be in good repair and well flushed with water. The ash-pit ought to be frequently emptied—no cesspool or convenience should be near the house, but at the end of the garden. From want of attention to this,

the air is quite bad before it enters the house. There is no poison worse than that which arises from matter in a state of decomposition. Robust health is seldom long found amidst such. Sickly parents, weakly children, dangerous diseases, poverty and misery, and its frequent accompaniment, degradation and immorality, is the prevailing state.

There is not a family, perhaps, but can mend in these matters, and do much to lessen the evil. And it is the duty of each never to cease their endeavours, until they attain that cleanliness and pure air about them, so necessary for health. How delightful is it to see a cleanly, tidy cottage, with sweet air about it; the front, perhaps, adorned with flowers, and a few creepers over the door! The influence of it is powerful on all who dwell in such. It tends to health and cheerfulness, promotes self-respect, and induces nice habits. The children are taught obedience and kindness at home, and sent to be instructed for their "soul's health" to school. The husband finds his neat fire-side and happy family more inviting than the beer-house or its company. He and his are regularly seen at Church: they are a respectable family, and God-fearing people. How contrary this to the debasing tendency of neglect in these matters! Then, self-respect is lost, vigour of body, purity of mind, and delicacy of habits. The children grow unruly, the family is impoverished, the noble feelings which prompt to exertion are lost, and the Parish or the Union is the resort.

And, lastly, I promised to say a few words about the Family. The parent has solemn responsibilities and many anxieties; but he is in a position where he may exert a happy influence. The public health, physical, mental, and moral, of the next generation, is much under the influence of the parents of this. We have to provide for their bodies, to train their minds, and to cultivate their souls. We have to fit them for the duties of this life, and prepare them for Heaven. If we neglect this, we may have to blame ourselves for their ill-health here, and their destruction hereafter! How earnestly, then, should we use every means for the health of the bodies, the instruction of the minds, and the improvement of the hearts of our children!

We shall begin with the body. It is known that many infants are lost through ignorant management, and many more grow up unhealthy from the same cause. We cannot now enter much into this, but would briefly say, that a little reflection, and following nature, would generally guide aright. Proper food, sufficient cleansing, good air, suitable exercise, and clothes that do not confine the limbs, will tend to bodily health. And every child should be vaccinated before it is three months old. There is no excuse for neglecting this, as it now can be done free of any expense.

With regard to training the mind, and forming the character, it is little considered how soon children begin to learn. From the very first, they are receiving impressions; and much depends upon those about them. A child soon begins to drink in knowledge, as though at every pore; all it sees, all it hears,—nay, every look forms an impression. How important, then, that tenderness, cheerfulness, and consistency should be shown by those around! While you make your children obedient, you should endeavour to keep them happy. While young, accustom them to good and orderly habits, tidiness, usefulness and cleanliness.

Children are by nature prone to sin and go astray. They need to be corrected, and made obedient. This should not be done by harshness and anger, but by gentleness and firmness. Implicit obedience should be enforced from the first year: it will then follow easily. You should not be always correcting your children; but it would be cruel tenderness to pass over sins which may prove their ruin. The rod should be reserved for very serious occasions. With good management it will seldom if ever be necessary. Never correct a child in anger. There must be immovable decision, but a composed manner, patience, and calmness; this will have a good effect. Very much depends upon your own example in forming their character. "Let parents be themselves what they wish their children to be." Remember they have immortal souls: and it is only by the power of the Gospel in your own heart that you will be enabled to bring your children up for God. Oh, solemnly and seriously dedicate them to the Lord in Baptism; train them up in accordance with their baptismal vows, teach them the Scriptures from their childhood, lead them to pray reverently, and often yourself pray for them, and also with them.

With a family about one, there is enough to be done. To do each day's work in its own day, it is necessary that time be well divided and economised.

It is hard to say how much more might be done, if this were sufficiently attended to. Each duty should have its fixed time, and be done punctually. Order and regularity will save much time and temper. The spare moments should be occupied, and the hands always employed. Many little things may be thus done, and time saved daily. The plans I have recommended regarding the person, and the house, if attended to, will redeem much time, and enable you better to get through your work. Few things cause the loss of so much, as neglect in these matters; and what loses our health and our time, robs us of our best fortune.

