

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. I.—No. 1.

SYDNEY, JUNE 1, 1848.

PRICE EIGHT-PENCE.

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS.

AN earnest desire having been frequently expressed by members of the Church of England in this Colony, for a suitable Periodical to serve as a vehicle of information on Religious, Literary, and Scientific subjects, and particularly on events of interest and importance immediately connected with the Church, it has been determined by certain individuals, who disclaim extreme or party theological views, to attempt the supply of this desideratum.

That there may be no misconception as to the sentiments of the proprietors of this Periodical, they at once distinctly record their grateful sense of the blessings they enjoy as members of a Reformed and Protestant communion; and further they unhesitatingly avow their determination to oppose to the utmost of their ability the dissemination of those unscriptural tenets, and superstitious observances, against which, as Churchmen, they protest; and to maintain those pure and holy principles, the truth of which has been sealed by the blood of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and a host of other martyrs and confessors.

Whilst, however, they declare themselves PROTESTANTS, they, at the same time, desire to have it understood that they are, in the strictest sense of the word, CHURCHMEN; and therefore cannot consent to any compromise of the doctrines and discipline of their Church, as exhibited in her Articles, Homilies, and Liturgical formularies, with a view to the conciliation of the diversified sects into which Christendom is unhappily divided.

In strenuously advocating what they believe to be the Truth, and in labouring to remove whatever may have a tendency "to hinder godly union and concord," it will be their earnest desire "to speak the truth in love," and "to show the more excellent way" faithfully, candidly, and unmistakably, with meekness and charity, in accordance with apostolic precept, and our blessed Lord's example.

With respect to differences of opinion that may prevail amongst Churchmen themselves, they desire to state that it is not their intention to make this Journal an organ for the expression of party sentiments, but to promote the "good of all men," and the prosperity of the Church at large.

While there are those who seem to think that the interests of the Church are to be

advanced by dealing in such distinctive appellations as orthodox and evangelical, high church and low church, Puseyite and Simeonite, Semi-papists and Semi-dissenters, they do not intend to recognise any such distinctions, but would rather strive that all such differences should be merged in their common churchmanship, and so lead all to unite for the good of their common Zion, and for her defence against all her adversaries. They would *heal*, and not *aggravate*, differences, and seek to educe that which should tend to "godly edifying," not angry contention; "to build up their brethren in their most holy faith," that "all may speak the same thing, and keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

To hope to please every one, they are conscious is vain; but to be instrumental with God's blessing in vindicating the purity of his worship from the corruptions of Popery, and in bringing those who have gone astray into that pure branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church to which they themselves belong, will be their most strenuous endeavour and most sincere and heartfelt prayer.

It has further been suggested that some portion of this Journal should be set apart for free and unfettered correspondence between Churchmen on all subjects of mutual interest, or upon which doubts may be entertained, or information sought. To this suggestion the Proprietors have readily assented, reserving to themselves only the right of rejecting whatever may appear to them objectionable in point of style, from the absence of courtesy or Christian temper.

It is not intended that this Journal should be devoted exclusively to subjects purely Theological:—Literature, Science, the Fine Arts, Poetry, Criticism, and indeed every thing likely to conduce to the moral improvement and intellectual gratification of the general reader will receive their proportionate share of attention.

As a Journal of intelligence and Record of events connected with the Church, not only in this country, but in Great Britain and its numerous dependencies, it will, they trust, be found, particularly useful.

Such are the principles and the objects of this monthly Periodical. To the Clergy and Churchmen in general, the Proprietors look for that support upon which the success of the Work must, of course, entirely depend.

May He who is the author of peace and lover of concord allay and prevent all contentions among us, and unite us in one common desire to promote each other's temporal and spiritual welfare.

Theology.

IDOLATRY OR IMAGE-WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"I will not shrink from the term Protestant, as though I thought it unbecoming a branch of Christ's holy catholic Church. I grieve too deeply that there should be errors, gross fatal errors, against which to protest. I glory in belonging to an apostolical church: I lament that such a church is compelled to be Protestant. But we cannot of ourselves part with our protesting character. The Roman Church must take that from us,—and how? By violence? God helping, we will imitate our fathers, and deliver our protest in the face of persecution and death. By our returning into communion with the Roman Church—the Roman Church as it is? No, no; I trust we may say, 'We have not so learned Christ.' We will cease to be Protestants when the Roman Church renounces the abominations against which we protest. Till then, we must keep the name; we must keep the thing. As to that, of which one has heard, of which one has read, unprotestantizing the church, God in his mercy forbid! We will pray, we will labour to reform the Roman communion: better to die, than to consent to Romanize the reformed.—REV. H. MELVILL."

It has been often urged as an argument against Protestantism, and as a powerful persuasive to join the Roman communion, that among those who are separated from that Church there is no unity of faith and doctrine; that among Protestants there is as great a variety of opinions, as there is of schools, or even of teachers in religion; so that among us the prayer of our blessed Lord can never be realized, that his disciples may be *one*: whereas within the Church of Rome all is unity, one unchanged and unchangeable uniformity in doctrine and practice, not only in one country but throughout the world. In that communion, it is asserted there is one faith, one discipline; and should doubts and disputations ever arise, there is in the Bishop of Rome an infallible ruler and guide, to whom all must defer, and from whose decision there is no appeal. Many, as we are assured, have been drawn away, by these representations, to seek in that Church a refuge from the perplexities of controversy, in the hope of there, at least, finding rest unto their souls.

That these representations are manifestly fallacious, both as to the faith and practice of that Church in every department of her system we are able to show indisputably, but in no case more plainly,

than in the doctrine and practice of image-worship. It would, indeed, be difficult to fix upon any points among reformed churches on which opinions and principles so irreconcilable and contradictory are maintained, as are those which we find set forth and defended within the Church of Rome by her accredited and authorised teachers. Few persons, it is believed, are sufficiently aware of this fact; on the contrary, it is too readily assumed to be a reality.

It is intended, therefore, to show, in this article, (for which we are chiefly indebted to a recent publication from the pen of J. Endell Tyler, B.D., Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's, London), that this boasted unity of doctrine and discipline in the Church of Rome has no existence in practical truth; that, on the contrary, within the pale of communion, there have, from the first, prevailed inconsistent, contradictory, and irreconcilable differences, not only in words, but in matters of fact also. This may be satisfactorily shown from an examination of the decrees of that Church, her authorised formularies of devotion, the declarations of her teachers, bishops, and canonized saints.

In tracing the history of the Church, under this head, we find, that through the first 300 years, *no images* of any kind were suffered to be placed in Christian churches. In the council of Eliberis or Elvira, A.D. 306, it was decreed "that *no images* should be admitted into churches, lest the objects of veneration and worship should be painted on the walls." It seems, therefore, that this novelty was then attempted and prohibited.

Through the next 400 years, portraits of departed saints, and even of living members of the Church, together with paintings of Scripture events, began to be admitted very generally into churches, and at the end of the sixth century Pope Gregory the Great maintained their usefulness for instruction sake, and sanctioned their admission, though he strongly prohibited their being worshipped.

After many struggles against their introduction in particular places through the greater part of the eighth century, it was decreed by the second council of Nice, A.D. 794, convened by the Empress Mother Irene, and her son Constantine, at the urgent instance of Pope Gregory's successor, Adrian, that images should not only be used and honoured, but also worshipped. At the same time this council condemned with bitter anathemas, not only all who should refuse to worship images, but all who should apply to them the prohibitions in Scripture against idols, (the very thing which Pope Gregory had done), and, in proof of the lawfulness of worshipping images, the council cited the very passage of Scripture to which Gregory had appealed as conclusive against their worship. The decree is thus expressed:—

We venerate, worship, and adore the sacred images. Let no one be offended by the idea of worship, for it is said, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." The expression *ONLY* is applied solely to the second word, 'serve,' and not to the word 'worship.' We may, therefore, worship the images, provided we do not 'serve' them.

All persons who profess to honour the sacred images, but refuse to worship them, do dishonour them, and are guilty of hypocrisy.

But we must not worship the images with the supreme divine worship due only to God.

The decrees of this council were forced upon the churches in the east and in the west of Christendom by the united authority of the popes and of the religious houses, whose revenues were swollen by the conflux of worshippers to the shrines of such images as were believed to be possessed of miraculous powers. Great resistance, indeed, was made in several parts to the introduction of this novel and heathenish practice, especially in England, yet the superstition grew and prospered, and for centuries triumphed over the pure worship of apostolic and primitive times.

The Council of Trent, although it prohibited the ascription of new miracles to old images, and base gain, &c., from that source, yet decreed that images should, by all means, be had and retained in churches, and that due honour be paid to them, asserting on the authority of the second Nicene council that the honour paid to the image is passed on to the prototype, and authoritatively pronouncing that a difference existed between idol worship among the heathen and image-worship among Christians. We maintain that this is groundless, imaginary, and contrary to fact. From the very first introduction of image-worship into the Church of Christ, its advocates have ever anxiously laboured to establish this distinction. An anxiety has been naturally felt to escape, if possible, from the prohibitions and denunciations of Holy Scripture against "the making of any image, the likeness of any being in heaven or earth," for the purpose of worshipping it: and to escape also from the strong language which the earliest Fathers of the Church uniformly employed against idol or image-worship. Various have been the subtle and refined distinctions by which it has been attempted to establish this difference; but that which is chiefly relied on is this: that heathens worshipped the material idols of wood, or stone, or brass, not as the representatives of unseen deities, but as being themselves gods; and that, placing their trust in those visible and tangible idols, they did not refer their worship to the unseen deity whom the idol represented; whereas Christians regarded the image as the representative of a saint or of God, and offered their worship, beyond and through the image, to the divine or holy being whom it represented.