Lastly, a family has to be provided for. Health and honest endeavours will do this. "If any man will not work, neither should he eat." Health gives time, and time well spent produces means. But these means are not laid out to the best advantage. We cannot go into this now; but sure I am, a better economy might be shown in buying articles whether of food or clothing. Things should be well chosen, and nothing bought unnecessarily. A clear account should be kept. Money should be allotted into regular portions, and no article should exceed its own allotment. A portion should be weekly laid by for rent, another for shoes, and any thing that can properly be saved ought to be placed in the savings' bank against an unforeseen expense. Much might be saved which is uselessly spent in stimulating drinks, tobacco, and snuff. It is also a good habit not to endure to see anything going to ruin for want of being mended,—this would save pounds in any family. A thrifty managing way will make everything go much farther. A handy man can always find some profitable employment for his leisure hour. The woman too can help the income by taking in washing or needlework. Lace making is a very "dead penny," but knitting can be done at little expense, and be taken up at any moment. In Wales every woman met walking on the road is busy knitting. All this will increase your means, and better enable you to live in a healthy house, and bring up the family well. The following rules are useful:—

1. Do everything in its proper time.
2. Keep everything to its proper use.
3. Put everything in its proper place.

We are daily receiving family mercies; we are dependent upon God for every blessing we have, or that we need. Therefore family prayer should not be neglected; we should seek God's fatherly hand to be over us through the day, his protecting care around us at night, and offer Him continual thanksgivings.

We must now end. The observations I have offered have been with the earnest desire of improving the condition of the labouring classes. Ill-health is an evil to the rich, but how much greater to the poor! The poor man is himself (and, perhaps, has a family too), depending for subsistence on his daily earnings; therefore to him sickness often brings want, misery, and wretchedness; yet none pay so little regard to their health as the working classes. I do trust what I have said may lead many to act upon it, and that those who have influence will use it in promoting the object among all within their reach.

In conclusion, though "our bodies should be washed with pure water," (Heb. x. 22.) we should make clean the inside also. If "a dirty body is an insult to Him who made it," how much more an impure heart! Our blessed Lord says, "Cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also." (Matt. xxiii. 26.) The Prophet says, "Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings;" and St. James, "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts, ye double-minded." Our souls need quickening, cleansing, health, and clothing. We should seek our peace with God through Jesus Christ, and the daily renewing of the Holy Spirit in secret prayer. Let us lift up our hearts to God for His grace to quicken our souls, purify our hearts, sanctify our thoughts and affections, and clothe us with the robes of holiness and the ornaments of heavenly grace. In the words of our Liturgy, "create and make in us new and contrite hearts," "cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit." We are not our own. God has created us for His glory. He preserves us, and has given His Son to redeem us from the guilt and power, from the love and dominion of sin. We are responsible to Him for the use we make of the life and health He has bestowed upon us. We have to give an account. May our gracious Heavenly Father enable us to glorify Him in our bodies and in our souls which are His!

THE MARRIAGE BILL.

The following extract from Mr. W. E. Gladstone's speech on the Bill for Marriage with a deceased wife's sister will be read with interest:—