Now we insist that this is a most palpable fallacy. It is grounded upon an assumption not only without foundation, but absolutely contradictory to the evidence of Scripture and of heathen times. A fair investigation of this subject will result in

a conviction, that instead of the worship of idols by the heathen and the worship of images by Christians being, in this respect, different, they are identically the same; that there is no such distinction maintainable between them—both being equally condemned by the doctrine and practice of the Primitive Church of Christ.

That multitudes in the pagan world have been so ignorant and blinded as to look only to their idols, without further preference to any unseen spiritual being whom those images visibly represented, there can be no doubt; but we have the testimony of a distinguished writer of the Roman Church, who flourished in the early part of the 16th century, that multitudes of Christians who frequented the images set up in churches in his time, did place their trust in the images more than in the spiritual beings whom they represented. That the priests and the people in the heathen world generally regarded the idol as the visible representation of an absent and unseen deity, whose anger they must deprecate and whose favour they must propitiate, we have indubitable evidence in the records of the ancient heathen world, as well as in what we read even in the Holy Scriptures themselves, and in the Fathers of the Primitive Church.—See 1 Kings, xvii.; 2 Kings, iv.; Acts, xiv.; Lact. Divin. Instit. lib. ii., cap. ii.

Whatever attempts may be made to guard the worship of the Almighty against the encroachments of idolatry, or to instruct the people that the spiritual being represented by the image is to be worshipped and not the mere image itself, we must believe that they will be led stealthily and unwarily to adore the image, at least quite as much as the Pagans were ever led to adore their idols.

The Council of Trent not only sanctioned the retaining of images in churches, but required that they should be revered with due honour—the head must be uncovered—the body prostrated—the knee bent before them! What is to be expected, but that the people should become idolaters! Cardinal Bellarmine accordingly says, "some worship *before* the image; some worship the image itself, but solely with an adoration to be passed on beyond the image to the spiritual object of their adoration. Then, some worship the image with an inferior adoration, reserving their full adoration for the prototype; and then, others worship the image, and adore it with the self-same adoration with which they worship and adore the being of which it is the figure and the representative!"

Let us, in the next place, see how her most approved teachers instructed the people to use and worship images. We might refer to many, but we think it enough to quote the judgments of Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura.

Thomas Aquinas, a canonized saint, distinctly maintains, that the images are to be worshipped themselves, with the self-same adoration with which the origi-

nal being, whom the image in each case represents, is adored; and as distinctly he holds, "that the image of Christ is to be worshipped with the supreme adoration exclusively appropriated to God only." The Church of Rome renews every year, and publishes throughout the whole world, wherever her voice can be heard, her confession of the truth and soundness of the doctrines of Thomas Aquinas. He is no ordinary canonized saint; and on his festival the Church of Rome every year now not only prays to him for his intercession in heaven, but actually prays to God for grace to enable her members to embrace with the understanding what Thomas Aquinas taught, and to fulfil, by their imitation, what he did; confessing in the same prayer, that the Almighty continues to enlighten the Church by the wonderful erudition of this same Thomas, and makes it fruitful by his holy operation. This, it must be borne in mind, is no obsolete confession and prayer; it is contained in the Roman Breviary now, and is commanded to be offered annually on the 7th of March, even to this very day.

In the next place, Bonaventura, who was canonized by Pope Sixtus IV., and who is an acknowledged doctor of the Church, his authority being cited and employed in all places of education, and in all ecclesiastical discussions and studies, positively maintains that the image of Christ is to be adored with the adoration of *latria*,—that is, the highest conceivable worship,—the worship due only to God; because, as he remarks, it represents him who was crucified for us, and the image presents itself for him.

Lyndwode, who wrote a comment on ecclesiastical statutes and laws; and Naclantus, a bishop, distinguished for his learning, and styled the "day-star" of the Tridentine Council, 1567, and *Dottrina Christiana*,—maintain the same doctrine.

Such is the teaching of the accredited writers of the Roman Church. It is impossible to mistake their views! Bonaventura says, in order to prove that divine worship, the worship due to the Supreme Being, is due also to the image of Christ, "a man speaks to the image in his petitions, therefore he speaks to the image as to a rational creature; therefore he speaks to the image as to Christ; and just as he speaks so he worships and adores; and, therefore, he ought to adore the image of Christ as he does Christ."

It will also be found that, in her Missal, her Pontifical, her Breviary, the Church of Rome authoritatively enjoins religious worship to be paid to images and material representations.

In her services for Good Friday there is an exhibition of the grossest superstition:—

The priest receives from the deacon the cross already prepared on the altar, which, turning himself to the people, he uncovers a little way down from the top, and begins the anthem alone—"Behold the wood of the cross!" and then he is assisted in the chant by the ministers down to "Come ye, let us

adore;" and when the choir is singing "Come ye, let us adore," all except the celebrant prostrate themselves. Afterwards he comes forward, and opens the right arm of the cross; and, lifting it a little higher than at first, he begins—"Behold the wood of the cross!" others singing and adoring as above. Then the priest proceeds to the middle of the altar, and uncovering the cross entirely, and elevating it a third time higher, begins—"Behold the wood of the cross!" others singing and adoring as above. Afterwards the priest alone carries the cross to the place prepared before the altar, and kneeling, places it there. Presently, having put off his shoes, he approaches to adore the cross, kneeling thrice before he kisses it. Then the ministers of the altar, and next the clergy and laity, two and two, kneeling thrice, adore the cross. Meantime, while the adoration of the cross is going on, &c., the choir are to sing more or fewer anthems, according to the time required for the congregation, whether large or small. At the end of the adoration of the cross, the candles are lighted on the altar.

Thus, the priests and the people annually adore the cross of wood, and the service is called the Adoration of the Cross. What room is left for superstition to add anything in this department?

In the Pontifical we also find that divine adoration is declared to be due to the material cross; and in the Roman Breviary are these words:—

Hail! O thou Cross! our only hope! To the pious do thou multiply grace, and for the guilty blot out all their sins. O thou Cross, do thou save the present congregation assembled for thy praise. The king is exalted to the sky, while the noble trophy of the Cross is adored by all the worshippers of Christ for ever!

And now let us hear what the Bishop of Siga, Dr. Baines, said in 1827, when addressing Protestants who had collected to witness the consecration of a Roman Catholic place of worship in Yorkshire.

Is it possible (said the Bishop) that any of you should persuade yourselves that the most ignorant Catholic would be capable of adoring the ivory image which you see upon that altar? Anathema to the man who gives to an image divine honours or prays to it.

Really, my Christian Brethren, I blush to think it should be necessary to say that Catholics as well as you (Protestants) know the folly, and detest as much as you the impiety of giving divine honours to a lifeless piece of wood or ivory, however skillfully the sculptor may have fashioned it, or whatever it may present to the imagination.

Thus spoke Dr. Baines: Dr. Wiseman, another Roman Catholic Bishop, in 1837 spoke to the same effect.

If I stood before the image of any one whom I had loved and had lost, fixed in veneration and affection, no one would surely say that I was superstitious or idolatrous in its regard. Such is precisely ALL that the Catholic is taught to believe regarding images set up in churches.

Can the Church, we ask, of which Dr. Baines was a Bishop, and of which the present Dr. Wiseman is a Bishop, be the same Church as that to which the canonized saints, Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura belonged? Can that Church be at unity with itself, without any essential discrepancy in its doctrines? What can be more antagonistic, more irreconcilable, more utterly inconsistent! than its teachings on Image-worship?

We have seen that the Church of Rome, in her decrees, pronounces that images must be retained and must be honoured with due reverence; that in her Ritual she authoritatively enjoins religious worship and adoration to be paid to them; that her canonized saints and teachers

defend this practice, so irreconcilably at variance with the simplicity of primitive Christian worship, and contradictory to the language and spirit of the revealed will of God.

This innovation having thus struck its roots into the Lord's vineyard, its fruits were soon abundant everywhere. Our fallen and frail nature, ever inclined to lean and rest on the accommodating but treacherous helps of superstition, rather than, under God's grace, to exert its best endeavours to secure the blessed promises of the everlasting Gospel, not only received this will-worship of images with acquiescence, but hailed it as a boon. And thus the authority of the Pope, and the inclinations of the unenlightened human mind, formed a cord too strong for any thing but the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, to sever. In our branch of the Catholic Church, it pleased the great Bishop of Souls, in his own good time, to effect that blessed work by our great Reformation, and we are thankful. Seeing, however, that attempts are still unremittingly made to shake our confidence in the soundness of our creed, and the Scriptural and primitive purity and excellence of our worship, it is not only our duty to be thankful that superstitions are no longer permitted to obscure the precious doctrines of salvation within our own communion, but having patiently and dispassionately examined the question for ourselves, we must state the results plainly and without reserve to others. Being assured that the doctrine of the Church of Rome is to worship and adore images contrary to God's word and the example of the Primitive Church (though in Protestant communities the more revolting features of that worship are kept out of sight) we desire to apprise those who may be persuaded to tender their allegiance to Rome, what will be required of them, so that they may not, with blinded eyes and implicit reliance on partial representations surrender themselves to be guided down a gentle path into a gulf from which, inquiry being shut out, they may never return to the light. Let it be remembered that to hold opinions against the rulings of the church, either openly or secretly, or even by a mere insinuation, subjects the individual to the name of a heretic, and to the pains and penalties of heresy, in countries where Romanism is dominant.

Our desire is to confirm the members of our own communion, more and more, in their well-founded attachment to the Church of England, as a true branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, purified from the corruptions and deceits which, in various essential points, had for ages excluded the true doctrine of the Gospel and established themselves in its place.

Our intention is, not merely to sound a general and vague alarm, but to warn every one of the awfully hazardous step which those persons take who suffer themselves to be seduced by specious representations, now artfully interwoven with

subtle arguments, to renounce the evangelical and apostolical principles of the Church of England, and to adopt the corruptions and innovations of Romanism in their stead; and we would induce, if it might be, such members of the Church of Rome as may be still anxious (and we believe there are many) to see an honest and dispassionate examination of the points of difference between their Church and ours—to take the matter up in good earnest—to weigh the cases uprightly,—and to decide for themselves, as before the God in whom we both believe, assured that the truth, while it will make them free, will secure to them satisfaction, and comfort and joy in the Holy Ghost.

We have been accustomed to hear, from time to time, that the charge brought against the Church of Rome of worshipping and adoring images is founded in ignorance and misrepresentation. We have heard solemn protestations from the Bishops of the Roman Church that images are placed in their churches not to receive divine honours, but merely to excite feelings of penitence and devotion.

But, on the other hand, we read in the approved works of the most celebrated divines and doctors, bishops and cardinals, of the Romish Church, that the images of Christ and his saints ought to be set up for the purpose of being worshipped and adored—that divine honours are of right due to them—and that those are heretics to be abhorred who deny images to be fit objects of religious worship; and yet, more than this, we find the Roman Pontifical asserting that the highest supreme divine worship is due to the material cross, and the Roman Breviary addressing the material cross with solemn and direct prayer.

Romish writers of the present day who dwell amongst Protestants tell us that even the use of images is not enjoined, but only recommended as a useful and wholesome help to devotion, and that the charge of adoring them is an unfounded and malicious calumny; at all events, that the adoption or rejection of them is a matter of indifference. With all the tone of unbounded liberality of sentiment, a snare the most dangerous is laid for the generous and confiding spirit of youth; and that snare is so skillfully concealed under specious fallacies, that we cannot wonder that in some instances it should prove fatal to such as expose themselves to the temptation, and dally with the tempter, before they have duly possessed themselves of the power of detecting the fallacies, and extricating themselves from the snare. To the individual members of the Roman Church, it is not a thing indifferent, a thing which he can accept or reject at his pleasure. The Church of Rome herself is bound by the decrees of the Tridentine Council, by which it is enacted that images are to be retained and treated with due veneration. Until the decrees of that council be reversed, and the Missal, Breviary, and Pontifical be reformed,

image-worship cannot become a thing indifferent. It is prescribed by the Church, and must be practised by every one who professes dutiful allegiance to that Church.

Those who are tempted by such plausible statements must be cautioned against the peril to which they expose themselves, if they give too hasty heed to them. Image-worship is not the only superstitious practice which persons, before their perversion, have been persuaded to regard as a thing indifferent, but the entire adoption of which, after they have been irretrievably taken captive, they have to their confusion found to be an indispensable condition of full communion with Rome.

Let every one investigate the whole truth, and not rashly adopt, upon representations which are delusive, a mode of worship, which, though called Christian, is overlaid with corruptions and much of the poison of heathenism.

God's mercy has bestowed on us the blessing of a Scriptural Liturgy. We are, indeed, members of a church apostolical and evangelical! But the merciful privilege which we enjoy brings with it increased responsibilities. It well becomes us all to take good heed, lest even the worshippers of images, with all their errors, rise up in the judgment at the last and condemn us. This they may do, if our hope be not at once more sure and more purifying; if our charity be not more fervent and more comprehensive. They unhappily persuade themselves to have recourse (in aid, as they say, of their devotion) to those innovations and superstitions, which we discard as unjustifiable, unworthy, and distrustful inventions of degenerate human nature. The gracious Founder of our faith has himself provided for us whatever is necessary for the soul's well-being and its progress towards heaven. Their errors may obtain pardon, because Omniscience may pronounce them to have persevered in their superstition ignorantly in misbelief. But how shall we escape either the displeasure of Almighty God, or the censures of our own conscience, if, with all the appliances of the Gospel provided for our use, spiritual and heavenly as they came fresh from the divine treasure-house, neither bound by the shackles of superstition, nor checked by the corruptions of man's device, we do not show forth his praise by a more ardent piety and a more holy life? How can we satisfy our duty to our heavenly Benefactor and to his church, the keeper and witness of the truth, if we do not honestly, yet humbly, give proof of the scriptural and primitive integrity and holiness of our principles, by a more steady and calm, and at the same time, more zealous and energetic devotion of ourselves, to the work of our heavenly Master, which, indeed, is none other than the work of our own salvation? How can we become or continue an acceptable people in his sight, unless we strive, by prayer and self-denial, and the best exertion of every faculty, (as long

as it is His good pleasure that we sojourn here,) to increase daily in his Holy Spirit more and more, having our conversation daily more and more in heaven, and, as we walk with God on earth in faith, and hope, and love, conforming ourselves daily more and more to the likeness of his ever blessed Son, 'the image of the invisible God?'

J. C. G.

Literary and Scientific.

The Address of Sir R. H. INGLIS, President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; delivered at Oxford, June 23, 1847.

[Abridged from the "Athenæum."]

MAY it please you, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, Sir Roderick Murchison, Gentlemen of the British Association:—It has been the practice of former Presidents to address the first general meeting of the Association on the progress of science during the preceding year, and on its state and prospects in the present. Sir Roderick Murchison, my eminent friend, who did honour to this chair, took a comprehensive grasp of all the objects which this duty placed within his reach. When I read his address, I felt, even more than before, my unfitness to follow him; but such as I am, you have selected me to succeed to his position and his duties; and I shall endeavour to discharge my functions with as little discredit to your choice as may be in my power. Whatever may be good in the observations which follow this exordium, will be owing to my friends, the Rev. Dr. Robinson, Professor Owen, Mr. Robert Brown, and Colonel Sabine.

I begin with Astronomy. The progress of Astronomy during the past year has been distinguished by a discovery the most remarkable, perhaps, ever made as the result of pure intellect exercised *before* observation,—and determining *without* observation the existence and force of a planet: which existence and which force were subsequently verified by observation. It had previously been considered as the great trial and triumph of Dynamical Science to determine the disturbances caused by the mutual action of "the stars in their courses," even when their position and their orbits were fully known; but it has been reserved for these days to reverse the progress, and to investigate from the discordance actually observed the existence and the place of the wondrous stranger which had been silently, since its creation, exerting this mysterious power. It was reserved for these days to track the path and to measure the force which the great Creator had given to this hitherto unknown orb among the myriads of the air.

I will not presume to measure the claims of the two illustrious names of Leverrier and Adams; of him who in midnight workings and watchings, discovered the truth in our own country; and of the hardly happier philosopher,

who was permitted and enabled to be the first, after equal workings and watchings, to proclaim the great reality which his science had prepared and assured him to expect. I will trust myself with only two observations: the one my earnest hope that the rivalry not merely of the illustrious Leverrier and my illustrious countryman Adams, but of the two great nations which they represent, France and England, respectively, may always be confined to pursuits in which victory is without woe, and to studies which enlarge and elevate the mind; and which, if rightly directed, may produce alike glory to God and good to mankind; and the other my equal hope, that for those who employ the same scientific training, and the same laborious industry, which have marked the researches of Leverrier and Adams, there may still remain similar triumphs in the yet unpenetrated regions of space; and that—unlike the greater son of a great father—they may not have to mourn that there are no more worlds to be conquered.

An Englishman—a subject of this United Kingdom—cannot refer to the enlarged means of astronomical observation enjoyed by the present age without some allusion to the noble Earl, Lord Rosse, who, himself educated amongst us here in Oxford, has devoted large means and untiring labour to the completion of the most wonderful telescope which science, art, and wealth, have ever yet combined to perfect; and which the Dean of Ely—a man worthy to praise the work—pronounced to be a rare combination of mechanical, chemical, and mathematical skill and knowledge. Its actual operations have, however, been suspended by a cause not less honourable to Lord Rosse in another character than the conception and early progress of his great instrument were to him as a man of science. They have been retarded, as far as he himself is concerned, by the more immediate, and, I will say, higher duties which, as magistrate, as a landowner, and as a Christian gentleman, he owed, and has been paying, to his neighbours, his tenantry, and his country, during the late awful visitation which has afflicted Ireland.