But what then was the great principle involved in this bill with respect to ecclesiastical legislation generally? For they were called upon, by a vote of that house, to determine, at least so far as the obedience of every individual clergyman was concerned, that the law of the Church, throughout the kingdom should be observed. What was the law of the Church, and what was the difference between this bill and that law? The prohibition of marriage in certain cases was a mere ecclesiastical prohibition, and both before and after the Reformation all laws merely ecclesiastical affected clergymen alone. This, however, was not an ecclesiastical prohibition; for the law on the subject professed to declare the word of God. The Church could add no authority to it—could annex no sanction to the prohibition. She only declared by her 99th canon, that it was no prohibition of ecclesiastical authority, but a declaration of the word of God. Here was the canon:—"No person shall marry within the degrees prohibited by the laws of God, and expressed in a table set forth by authority in the year of our Lord 1563." Let the house look at this. What more could be done by the Church than declare that this prohibitory law was the truth of God? It was said, in an age not over religious, by a worthy ancestor of his, that the people had taken the word out of the commandments, and put it into the creed; but he should say, if this bill were to pass into a law, the consequences which it must draw after it would be to bring the whole religious belief of the subject within the sole vote of Parliament. He thought the bill was most dangerous to our conscientious freedom, and most absurd so far as regarded the means of discussion in that house. His learned friend would not suppose that he was imputing to him any blame for the consequences of this kind which might follow the passing of the bill, but he did think they were consequences which would ensue if the principle once received the covert but effectual sanction of that house. Several honourable gentlemen who had spoken in this debate had stated that they would forbear to enter upon the religious portion of the discussion. He could well understand how such individuals as the Secretary of State, who had made up their minds that there was no religious prohibition binding upon their conscience, could pass that part of the question by unnoticed. Considering, however, that the bill was opposed by many on the ground that it was opposed to the word of God, he could not approve of their leaving that portion of the discussion untouched; and although he acknowledged his own incapacity to deal with it, he yet must state to the house that it appeared to him to be a religious prohibition binding them to refuse their sanction to the bill. His assertion was that marriage of a man to his wife's sister was contrary to the law of God, declared for three thousand years and upwards. He found, in the 15th chapter of Leviticus, but prohibited to them in a sense not peculiarly applicable to the Jews only, but applicable to the nations of the world. For they were told in that very chapter that the crimes of the people whom the Jews were then going to dispossess of their land had brought down upon them the condign punishment of God, and among the other incestuous acts charged upon these nations was this particular relation to be found in the catalogue. It was impossible to confine the prohibition to which he alluded to the Jewish nation, for the Canaanites were punished for offending against the law of God by this crime; but, if it had been a law prohibitory to the Jews only then it was not binding on the people of Canaan. But since they, too, were punished under this law, the inference was that it was of universal application to mankind! How stood criticism with regard to the passage? He concurred with his learned friend in the admirable speech which he had made upon this question. Look, then, to the chapter which had been so often resorted to, and look to the 6th verse of the chapter. (Cries of read.) "None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness, I am the Lord." The words were near of kin. Now he said that it was no mere probable argument, that it was not a mere inference which could not be removed from the effects of doubt, but it was an argument that admitted of proof that the case of a wife's sister came within the meaning of those words. Then in the 6th verse the prohibition was absolute; marriage was prohibited between a man and those near of kin, and what it was necessary to show was, that a man was near of kin to his wife's sister. He contended that, in the very sense of these words, there existed that relation between the two

parties, and to get at that relation he did not find it necessary to go through indirect affinities. He found that the relation was reached by two steps; the one, the relation of a man to his wife; and the other, of a wife to her sister. A man and his wife were one. He did not stop to enquire how that dogma stood to the case in question; he did not wait to declare whether it was mystical, or social, or civil; but this he said, that for the purposes of that chapter, and in the sense of that chapter, considered as containing the law of the question, a man and his wife were one. The right hon. gentleman then said that the 12th and 13th verses exhibited the sense in which the words of the law were used. He argued that as a father's sister and a mother's sister, so a sister to a sister were, in the words and sense of the chapter, 'near of kin.' The 6th verse, 'You shall not approach to any one near of kin,' was an absolute dogma; and all that followed to the 18th verse inclusive were but separate instances of particular cases of this grand prohibition. He held, then, that the arguments of the learned lord had not touched upon the ground on which this prohibition rested. But he would ask what he made of the various doubtful verses which were given to the 18th verse? As he had been already told, there were thirty-five cases of the expression found in the 18th verse being made use of in a similar sense in other parts of scripture, and there were thirty-four instances where it merely signified 'like to like,' or one woman to another, the rendering which was found in the margin, showing at least that it was of equal authority with the text. However, he should pass by that, not choosing to build any argument where there was room for doubt. But this he repeated that there was no other mode of adjustment than the one he had already pointed out by taking the sixth verse as absolute, and what followed as particular cases of disobedience to the same grand prohibition. Again, it was admitted that the practice among the ancient Jews was to prohibit this connection to their nation. The Rev. Mr. Jenkins, a witness who had been produced by the friends of the bill, said that the Jews did not practise these marriages:—'It appears, however, that the traditional law of the Jews did exclude the marriage of two sisters in succession, but whether upon the ground of this passage, or upon some more general law, does not clearly appear.' When he spoke of practice, he meant legal practice. But, he asked, what was the character of the Jews in this respect? Were they a people likely to impose upon themselves this restraint. They had authority for saying that the whole tendency of that people was to relax the restraints imposed by divine law, because they had evidence unimpeachable in the rebukes which our Lord administered to them during his personal ministry on earth—in regard to the marriage relations especially. He argued, therefore, if the tendency of the people was such, while they at the same time retained a legal restraint of this character, the law was not human which they received and retained with this sacred severity—it was imposed on them by the authority of God. But it might be said, 'You are not to take any thing for binding because it is written in Leviticus; else, if you admit one, on the same principle you admit all that is found there to be binding still.' In reply to that, he said it was necessary, first, to ascertain the subject matter of the passage, and secondly, how it had been regarded in time following. They were aware of the interpretation inserted in the Septuagint version, made in all probability 277 B.C., for the 23rd verse of the 27th chapter of Deuteronomy. It was this, 'Cursed is he who lieth with the sister of his wife. And all the people shall say amen.' But that might be considered as interpolation. What, however, they had to rely upon mainly were the doctrines of the Apostles and the Christian Church. The honourable and learned gentleman had spoken as if it were the object of those who opposed the measure to narrow the rule which excluded the conjugal relation. On the contrary, the bearing of the argument of analogy was entirely the other way. It was clear that, in the transition from the Jewish to the Christian dispensation, all restraints affecting marriage, as to the choice of the person, must become, not more relaxed, but more strict; because, the nature of marriage, being more elevated under the Christian dispensation, justified and required the maintenance of the prohibition. But he held that the prohibition was cared for in the New Testament by the decrees of the Apostles themselves. The 16th chapter of Acts distinctly stated that certain portions of the Jewish institutions were to be cared for, and form part of the Christian law; and among those portions of the Jewish institutions there was described the general term of *συνεχίαι*; to which it was impossible

to attach any rational signification unless it was equivalent to the prohibition of marriages, as known to the Jewish law, within the Levitical degrees. Then we were told that the civil law of the Roman empire was adverse to these marriages, and that the Christian Church became, in consequence, also adverse to them. It was impossible to make a statement more opposed to every rational view of the case; because, in the first place, the prohibition was enforced in the time of the Apostles; and, in the second, it was ludicrous to suppose the Roman law was the means of imposing upon the Christian Church a stricter system with regard to marriage. It was obvious that in the later periods of Rome, down to Constantine, the law of marriage was of a different character. How, then, did the prohibition come? From Christian sources, and it was not necessary to rest it upon the councils of the third century, for it was established in the customs and practice of the Church; and, being established in the customs and practice of the Church, it would naturally attach to the law of the empire when the governing power was Christian instead of heathen. It was admitted that from that period the case as to history was pretty clear, indeed there could be no doubt that it had, from that time, through many centuries, continued to be the universal and unbroken law of the Christian Church. The practice of the Greek Church maintained it at the present day in the greatest strictness; and the practice of the Roman Church testified that such was the law of the Christian Church. But, if we were to speak of the dispensations sufficient to overthrow the authority of the law with which it dispensed, let one point be recollected. Let it be recollected that the evidence of ecclesiastical dispensations dated entirely from those ages of the Church when political corruption and administrative abuses were at their highest point, and when the whole machinery of the Church had the greatest amount of corruption in it. It was about the period of Innocent III. that the practice of dispensation came in, and the practice of dispensation in these particular cases dated from the example of Alexander VI., one of the greatest monsters who ever filled a conspicuous situation in the history either of the Church or of the world. It was unnecessary for him to enter into the opinions of the Reformers, either of this or any other country, as it was undisputed that they believed these marriages prohibited by the Scriptures as received in all time. He had observed already how very light appeared to be the authority of the modern Jews upon this question. The authority of the ancient Jews was not for, but against, the proposition of his right hon. friend; and his right hon. friend's witness, the most learned man who had been produced to sustain and strengthen the case, stated that the traditional laws of the Jews were against the practice, and that he questioned whether they were not founded upon the text in Leviticus. But he (Mr. Gladstone) disclaimed the authority of the Jews upon this question altogether. He contended there could not be a greater logical inconsistency than for Christians to accept the modern testimony of Jews as in any degree whatever a criterion of the sense of Holy Scripture. If we were to take the testimony of Jews as a criterion of the sense of Holy Scripture, how far were we to carry the principle? We began our profession by believing that they had altogether failed to attain the sense of Holy Scripture in those points which were most vital and essential; and that, at this day, they were unable to comprehend the very truths of which they had so long been the guardians. That being so, there was not the least reason to follow their interpretation upon one or more particular passages from the Mosaic law. What, then, was the authority with which the opponents of this measure were pressed? With the authority of the modern practice of Rome, and of certain Protestant states. His right hon. friend, and others who supported the bill, were, most of all, fond of dealing with the practice in the United States of America. Now, he wished his right hon. friend to observe, in the first place, a manifest distinction in the precedents that were quoted. In the United States of America the precedents were exclusively not of alterations in the religious character of marriage, but of the mere legalization of the civil contract. Not a single case had been quoted by his right hon. friend, as to America, of marriages having been dealt with as any other than civil contracts. But the question of civil contracts, and legitimizing issue, was not the question now submitted to the house. He did not, however, attach much weight to the authority of the United States of America upon this matter, because the most formidable relaxations had there been introduced into the law