The President here read a paper from the Astronomer Royal, on an important and interesting discovery which had been made during the past year, with reference to Bürg's assumption of a slowly varying error affecting the epoch of the moon's mean longitude, which discovery had resulted from the reduction, sanctioned by Government, of the Greenwich observations of the moon, made since the year 1750. After which he proceeded as follows:—

The doctrine of the influence of the moon and of the sun on the tides was no sooner established than it became eminently probable that an influence exerted so strongly upon a fluid so heavy as water could not but have the lighter and all but

imponderable fluid of air under its grasp. It is now clear, as the result of the observations at St. Helena by my friend Colonel Sabine, that as on the waters, so on the atmosphere, there is a corresponding influence exerted by the same causes. There are tides in the air as in the sea, the extent is of course determinable only by the most careful observations, with the most delicate instruments; since the minuteness of the effect, both in itself and in comparison with the disturbances which are occasioned in the equilibrium of the atmosphere from other causes, must always present great difficulty in the way of ascertaining the truth, and had, in fact, until Colonel Sabine's researches, prevented any decisive testimony of the fact being obtained by direct observation. It appears that in each day the barometer at St. Helena stands, on an average, four thousandths of an inch higher at the two periods when the moon is on the meridian above or below the pole, than when she is six hours distant from the meridian on either side; the progression between this maximum and minimum being moreover continuous and uninterrupted; thus furnishing a new element in the attainment of physical truth; and to quote the expression of a distinguished foreigner, now present, which he uttered in my own house when the subject was mentioned:—"We are thus making astronomical observations with the barometer"—that is, we are reasoning from the position of the mercury in a barometer, which we can touch, as to the position of the heavenly bodies, which, unseen by us, are influencing its visible fall and rise. "It is no exaggeration to say"—and here I use the words of my friend, the Rev. Dr. Robinson,—"that we could even, if our own satellite were incapable of reflecting light, have determined its existence, nay, more, have approximated to its eccentricity and period."

In Physiology, the most remarkable of the discoveries, or rather improvements of previous discoveries, which the past year has seen, is, perhaps, that connected with the labours of the distinguished Tuscan philosopher Matteucci. I refer in this instance to his experiments on the generation of electric currents by muscular contraction in the living body. This subject he has continued to pursue; and by the happy combination of the rigorous methods of physical experiment with the ordinary course of physiological research, Professor Matteucci has fully established the important fact of the existence of an electrical current—feeble, indeed, and such as could only be made manifest by his own delicate galvanoscope—between the deep and the superficial parts of a muscle. Such electric currents pervade every muscle in every species of animal which has been the subject of experiment; and may therefore be inferred to be a general phenomenon of living bodies. Even after life has been extinguished by violence, these currents continue for a short time, but they cease more

speedily in the muscles of the warm-blooded than in those of the cold-blooded animals.

The delicate experiments of Matteucci on the torpedo, agree with those of our own Faraday (whom I may call doubly our own in this place, where he is a doctor of our University), upon the *Gymnotus electricus*, in proving that the shocks communicated by those fishes are due to electric currents generated by peculiar electric organs, which owe their most immediate and powerful stimulus to the action of the nerves. In both species of fishes the electricity generated by the action of their peculiar organised batteries—besides its benumbing and stunning effects on living animals, renders the needle magnetic, decomposes chemical compounds, emits the spark, and in short, exercises all the other known powers of the ordinary electricity developed in inorganic matter or by the artificial apparatus of the laboratory.

Etherization, a kindred subject, one to which deep and natural importance is now attached, may not unfitly follow the mention of Professor Matteucci's investigations.

It is the subject of the influence of the vapour of ether on the human frame. Several experiments on the tracts and nerve roots, appropriated respectively to the functions of sensation and volition have been resumed and repeated in connexion with this new agency on the nervous system. Messrs. Flowrens and Longet have shown that the sensational functions are first affected, and are completely, though temporarily, suspended under the operation of the vapour of ether; then the mental or cerebral powers, and finally, the motor and excitomotor forces are abrogated. It would seem, that the stimulus of ether applied so largely or continuously as to produce that effect is full of danger, and that weak constitutions are sometimes unable to rally and recover from it; but that when the influence is allowed to extend no further than to the suspension of sensation, the recovery is as a general rule complete. It is this remarkable property of ether which has led to its recent application with such success as may well lead us to thank God, who, in his Providence, has directed the eminent physicians and surgeons amongst our brethren in the United States to make this discovery:—a discovery which will long place the name of Dr. Charles J. Jackson, its author, among the benefactors of our common nature.

In no department of the science of organized bodies has the progress been greater or more assured than in that which relates to the microscopic structure of the constituent tissues of animal bodies, both in their healthy and in their morbid states; and this progress is specially marked in this country during the period which has elapsed since the communication to the British Association by Professor Owen of his researches into the intimate structure of recent and fossil teeth.

The result of these researches having demonstrated the constancy of well defined and clearly appreciable characters in the dental tissues of each species of animal, other observers have been stimulated to pursue the same minute inquiries into the diversities of structure of the tissues of other organs; and thus the very hairs of the different mammalian animals have been found to offer to the microscopical anatomist a field of observation as richly and remarkably developed as the *teeth*, which formed the subject of Professor Owen's communication in 1838, and as the external coverings of the testaceous mollusca, which formed the subject of Dr. Carpenter's communication in 1846.

The most brilliant result, perhaps, of microscopic anatomical research has been the actual observation of the transit of the blood from the arteries to the veins. Malpighi first observed the transit in the large capillaries of the frog's web. It has since been observed in most other tissues, and in many other animals.

No part of the animal body has been the subject of more, or of more successful, researches than the blood itself. The forms, and dimensions, and diversities of structure characteristic of the coloured discs, corpuscles, or blood globules, as they were once termed, in the different classes, orders, and genera of animals, have been described, and for the most part accurately depicted; and, through the concurrence of numerous observers, the anatomical knowledge of these minute particles invisible to the naked eye, has become as exact and precise as the knowledge of the blood vessels themselves, or of any other of the grosser and more conspicuous systems of organs; and has added, when we consider how easily the action is deranged, by how many causes it may be diseased or stopped, another to the many proofs that we are fearfully as well as wonderfully made. In surveying how our frame is formed, how sustained, how revived by sleep, one of the most wonderful of all the incidents of our nature, what suffering is produced by any pressure on the lungs, and yet how unconsciously we breathe a million times in health for one in sickness: I cannot but feel that our Heavenly Father gave another proof of his essential character when, in answer to the prayer of Moses, "Shew me thy glory," God answered, "I will cause *all my goodness* to pass before thee."

I proceed now to notice the science of Botany; which, aided in these days by the microscope, and by chemistry, as to the structure, functions, and uses of the living plant; and as to the analogies in the vegetable world in its fossil state, presents one of the most interesting subjects of inquiry to the student and to the general observer.

Systematic botany is constantly receiving additions to the number of species.

With respect to new species of plants received only in the state of specimens

for the Herbarium, they have been in part obtained from China, South America, and New Zealand, but chiefly from Australia. The late expeditions into the interior of that great continent—expeditions so creditable to the enterprise, perseverance, and intelligence of their conductors—have, however, been but little productive, so far as we at present know, in the department of botany. The animal productions of New Holland, so wonderful in their forms and structures, have long formed the most remarkable characteristic of its vast region; nor is its botany without distinctions of much interest, though as yet very imperfectly explored. It may be said, however, in reference to the results of these later expeditions, which have penetrated further inland, that they have not brought to our knowledge any peculiarities in the vegetable kingdom, so various and so striking as those which exist near the coasts, and which are sufficient to distinguish New Holland and the Australian colonies from the other regions of the world.

In vegetable physiology, microscopic observers have of late been much occupied in investigating the phenomena of fecundation, and especially as to the mode of action of the pollen.

On this subject botanists are still divided. Professor Amici, of Florence, very recently, in an essay, communicated to the scientific meeting held in 1846, at Genoa, has endeavoured, by a minute examination of several species of *Orchis*, to prove the existence of the essential part of the embryo, anterior to the application of the pollen, which, according to him, acts as the specific stimulus to its development.

This view receives great support from some singular exceptions to the general law of fecundation.

Of these, the most striking occurs in a New Holland shrub, which has been cultivated several years in the Botanic Garden at Kew; and which, though producing female flowers only, has constantly ripened seeds, from which plants have been raised perfectly resembling the parent; while yet there is no suspicion either of the presence of male flowers in the same plant, or of minute stamens in the female flower itself, nor of fecundation by any related plant cultivated along with it.

This plant has been figured and described in a recent volume of the Linnean Society's transactions, under the name of *Calebogyne ilicifolia*, by Mr. Smith, the intelligent curator of the Kew garden, by whom, indeed, this remarkable fact was first noticed. It is not the least curious part of the history of the *Calebogyne*, that male flowers have lately been discovered in New Holland unquestionably of the same species.

The extension of the means of communication by the electric telegraph is yearly facilitating intercourse, almost as rapid as light or thought, between distant

portions of England, and between distant provinces in the vast empire of our Queen.

Even if I possessed myself, or had collected from others, the materials for the most rapid sketch of the progress of other sciences, the time would fail me in the attempt to convey it to you. I abstain from any reference to geology, principally from my own ignorance of its later progress. I can as little endeavour to bring before the Association the discoveries during the past year by which science has ministered to the arts, or to commerce; yet I cannot leave altogether unanswered—though I can hardly do more than name—the discovery of the gun cotton, and the application of electricity to the smelting of copper.

For that process, I believe, a patent has been recently taken out. As yet, perhaps, sufficient time has not elapsed to test its full value. We all know that an experiment succeeds perfectly in the case of a model, or in a laboratory, which may not succeed so perfectly when the miniature steam engine, for example, is extended to its ordinary size in a manufactory, or when the operation is transferred from ounces to tons. But if the hopes, expectations, and confidence of the discoverers be realised, their plan will be of the greatest value to this country, and of even greater proportionate value to some of the Queen's most important colonies. It has been said that 10,000 tons of copper ore were sent last year from Australia to be smelted in England, and that they produced no more than 1600 tons of copper. It is evident, therefore, that, if by this process of smelting by electricity, the refuse, 8400, can be left on the spot, 8400 tons of shipping are liberated for other purposes of commerce between the Colony and the mother country; and the saving of coal in England, an object not wholly devoid of interest, is immense.