of marriage. What would his right honourable friend say of this fact, that there were certain states in America in which the unlawful intercourse of a married man with an unmarried woman was declared not to be adultery? That was a staggering fact. It showed an extraordinary state of opinion among a community where such a law could be enacted; and he hoped his right honourable friend would bear it in mind when next he pressed the opponents of the bill with the authority of the United States of America. So, also, with regard to Protestant States upon the Continent. He was not disposed to copy their example in this matter. We very often hugged ourselves in this country that they were found pursuing our laws and copying our institutions; but, with regard to the sanctity of marriage and the observance of its obligations, he did not think the time had arrived for the people of this country to follow the example of any state whatever upon the Continent. He came now to the authority of the Church of Rome; and he must say that the learned lord who had preceded him had dealt with this part of the subject in a manner the most fallacious. The law of the Church of Rome, to begin with, was still against these marriages. And he begged to say that the authentic sense of a great Christian body, particularly of a body so politic as the Church of Rome, was not to be taken from what were stated as extreme circumstances, which she had bound herself to permit, but from that which she had continually and loudly declared. Such, he repeated, was her law; and what was her practice? In certain particular cases, such as England, where a small number of Roman Catholics were mixed with many other persuasions, upon account of this vexed question, she allowed these marriages. But why was it that the Irish Roman Catholics—and he honoured them for their conduct—were opposed to the change? Was there not a strong sentiment among the Roman Catholic community, wherever it existed, not merely in individuals dispersed through the mass, distinctly adverse to the formation of these marriages? His right honourable friend could not show that the Roman Catholics drew any distinction between these and other incestuous marriages. It has been said the Roman Catholic Church did not claim to dispense with the law of God; but she dispensed with it as to marriages in certain cases, and *ergo in verba*, such marriages did not appertain to the law of God. The Roman Catholic Church did not dispense with the law of God in the sense in which she understood it, but she claimed to dispense with it as written in Leviticus. What was the law of God? That was the whole question. About that there could not be a doubt. Now, though the Roman Catholic Church claimed to dispense with the degrees as written in Leviticus, she disapproved of the dispensation in the highest degree. The Council of Trent had recorded an indication of the nature of these dispensations—'In secundo gradu nunquam dispensatur; nisi inter majores principes et ob publicam causam.' So that it was in the most urgent instances only, and for the greatest causes, that these dispensations were to be permitted. The proof, however, was positive and undeniable, that the Church of Rome did assume authority to dispense with the Book of Leviticus. He need not remind the house of the case of Henry the Eighth—the case of a brother's wife—and other instances of a similar kind, expressly forbidden in the Book of Leviticus, in which the Church of Rome had dispensed. Although, therefore, she might be willing that we should consider her power and authority to relax obligations which every persuasion in Christendom considered binding, she had no authority to enable or assist the house to prove that the written word of God did not contain a prohibition of these marriages. There could be no doubt that, at this moment, something like five-sixths of Christendom observed the prohibition. It was their law, and it had been observed uniformly and constantly, whilst dispensations from it dated from a period of the grossest corruption. They were founded, as he had shown, upon the practices of men whose example ought to be a warning instead of an inducement for that house to follow. What, in the next place, was the argument advanced as to social interests? The records which the promoters of the bill had furnished would, he thought, put an end to the assertion that it was for the poorer classes of the community they were called upon to legislate. Nothing, he contended, could be clearer than that they were bound to the maintenance of the present law, and this had been set forward with great good sense by Mr. Tyler, in a document received by the commission. But what was the argument of the commissioners—to prove that it was unjust to interfere with natural liberty in this respect? With regard