From the sciences cultivated, extended, or encouraged, I advert to a consideration of the Association itself. The importance of these meetings is national. Their direct results have been eminently beneficial to science; their indirect effects in uniting men of the same pursuit from different parts of our common country, and not less in bringing together those whom seas and empires divide, but whom the same zeal for knowledge happily associates as in this place, are equally remarkable. Those antipathies (I hardly use too strong a word) which once separated us from our brethren in other realms, and from which even men of science were not always exempt, are year by year vanishing; and we have met cordially on common grounds to assist and encourage one another in the pursuit of objects honourable and serviceable to the whole family of man.

I feel that I have very inadequately discharged the duties of the station in which I have been placed. Wherever the failure is less apparent, I unfeignedly desire you to attribute such partial suc-

cess to the aid which I have received from Dr. Robinson, Professor Owen, Mr. Robert Brown, and Colonel Sabine; since nothing which is derived from them can be unworthy of your notice. Lest you should have forgotten my earlier mention of them, I repeat this statement; and add again, that it is enough for me to be allowed to call such men my friends. I will only add my firm belief, that every advance in our knowledge of the natural world will, if rightly directed by the spirit of true humility, and with a prayer for God's blessing, advance us in our knowledge of Himself, and will prepare us to receive his revelation of his will with profounder reverence.

The improvements of modern art have greatly facilitated the progress of science. Here how have they brought together from distant regions men of other tongues and other families, but not of other minds! men whom I name to honour them; the Prince of Cassino, Van der Hoeven, Langberg, Ehrenberg, Leverrier, Struve, and Gautier, united here in one common object. In the words of the Prophet Daniel, if they may be applied without irreverence, "men travel to and fro, and knowledge is increased."

May that knowledge be guided aright—may every acquisition of it be sanctified—as the circle widens may every eye be still directed to the centre of all truth, and may every science, whether cultivated in connexion with this great Association or in the elder establishments of this great university, willingly, gladly, and cheerfully lay its tribute on the altar of God.

[The Review of "Reasons for submitting to the Catholic Church, &c.," has been superseded by the Letter of a Correspondent to avoid the reiteration of similar arguments.]

A LETTER TO R. K. SCONCE, B.A.,
ON HIS

REASONS FOR SUBMITTING TO THE
(ROMAN) CATHOLIC CHURCH,

By THE REV. B. LUCAS WATSON, M.A.,
ST. MARY HALL, OXFORD,
MINISTER OF PENRITH AND SOUTH CREEK.

"Eminently mischievous as Mr. Newman's Work (Essay on Development) may be in promoting the cause of infidelity, I deem it, exceedingly, to wit, those unstable and half-read youths who implicitly swallow whatever that gentleman may please to tell them, quite innocuous with every thoughtful person, so far as the ADVANCEMENT OF FOLKRY IS CONCERNED."—PAPER'S LETTERS ON SESSIOON.

(Per favour of the "Sydney Guardian.")

Sir,—Although not one of those who ever expressed a wish that you should publish your reasons for the step you have taken in forsaking light for darkness, and the liberty wherewith Christ has set his people free from the abject slavery and spiritual bondage of the Papal system, I confess that upon the appearance of your pamphlet my curiosity did prompt me to see what you had to say in vindication of yourself. And in sober truth I must acknowledge that I consider you are justly entitled to the thanks of all sincerely attached members of the Church of England for your well-timed publication. Had you been anxious to check the mischief which might possibly have resulted from the force of your example, you have taken the most effectual means of doing so. The natural expectation was that you would have attempted to shew that the doctrines and practices of the Romish Church were in accordance with Holy Scripture, and set forth the process by which your mind became opened by degrees to receive, as truths, such doctrines as transubstantiation, purgatory, priestly intonation, prayers for the dead, works of supererogation, &c., &c., and to justify such practices as the adoration of the Virgin Mary, the invocation

of saints and angels, the worshipping of images and relics, with many other things which, but a short time previous, you professed to believe sinful and corrupt. It was expected, moreover, that you would have brought some little skill to bear upon your work, sufficient at least to mislead those who were ignorant of the authenticity of your facts, and unable to see through the sophistry of your arguments. But instead of all this, what have we?—not one word in vindication of the Church of Rome from those heavy charges which have been brought against her as corrupt both in doctrine and in practice: not one word to prove that those absurd dogmas which are held by her to be Christian verities, are in truth, "the undoubted Word of God," and that "instead of being opposed to the written Word" they are "thoroughly and beautifully consistent with it," but a simple assertion that such is the case! Weak and inconclusive, however, as your reasoning is, we are bound to consider that you have done the best in your power on behalf of your present communion, and award you our thanks for the service you have rendered to us when we see how very ineffective and how puny your strongest efforts are.

But to proceed to the consideration of your pamphlet. So far as I can see, the only reasons, (properly so called,) which you adduce are, 1st—That tradition is of equal authority with the Scriptures;—that we are bound to view the oral teaching of the Church as the rule of faith equally with the written word of God;—and that as the Church of England maintains that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation," you have been compelled to forsake her communion for one which, according to your view of the case, holds a sounder creed: and 2ndly—That it is requisite, in order to be a subject of Christ's kingdom, to acknowledge that Church which claims St. Peter for its first Bishop, upon whom, as upon a rock, you consider the Church to have been built.

But before coming to the point, you give us a mass of introductory matter, such for example as your opinion of the state of the English Church prior to the Tractarian movement, the effects of that movement, the way in which your mind was influenced by it, and much more very remotely connected with the subject, which is, or rather should be, a justification of your late proceedings. Still in this heap of irrelevant matter there are some things which ought not to be passed over unnoticed, and I will therefore offer a few comments upon them, as much as possible in the order in which they stand in your pamphlet.

And, at the very outset, there is a remarkable exemplification of your true character. You speak of yourself as having been "REVERED"! Believe me, Sir, you greatly over-rate the estimation in which you were held by even your warmest admirers. Nothing but the blindest infatuation would have led you to suppose that you were ever regarded in so strong a light. By many you were considered an active and zealous young man, and therefore entitled to all the consideration and respect due to such a character; whilst by the vast majority of Churchmen you were regarded as a young man whose arrogant assumption and over-weening self-sufficiency would inevitably lead him astray from the paths of sobriety and steadfastness. And have not spiritual pride and self-confidence indeed been at the root of all your errors? Had you been somewhat more humble-minded,—had you, when doubts and difficulties first arose in your mind, with a becoming distrust of your own judgment, sought the counsel and advice of men older and wiser than yourself,—more particularly had you, as was your bounden duty, sought for instruction and confirmation in the truth at your Bishop's hands, you would not so lamentably have made shipwreck of your faith, and given occasion of scandal and of scoffing to the thoughtless and the profane. To this you have in substance replied,—"I did consult the Bishop—I did lay my doubts before him; but he gave me no satisfaction; he answered me mainly by referring me to such divines as Dr. Jortin, and as I nauseated the blasphemies of that sceptical writer, my honest and straightforward avowals of difficulty brought me no relief." All this you have said at different times, and more. Now, is your defence a true one? Did you go to the Bishop with a sincere and hearty desire of being relieved from your perplexities? I fear that no one, taking the assertions that you have made, in connexion with the statements contained in your "Reasons," can come to any other conclusion than that you did not. You did not wish to be convinced, and therefore, while, to save appearances,

you thought it expedient to consult him, you concealed the extent of your difficulties from him. You say yourself, "Though he," the Bishop, "did long know of my doubts, he did not know the extent to which they had carried me; and I am persuaded that he was as much surprised as any one at what he conceived to be my sudden decision." Here is a pretty admission! Is this your notion of honesty? If it is, the Church of England has cause to thank you for something more than the publication of your "Reasons;" she has also cause to thank you for the step you have taken in withdrawing from her communion. As you had never, therefore, made a candid statement of your doubts and difficulties, it was manifestly impossible for the Bishop, or any one else to whom you may have applied, to say anything that could have removed them. But one word about Dr. Jortin and such writers. From a circular addressed by the Bishop to the clergy, this statement of yours is proved to be untrue. It seems that, in course of conversation on the subject of mediæval miracles, on which you displayed a marvellous degree of credulity, coupled with want of information, the Bishop asked you if you had ever looked into Jortin's Remarks on Ecclesiastical History; and on your answering in the negative, he said, "there are some things in him on that subject which may be worth looking at, though he is a flippant writer, whom I cannot say I hold generally in much esteem." So much for answering you mainly by reference to Jortin. Now, with respect to "such divines." It seems that the only other book on divinity the Bishop recommended to you was Usher's Answer to a Jesuit; and if you can really, in your sober senses, place Archbishop Usher and Dr. Jortin on an equal footing, your intellect must be on a par with your ingenuousness.