to the argument of natural liberty, that was disposed of by an appeal to the Divine law. But who were the parties that would be affected by the change? They were, in the first place, the very persons who wished to contract these forbidden marriages. It was open to him, he thought, to say it would be doing them but a left-handed favour to relax the divine law, in order to enable them to make a contract which they considered for their interest. In a parliamentary sense, he would admit they must be considered the best judges of their interest, for the house was not entitled to impose upon them its sense of the Divine law merely because it commended itself to their conscience. But, after all, those who wished to contract these marriages were but a small proportion of the persons who would be affected by the change. He went, however, from this class to another. Take the case of the children of the first wife. The house was appealed to upon the ground of their interest. He received that appeal, and upon the grounds of that appeal he refused to assent to this bill. No doubt the children of the first wife derived an inappreciable advantage from the care of the sister of their mother after her death. She stood to them in a natural relation, approved by God and man; and mindful of the tenderness which united her to one now removed; she carried the overflows of her tenderness to the offspring of the beloved person who had been called away. But what was the effect of mixing with this natural relation a relation contrary to nature, as it had been considered for three thousand years? You introduced the character of step-mother to mix with the character of the sister. Was the addition of the character of a step-mother, which was proverbial for the jealousy it stirred up, likely to increase the affection of the sister of the deceased for her children? On the contrary, by adding the new relation, you perverted the former one. You introduced cross feelings, cross interests, which were infinitely more likely—he did not say in all cases—to take away that attention, which, under the law as it stood, could not fail to be bestowed on the children. And what should he say of persons standing in the relation of widower and sister-in-law, who did not wish to marry? Were they to be entitled to no consideration? His right hon. friend did not wish to alter their relation; but would not their feelings be lowered, if not tainted, by the change which his right honourable friend invited the house to make? The words 'brother-in-law' and 'sister-in-law,' which were used in a colloquial sense, did but ill represent the idea they meant to convey. The sense of them was this—that brotherhood by affinity ought to be practically the same as brotherhood by blood; and he spoke a truth to which almost universal experience would bear testimony, when he said that brother-in-law and sister-in-law in this country was not a mere fiction of the law, but that it was realised in practice; and that they approached so nearly to relationship by blood, that, in the vast majority of cases, a practical distinction could not be drawn. If so, the house was required by it to exclude the possibility of marriage. He stood upon the general principle, that, in all cases where age was suitable to a domestic relation, there ought to be no power to form a conjugal engagement. It was vain to tell him that laws could not control feelings. He admitted that laws were not the sole agent in the formation of social feelings; but they were a material auxiliary, and they had great effect in determining whether they should be promoted or discouraged. The principle that where domestic relationship subsisted conjugal relations should not be formed lay at the foot of the structure of society. By the domestic relation you knit individuals in families; by the conjugal relation you bound families together, and consolidated the whole fabric of social union. But if you permitted domestic and conjugal relations to be confounded, you aimed directly at the foundation upon which all Christian society was organized. It appeared to him that not only the intercourse of those who were widowers with their sisters-in-law, but the intercourse of all married men who were not widowers was threatened and menaced by the change which his right honourable friend proposed. Nay, more, even the purity of sisterly love itself, which afforded perhaps, the most beautiful picture, when it was manifested in its perfection, which it was given to human eyes to witness upon earth, and was redolent of heaven more than any other object with which we could be conversant, was threatened to be tainted by the invasion of possible jealousies, if the house was led to accept this ill-omened proposal. He had only one more point to put. He wanted his right hon. friend to tell the house where this legislation was to stop. We had at this moment a law perfectly de-

finite, for we stood upon the known and unchanged law of the land from time immemorial. We stood upon the public sentiment, uniform and universal in Scotland and Ireland, and general in England. We stood upon that which the great mass believed to be the declared and positive injunction of the declared word of God. We stood upon that which we knew to have been for many centuries the uniform practice of Christendom, and which was the general practice of Christendom at the present hour. Such was the basis upon which we stood; and it was that basis which his right hon. friend was bound to show was unsound. Upon what basis did his right hon. friend stand? What were the limits of the voyage which he invited the house to undertake? Who was the pilot to guide them? Were they to stand upon expediency, and say, because there was a multitude of these persons, it was safe to make this change, and that they would be called upon for no more hereafter? He could understand that argument very well if the house was not dealing with a question of such deep solemnity, and if it was borne out by the facts. But he pressed his right hon. friend exceedingly for an answer to this question, because it was vitally important, where would he stop? If this bill passed, would not another be introduced to meet other cases? His right hon. friend did not even now confine himself to cases of marriage with a wife's sister, for he proposed to provide for cases of marrying a wife's niece, as well as her sister. But there were, he apprehended, very few cases where a man wished to marry his wife's niece. He wished to know if his right hon. friend was prepared to take his stand on the letter of the Scripture? Did he mean to say, "I bind you to the letter of Leviticus, and to nothing else?" If his right honourable friend took that course, he would leave them open to the most horrible incests. There were there cases of incest that excited the greatest horror in the mind when they were referred to. They were incest with the mother, with the daughter, or with the sister. Of these the first named was the only one that was prohibited in Leviticus. In the authorised translation the word 'sister' was introduced, but on reference to any other version except ours, it would be seen that the allusion was only to the half-sister, and that neither the full sister nor the daughter were mentioned in the book. He might be told that, in this country, the sentiment of horror which rose in the breast of every man when the crimes were mentioned would be a sufficient protection against the principle being carried further. It was perfectly true that that sentiment of horror existed—it was sustained by the law of nature? What was the law of nature? Would it be contended that the law of nature was a fixed and definite code, independent of the laws of religion? He would wish to know when the law of nature had been developed in that form? It was true that the law had always existed in one form or other—that there was always a feeling in the human heart repugnant to the commission of certain crimes. As Juvenal sang—

"Natura imperio geminus, cum funus adultro
Virginia occurrat, vel terra clauditor infans,
Et minor igne rogi."

But how was the law of nature cherished and developed except by the law of religion? He would call upon the house to recollect that the law of nature depended upon the law of Christianity. They could not keep the law of nature and get rid of the law of religion. It was Christianity which showed what were the demands, the capacities, the obligations of nature, and therefore the answer to the question, 'What was the law of nature?' depended on the answer to the previous question, 'What was the law of Christianity?' If that were so, then his right honourable friend, in taking the law of Christianity, took also the law of nature. He did not mean that his right honourable friend would lead them to the horrors to which he had before alluded, or that any one present would live to see them legalised; but he knew that there were opinions entertained by some persons that went much further than this bill, and that the doctrine was held by some that there was no incest except in cases of consanguinity. He believed that if they allowed this bill to pass they should be assailed with other applications for a further extension of its principle. It was right to understand what the law relating to prohibited degrees was. In some instances there were two prohibitions contained under one head, but separating these, he found that there were in all thirty-five cases of prohibition. Of these only seventeen were prohibited by Scripture, while the remaining eighteen were lying out of the letter of Scripture, though provided by the Church. He did not mean that the law of the Church was wholly independent of the Scripture in