Then, as to the suddenness of your decision, you say, "Sudden it was not, in any other sense than as the overflowing of a cup is sudden when the last drop is added. It was the natural and legitimate termination of a long course of steady progress." Your determination to secede was announced early in February;—how do you reconcile this assertion with the fact that in January you, not once or twice, but over and over again, declared your firm and unshaken attachment to the Church of England? Did you not, I would ask you, so strenuously avow that attachment to one clergyman, who had forbidden you to officiate in his church, as to induce him to recall his prohibition? Did you not, in writing to another clergyman, declare that after many doubts, the course of reading you had pursued had strengthened your attachment to that Church, in whose communion you had been brought up, and in which all your affections were centred? Did you not, again, on the evening of January 26th (the day preceding the consecration of Marsfield Church,) volunteer a statement to the effect that from the high estimation in which you held Newman you had at one time had doubts in your mind whether such a man could be wrong, but that those doubts had been all dissipated? And again, as a contrast to all this, I would ask you, whether you have never stated that you left Sydney to go to the consecration of Marsfield Church an attached Churchman; but that, while kneeling at the altar rails, a light from heaven burst upon your mind in answer to your prayers, and shewed you the path of duty? All this you have said, and much more to the same purport: all proving that your perversion was, or rather was represented by yourself at one time to have been, sudden: yet now you coolly tell the world that "your decision was not sudden," that it was the natural and legitimate termination of a long course of steady progress, and that you "did not act upon impulse, or under morbid feeling, or out of reverence for individual men, but simply because you were convinced." How are these statements, contradictory as they manifestly are, to be reconciled? If you really have acted solely under conviction, it is but justice to yourself to state (which you have not done in your "Reasons.") what it was that occurred to convince you in the short space of something like fourteen or sixteen hours, which is all that could have elapsed between your return to your own house from the place where you made your strong and voluntary avowal of attachment to the Church of England, and the time when, as you have said, the light of inspiration burst upon your darkened mind, and shewed you that the Church of your youth and of your affections was nothing else but a body of "heretics," and nor a branch of the Catholic Church at all! But, Sir, as you were professedly stating your reasons for the step you have taken, why did you leave out this fact of the inspiration? Was it because you were conscious that however well it

might serve to magnify your importance in your present superstitious and credulous communion, it was one which would only be treated with deserved ridicule and contempt by those among whom you wished your pamphlet to circulate: that while with the one, it might serve to strengthen your claims to future canonization; with the others it would only be taken as a proof that you were a fit subject for Tarban Creek. Your decision was either sudden, or it was not; in the one case your conduct is stamped with imbecility, in the other with duplicity; and whether you are labouring under a disease of the head or of the heart, your "Reasons" do not afford sufficient data to decide. It is to be feared, however, that both are in some degree affected. I cannot otherwise account, than upon this supposition, for your conduct in continuing a minister or a member of the Church of England one day after you had gone the length of learning to call the Church of Rome, that mother of abominations, "your sister church," and using, in private, Popish "devotions, adapted to the English Church," and your heart had been "awakened" (1) to regard the blessed "Reformation as a fearful act of schism." The Reformation a schism! You are fond of talking of your reading and your study, but they have been to little purpose if you have not yet learned that the English Reformation had in it no one ingredient that could constitute it a schism; and that so far is your assertion from being the fact, the Roman Catholics, after the Reformation, did as a body conform to the worship of the Church as by law established, although they might not have approved of all the changes that had been effected. More than this, we find Lord Montacute, who had the character of being "a most devout follower of the Romish religion" arguing in favour of it at the Court of Spain, and asserting that "no other religion was brought into England than that which was consonant to the Holy Scriptures, and the four first oecumenical (general) councils." This state of things continued till the year 1569, when Pope Pius V. excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, when a schism was caused by those who supported his supremacy withdrawing themselves from the national religion to which they had previously conformed. The assertion, then, that the Reformation was a fearful act of schism, is one of those gratuitous assumptions in which you are so fond of dealing, and in support of which you offer not one particle of proof.

The next paragraph which seems to demand notice is the following:—"The movement went on, and the great and good men, to whom, as all allow, the Church of England was indebted under God more than to any others living, became (Roman) Catholics—men holy in their lives, sound in judgment, familiar with controversy, learned in the Fathers." Here again you are committing the same error with regard to these men which you just now committed respecting yourself; and again you have need to be reminded that you have no right to attribute to others a participation in your own extravagant sentiments. All do not allow, or ever have allowed, that those apostates are such as you have described. The great bulk of members of the Church of England, including amongst them the men of greatest piety and learning, and soundness of judgment, and most familiar with controversy, in short, all the brightest ornaments of the Church, have habitually regarded them and their proceedings in a very different light. And the result has only confirmed their forebodings of evil, and the justness of their condemnations. Surely, Sir, when you wrote the above high-flown panegyric, you could not have been aware that Newman, that "great and good man," a man whom (as I have heard you say) you "love as dearly as it is possible for one person to love another: whom you hold in the highest veneration; whom you regard as more than a father, so that you would rather hear your own father abused than listen to one word against him;" that he, "holy in life and sound in judgment;" has confessed that ever since the year 1833 he has actually been a concealed Romanist; that when he wrote so strongly against Romish error, he did not express his own real sentiments; that he wrote as he did, not because he believed it true, but because he found it necessary to his position: persons had begun to suspect him, and therefore to fill suspicion he was obliged to write in the character of, and to express himself as would be expected from, a divine of the Anglican Church! You cannot surely be aware that this man, your great oracle, or rather the idol at whose shrine you have sacrificed everything you ought to have most treasured, has admitted with the coolest effrontery imaginable, that for years he was living a life of the most consummate hypocrisy, that in fact for years his whole life was one great lie, and a lie not to man

only, but more awful still by far, a lie before his God. If you did know of these facts, and it is almost impossible that you could have been ignorant of them, then we can estimate the value of the testimony you bear to "the healthy tone of mind," "the Christian refinement and delicacy of thought," "the implicit reliance on the inherent power of truth," and "contempt of mere expediency," which you profess to have discovered among your new associates. A man whose moral perception has been so deadened, or rather whose moral sense has been so completely obliterated, as to eulogize Newman after such a disgraceful confession as that which he has made, can scarcely be a safe guide on any question where morality is concerned.

While upon this topic, I cannot pass over the most extraordinary quotation you have given us from some sermon which, you say, was preached four years ago in a Protestant pulpit. The whole passage is so extremely rich, that the temptation to give it entire is irresistible:—"If the truth must be spoken, what are the humble monk, and the holy nun, and other regulars, as they are called, but Christians, after the pattern given us in Scripture? What have they done but this:—continue in the world the Christianity of the Bible? Did our Saviour come on earth suddenly, as he will one day visit, in whom would he see the features of the Christians he and his apostles left behind them, but in them? Who but these give up home and friends, wealth and ease, good name and liberty of will, for the kingdom of heaven? Where shall we find the image of St. Paul, or St. Peter, or St. John, or of Mary the mother of Mark, or of Philip's daughters, but in those who, whether they remain in seclusion, or are sent over the earth, have calm faces and sweet plaintive voices, and spare frames, and gentle manners, and hearts weaned from the world, and wills subdued; and for their meekness meet with insult, and for their purity with slander, and for their courage with gravity with suspicion, and for their courage with cruelty; yet meet with Christ everywhere—Christ their all-sufficient, everlasting portion, to make up to them, both here and hereafter, all they suffer, all they dare, for his name's sake!" You have forgotten to mention the name of the individual by whom these words were uttered. This was a great omission, for while from the staple of the composition I entertain little or no doubt that they are Newman's; still it is just possible that they may have proceeded from the pen of one of his numerous shadows. But whoever it may be, he ought to have his name enrolled in the list of literary prodigies, for a mind so perfectly free from all taint of history is seldom to be met with. In good truth, if Romish historians are to be themselves believed, "the humble monk, and the holy nun, and the other regulars as they are called," "with their calm faces and sweet plaintive voices, and spare frames, and gentle manners, and hearts weaned from the world, and wills subdued," have in every age been in the habit of teaching the "Christianity of the Bible," much after the same fashion as the Helots taught sobriety to the youths of Sparta. In fact, the irreligious lives, the ignorance, the frauds, the dissoluteness, and the flagrant crimes of the monastic orders, whether male or female, together with many other proofs of their impurity, are too notoriously matters of history to be denied, and form a too fertile subject of complaint even to Romish writers themselves. To prove my assertion, I should have to quote passages utterly unfit for the perusal of the general reader; and therefore will content myself by referring to a certain note contained in the 2nd volume of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History (Murdoch and Soame's Edition) page 354, together with the authorities (Romish) there given; and also to Roscoe's Life of Scipio de Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia and Prato, who died in 1810, a learned and good man, who, for his strenuous efforts to bring about something like a reformation of religion in Tuscany, suffered grievous persecution, and was, after Roman custom, branded by Pope Pius VI. as a "fanatic, a liar, a calumniator, seditious, and a usurper presumptuous to refer a man of your extensive reading ("220 folios in Greek and Hebrew," to say nothing of such light dishes as quartos and octavos, together with a miscellaneous assortment of Latin of all sorts and sizes!) to any works whatsoever, under the assumption that you are already master of them all; still I venture to believe that if any man, however prejudiced, will only look into this matter with a desire to discern the truth, the ludicrous delusion under which your author seems to labour respecting "the holy nuns and humble monks, with their subdued wills," will be entirely removed. You will, perhaps, be ready indignantly to exclaim, "Here is a proof of the truth

of what has been said,—here is an instance in which these holy men and women, for their meekness meet with insult, for their purity with slander, and for their gravity with suspicion." But I would have you to recollect that if they have been insulted, and slandered, and suspected, it has been by Romanists, by members of their own communion, and not by us; we only believe the charges brought against the monastic orders, as we believe any other historical fact, after duly weighing the authority and credibility of the persons by whom the charges have been preferred.