these matters, but what he meant was, that these prohibitions were established by the Church, interpreting according to her functions the letter of the Scripture. (Hear, hear.) He hoped that under these circumstances the house would not hesitate to reject this bill—that it would on this question be disposed to respect the general sentiment of nearly the entire country—that it would not inflict upon the Church the misfortune of having anarchy introduced among its ministers, and he hoped that on similar grounds they would do all that in them lay to maintain the strictness of the obligations of marriage and the purity of the hallowed sphere of domestic life. (Cheers.)

ST. PHILIP'S PAROCHIAL ASSOCIATION.—The Ninth Annual Meeting of the St. Philip's Parochial Association was held on Wednesday, the 21st ult., in the Infant School Room, in Harrington Street. There was a large attendance of the friends and subscribers, who appeared to take much interest in all the proceedings. The Venerable President, Archdeacon Cowper, was in the chair, and addressed the meeting at some length, on events connected with the Association which had occurred during the preceding twelvemonth. It was a cause of great thankfulness to all interested in the objects of the meeting, and indeed, as we believe, to all who wish prosperity to our Zion, that he has been spared hitherto, and raised from his bed of severe affliction again to take his wonted part in the business of his important parish. The Report was read by the Secretary, Mr. Thomas Day, jun., and alluded in passing to the proceedings of the Building Committee of the New Church. It then spoke of the state of the Parochial Schools. We were glad to hear that in none had the number of children decreased, while in the Infant School there had been a considerable increase; this was satisfactory, the more so as it had been feared that the alterations made in the beginning of the year in the salaries of the masters and the payments of the children would have had a serious effect upon the numbers attending; such, however, has not been the case. The Association has been enabled in part to make up the deficiency in the salaries of the masters, and thus contribute to the efficient maintenance of the schools themselves. The Report stated that the Parochial Library consisted of upwards of 1000 volumes on various religious, historical, scientific, and other interesting subjects. The average number of readers was about 30 per week. It also spoke of the support (£25 per annum) which the Association was able to afford to the Sunday Evening Lecture, and of the increasing number of persons attending that service. After the Report had been read the several resolutions were proposed and seconded by the Rev. R. L. King, Messrs. Burton, H. Smith, Sandford, R. Campbell, C. Kemp, Robinson, and Lumsdaine. On the whole the Association seems to be working well and efficiently; and to be the instrument of much good in St. Philip's parish. We may therefore confidently recommend to all our friends who have not as yet followed, so wholesome an example, to "go and do likewise."

ST. ANDREW'S CATHEDRAL.—Sermons were preached in behalf of the building fund, at the temporary Cathedral, on the 25th November; that in the morning was preached by the Rev. J. Milner, B.A., chaplain of H.M.S. *Havannah*; that in the afternoon by the Rev. R. L. King, B.A.; Mr. Walsh, who was announced as the afternoon preacher, having been suddenly called away during the week to attend upon a sick clergyman in the country. About £22 were collected in the course of the day.

TO CORRESPONDENTS, &c.

"Churchman." No! We consider the question settled by the judgment of Dr. Mant, and cannot waste our time in controversies with Presbyterians or Semi-Churchmen. We have not seen the P.S. The omission of the words is too apparent to be misapprehended. If Churchman wishes to reply, we shall be happy to insert his communication in our next.

The following were sent too late for this month:—Plans suggested for the augmentation of the Cathedral fund. "A Friend of the Church" on the Offertory question. A Sonnet, Theophilus on Absolution, Conundrums Arithmetical Questions, Solutions, &c. The whole of the above communications will be given in our next number.

TO PRIVATE FAMILIES.

THE undersigned have always on hand Port and Sherry Wine in bottle, of good quality and at very moderate prices.

MACKINTOSH AND HIRST,
Queen's Place.

Printed for the Proprietors, by CHARLES KEMP and JOHN FAIRFAX, 586, London George-street; and Published by F. M. STOKES, 337, George-street, Sydney. December 1, 1846.