As I have here alluded incidentally to the claim you advance to superior literary attainments to those ordinarily met with, I cannot help noticing, at the risk of digression, that self-satisfactory, and (as you appear to regard it,) impregnable defence you throw around you in order to screen yourself from any attacks which may be made upon you. You deprecate strongly the idea that any one has a right to charge you with being mistaken in anything you have said, who has not gone through the same course of study with yourself; as though what you had thought and you had done, was of necessity the pattern for all to follow; and as though all must necessarily be ignorant who had not trodden in your footsteps! Now what course of reading you may have pursued I know not, but judging from its effects, it must have been a very bad one. Lord Bacon has observed that "a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to Atheism; but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion;" and it appears to me to be an equally clear axiom, that a slight and superficial knowledge of the Fathers and Ecclesiastical History inclineth man's mind to Popery; but depth in those things bringeth men's minds about to Protestantism. A confirmation of this fact is afforded us by the different results which followed the study of antiquity and Ecclesiastical History by you, and by our Reformers; you with your shewy but shallow acquirements have forsaken the Church of England for that of Rome; they, giants as they were in patristic lore, forsook the darkness of Popery for the pure light of Gospel truth. You must pardon me, therefore, if even at the risk of being pronounced by you to be presumptuous, I decline taking you for my exemplar in this or any other matter.

You next complain that the Church of Rome has been "caricatured by controversialists," and that in your searching after the right way, an "almost impenetrable veil of misrepresentation hung between yourself and the truth." An almost impenetrable veil of misrepresentation has indeed been cast over Romish doctrine; and the tenets of that Church have been grievously caricatured. But by whom? Not by Protestants, but by yourselves. As though you were aware that the peculiar doctrines of your faith were too monstrous to meet the eyes of any who had not been habituated to them; the modern heads of your communion, in the British dominions at least, have misrepresented them to such a degree, and so altered them to suit the tastes of Protestants, that it is a task of no small difficulty to arrive at the truth respecting them. Take, for instance, the subject of idolatry. You will say, that in this particular the Romish faith has been misrepresented and caricatured by Protestants; and that you do not, as we say you do, pay divine worship to images; but that you only use them to remind you of the beings they represent, and as helps to devotion. So say all your modern English writers, although they thereby most plainly contradict some of your canonized saints. If you doubt or deny this statement I would request you to compare the teaching of Milner, Baines, and Wiseman, with that of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventura on this subject.

Now, when it is recollected that the writings of Aquinas and Bonaventura are looked upon as standard authorities in the Church of Rome—that they have themselves been canonized—and that prayers are actually offered up to them as intercessors between God and man; and that, of Bonaventura, it was said by Pope Sixtus IV., that "he had so written on divine things that the Holy Ghost seems to have spoken in him;"—they must be taken to be possessed of far more weight as expositors of Romish doctrine than men like Baines and Wiseman, whose writings have never received the Papal sanction, and can be repudiated at any moment. Perhaps it may be said that these older writers were living before the Council of Trent, at which "due veneration" only was commanded to be paid to images. But then we find Naclantus, one of the most influential members of that very council, expressing himself even more strongly, if possible, than either of them. "The faithful in the Church,"

he says, "do not only worship before the image (as some for caution's sake affirm), but they do worship the image itself, without any conceivable scruple whatever." Nay, they must worship the image with the worship of right due to the prototype or original being. So that, if the original being is to be worshipped with latria, (supreme divine worship) the image must also be adored with latria." The same language, moreover, is used at this very day in Roman Catholic countries, where the necessity for diluting Romanism to suit the tastes and prejudices of Protestants does not exist. For instance, in a work entitled "Christian Doctrine," published at Florence in the year 1837, we read the following question and answer:—"Q. Ought we to pay any adoration at all to the images of Christ, or of the Virgin, or of the Saints? A. If we consider them only in themselves, as a sacred and blessed thing, we show them that respect only which we feel towards a sacred and blessed thing; but, considered as the representative of a saint, we ought to adore them with the same kind of adoration with which we adore the saint whom they represent." Who then is it that misrepresents and caricatures Romanism,—Protestants or such Jesuitical writers as Doctors Wiseman and Baines? I agree with you that Romanism has been misrepresented and caricatured; and it would be well for you if you could be brought to see it as it really is, instead of in the masquerading it at present wears. But at any rate, when you talk of misrepresenting and caricaturing, remember that members of the Church of England are most assufully justified in preferring St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventura, and Nacianthus, as expositors of Roman doctrine to Wiseman and Baines, or even Robert Knox Sence himself; and upon their authority, enforced as it is in a multitude of ways by the highest sanction of the Romish Church, bringing the charge of gross and palpable idolatry against that corrupt communion.

But, Sir, suppose your modern English writers are right in their statement of your faith, and your old divines are wrong, what then becomes of your boasted unity of doctrine: a unity which you regard as so striking as to lead you to contrast with it the differences of opinion which exist in the Church of England? You say, "There is a Church in the world teaching in every nation under Heaven one and the same thing;" and, again, you speak of "the Church which, as an undeniable historical fact, has ever taught one and the same doctrine." On the subject of Image-worship to wit! But besides this there is scarcely one single tenet of your faith on which you are agreed, or which has not been the subject of the bitterest animosities and most violent dissensions:—dissensions so bitter and so violent, that in the language of Dr. Payne, "it has been all along almost as dangerous to the interests of the Roman Church, to let their controversies go on, as to go about to decide them." I would recommend to your notice the following extract from Townsend's "Accusations of History against the Romish Church:—"*I could have selected from the writings of the Romanist divines nearly every doctrinal opinion which is advocated by our jarring sectaries. Arminianism was the doctrine of the Jesuits; Calvinism of the Jansenists; Quakerism of the Franciscans; Socinianism, in all its branches, from Arrianism to Belshazzar, was taught by the authors enumerated in the 'Roma Racoviana' of Jameson. The fanaticism of new sects among us, was the same with that of new orders among you; yet all these appeal to Popery, and protest against the Scriptures."* As I do not approve of your practice of making assertions without offering any proof in support of them, I will not follow your example; and, therefore, will afford you an opportunity of refuting me, if I am wrong, by giving you a few instances. To pass over the disputes between the Thomists, the Scottists, and the Occamists, the Canonists and Schoolmen, which were not all of them about trifles, (though most of them were); what say you to the fierce contentions between the Jansenists and the Molinists?—what say you again to the dispute between the Franciscans and the Dominicans on the subject of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary?—a question which was by themselves esteemed of such vital importance that, if we would only believe them, there would have been revelations against revelations, and even miracles against miracles wrought in favour of either party. This disputed point caused such discord at the Council of Trent, (both parties being very powerful as well as earnest, the Franciscans zealously maintaining this dogma, and the Dominicans as fiercely denying it), that in order to prevent an open schism it was left undecided, the Council declining any interference with it. The following decree was passed instead:—"The holy council further declares,

that it is not its design to include in this decree, which treats of original sin, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God; but that the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV., of blessed memory, are to be observed, under the penalties contained in the same, which are hereby renewed." Those constitutions declare "that indulgences should be granted to those who devoutly celebrated the wonderful conception of the Virgin to the same extent as were enjoyed on Corpus Christi day; and that the disputants on both sides should refrain from reviling and condemning each other, since the Church had passed no decision on the subject." By the use of the word "wonderful" instead of "immaculate" the Pope carefully guarded himself against any expression which could imply a decision of the controverted point. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that neither these constitutions, nor yet the decree passed at Trent, seemed to quell the tumult and restore peace. The contest raged as furiously as ever, and so late as the seventeenth century, more than a century after Trent, "the kingdom of Spain was thrown into such confusion, and so miserably divided into factions by this controversy, that solemn embassies were sent to Rome, to engage the Pontiff to determine the question, or, at any rate, to put an end to the dispute by a public bull." But "after the most earnest entreaties and importunities, all that could be obtained from the Pontiff by the Court of Spain was, a declaration, intimating that the opinion of the Franciscans had a high degree of probability on its side, and forbidding the Dominicans to oppose it in a public manner; but this decree was accompanied by another, by which the Franciscans were prohibited in their turn, from treating as erroneous the doctrine of the Dominicans." So much for your assertion that "there is a Church" (meaning the Romish) "in the world, teaching in every nation under heaven one and the same thing," and "which as an undeniable historical fact, has ever taught one and the same doctrine!" I maintain, without fear of contradiction, that there never at any time has been any question mooted among members of the Church of England, that has caused one half the animosity and confusion that has been caused by this of the "immaculate conception" among members of your communion; yet you bring it as a charge against her, that "she does not teach one and the same thing, for everybody in Sydney knows that at Christ Church and St. Andrew's one doctrine was taught, at St. James's another, at St. Philip's a third." To this assertion, with the exception of St. Andrew's, may a most positive denial be given. In one and all of these churches, the great and distinguishing principles of the Gospel of our salvation are habitually preached without reserve, and in all of them is the teaching of their respective incumbents believed to be in strict and perfect accordance with the doctrines set forth in the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy, of the Church of England; if it is not, then, instead of throwing out an insinuation calculated to injure the character of men, whom it may, without flattery, be said that a comparison between any one of them and yourself would certainly not be to their disadvantage; you were bound to prove your charge, and state the particulars wherein they differed from each other, and from the Church. As you have not done so, I take the liberty of telling you that this assertion of yours, like every other throughout your pamphlet which you introduce with the expressions—"somebody knows," "all admit," &c., is a misrepresentation, a gratuitous and, I fear, a malicious misrepresentation. So long as men are men, and minds are differently constituted, and so long as men remembering that they are rational as well as accountable beings, use the intellect which God has given them, will there be differences upon minor and non-essential points. And, further, there may occasionally be a slight diversity of opinion even upon some points which can scarcely be considered either minor or non-essential, though in such cases the discordance in sentiment is not so great as to constitute either shade of opinion a fundamental error. This fair and reasonable difference of opinion may, and doubtless will, exist; but to assert more than this, especially as you have done, without proof, is most untrue, and most dishonest, more particularly when you carry it the length of implying that these differences, insignificant as they are compared with yours, are publicly proclaimed from the pulpits of the Sydney churches. For the other churches I have spoken, and denied that contradictory doctrines are preached in them; but with respect to St. Andrew's, I am bound to receive as truth the admission you have made, and to believe that a man has been in the habit of standing up in that church and labouring to undermine the faith of his hearers by preaching

other doctrine than that which before God he had solemnly declared that he believed to be the truth. But, Sir, while you were enumerating the churches in Sydney, and pronouncing the preaching in them to be contradictory, why did you, in such a marked manner, couple Christ Church with St. Andrew's? Your object is but too apparent. Why will you insist upon degrading yourself still lower, and exposing to the public gaze, and the public scorn, so sad a spectacle of malignity? You do not suppose, surely, that your aim is not manifestly seen to be the gratification of your private feelings of ill-will? You know that nothing can possibly tend to compromise any clergyman more than being suspected of entertaining sentiments similar to your own; and now, in order to revenge yourself on the incumbent of this church for the decided manner in which, notwithstanding your efforts to the contrary, he repudiated your friendship immediately on your apostasy; you industriously endeavour, by every means in your power, to foster the idea that it is not improbable that he will follow you to Rome! No one knows better than you do yourself, and it is right that the world should be made cognizant of the fact, that months before your secession you were prevented from preaching within the walls of Christ Church in consequence of that gentleman's disapproval of your doctrine!

Though I have not yet noticed one half the weak points in your miscellaneous observations which I had marked for comment, I have already so far exceeded the limits I had proposed to myself, that I must be content with merely a few brief notices on the principal of those that remain, in order to get, with as little delay as possible, at your two main reasons.

First, then, you bring it as a charge against the Church of England that "she is not called the Catholic Church, though her members profess their belief in such a Church every time they say the Apostle's Creed." This is true. And why? Simply because her members are endued with more discernment than to suppose that a part can be the whole. She claims to be a BRANCH of the Catholic Church, but not the WHOLE Church. This absurdity was reserved for Rome to perpetrate. An absurdity in which she stands alone, for none of the other branches of the Catholic Church throughout the whole world have ever sent forth such pretensions. Perhaps you may not be conscious of this fact, for you appear not to be aware of the existence even of any National Churches throughout the world, independent of the See of Rome, except the Church of England:—a most unwarrantable piece of ignorance truly, in a man of your profound study and vast reading! You tell us that besides the Church of Rome, "The only other Church claiming obedience, as a Church, is the Church of England." I will, in compassion, add to your stock of knowledge by informing you of the Greek, the Syrian, the Abyssinian, the Coptic, with many others which never acknowledged the authority of Rome. Then again, the claims of Rome to be the one, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, are plainly, in so many words, asserted by you; but as you do not bring forward one single argument in support of these claims, and seem content to allow this point to rest upon your own ipse dixit, I will be content, on my part, simply to place the assertion and authority of another against yours. I will leave the name of Archbishop Laud to weigh against your name, and then the world may decide to which of the two most weight is to be attached. Hear, then, what Archbishop Laud says on this question:—"One she is, as a particular Church, but not THE ONE. Holy she would be counted; but the world may see, if it will not blind itself, of what value holiness is in that court and country. Catholic she is not in any sense of the word: for she is not the universal, and so not catholic in extent; nor is she sound in doctrine, and in things which come near upon the foundation too;—so not catholic in belief. Nor is she the pristine mother-church of Christianity.—Jerusalem was that; and so not catholic as a fountain or original, or as the head and root of the catholic."

Next, in support of your position, that the Romish Church teaches "Bible Christianity," you use a most strange argument, and one which, I suspect, will prove more than you are prepared to admit. You say, "In the week just passed, had a Protestant looked in at St. Mary's, at six in the morning, he would have seen, day after day, some 1500 souls gathered round their Bishop in preparation for their Paschal Communion; and every day in the year he would see, devoutly kneeling on their knees at early prayer, about 400 worshippers." Doubtless the earnestness and zeal of many

Romanists, and their attention to the duties of their religion, (supposing it to be the free-will offering of the heart, and not mere formal and slavish service), is highly commendable, and puts to shame the coldness and indifference of many who possess a pure creed: But to bring this forward in proof of the soundness of their faith is most inconclusive reasoning. As well might the Hindoo refer to the multitudes who assemble at the temple of Juggernaut, where you would find almost as many thousands as you have mentioned tens, as an argument in support of Hindooism; or the Mahomedan appeal, to the devotedness with which he breaks off from whatever may at the time be his occupation, to engage in prayer at the call of the Muezzin, as an indisputable evidence that Mahomet was the Prophet of God. No;—we have another, and a surer mode of testing the truth of any creed,—a mode given by God himself,—but one which you have unhappily rejected. We are not left to the uncertain test of popular fervour and enthusiasm on the one hand, or of popular indifference and lukewarmness on the other; but we are enjoined to go “to the law and to the testimony,” with the positive assurance that “if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Every word, as well as every work, is to be brought by us to the infallible touchstone of Holy Writ, so that if an angel from heaven ever should preach to us any other Gospel than that which we have received, he is to be held accursed. Now are the doctrines of the Romish Church in conformity with the word of God? This question brings me at length to the consideration of your first real reason for departing from the Church of England. She maintains that “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it shall be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.” With her, therefore, Scripture is the test of doctrine. You, on the contrary, assert that the teaching of the church is of equal authority with, if not paramount to, Scripture; and consequently that whatever she teaches must implicitly be believed as we hope for salvation. This position you endeavour to support by labouring to show that the texts following, John v. 39; 2 Tim. iii. 15–17; and, Acts, xvii. 11, do not really teach the doctrine in fact, which they are usually adduced. You assert, and truly, that the Scriptures spoken of in all those passages are the Scriptures of the Old Testament; but then you draw from this fact the impotent, and somewhat impious conclusion, that if the words are to be taken as affording “an argument for sufficiency at all,” they “would imply that the New Testament was an unwarrantable addition;” and you ask the question, “If these” (the Scriptures of the Old Testament) “were able to make him” (Timothy) “wise unto salvation without anything else, what need had he of the New Testament.” We are bound to believe of every revelation of His will that Almighty God has been pleased to make, that it was perfectly adapted to the spiritual wants and capacities of those to whom it was vouchsafed; and that in every age of the world men were required to walk according to the light afforded by their respective dispensations. Yet your inference would amount to this: that we, who live under the Christian dispensation, need not trouble ourselves with any further revelation of God’s will than that which was made to Adam. Your mode of reasoning leads to this conclusion: because the revelation made to Adam was perfectly suited to his condition, and able to make him wise unto salvation, the fuller revelation made to Abraham was “an unwarrantable addition;” and so also was that made under the Mosaic dispensation; and so also was the Christian revelation. You certainly cannot mean, I should imagine, to take up such a position, and therefore, I only allude to it, in order to point out the danger of using a sophistical and bad argument, without waiting to see what it may lead to, simply because it looks sharp and clever; yet this is a fault of which I could point out fifty instances in your pamphlet, did time permit. You yourself admit that the command, “Search the Scriptures,” was addressed to the Jews, bidding them to examine well the law, and the Prophets, and the Psalms, which spake of Christ; and then you add “undoubtedly the Old Testament, duly searched, would lead a Jew to recognise our blessed Lord as the expected Messias. And this is all that need be signified by the text.” And this is quite enough. If you admit that the Old Testament was sufficient for the purposes for which it was given, namely, to direct the minds of men to a Saviour who should come; and if you admit also that the Jews were commanded to search them, and the Bereans were commended because

they searched them; it devolves upon you to show how, and why, it is that the fuller and clearer revelation which we enjoy under the Christian dispensation is insufficient for the purpose for which it was given, to direct the minds of men to a Saviour who has come, that so they may be led to trust in Him for the pardon of their sins, and seek for the gracious assistance of His spirit, to enable them to live as becometh the subjects of His kingdom; and it behoves you also to shew that the practice of searching the Scriptures, which was commanded to the Jews, and commended in the Bereans, is no longer permitted to Christians; but that they are rather required to take for their infallible guide that, which you term, “the UNWRITTEN Word.” If it was right and commendable in the Jews and in the Bereans to search the Scriptures, because they testified of Him who had come into the world to be the Saviour of the world; it must be also right and commendable in us all to search the Scriptures, in order that such as are yet in their sins may be brought to repentance and learn the way of salvation through a merciful Redeemer; while such as have entered upon the path of life may continually be acquiring an increase of wisdom and spiritual understanding and growing in grace and in the knowledge of their only Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Besides the three texts to which you have referred, there are a multitude of others which set forth the use and authority of the written Word. Such, for example, are Luke, i. 3, 4; Luke, xvi. 29–31; John, xxi. 31; Rom. xv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 11; and 2 Pet. i. 19–21. This last text proves that St. Peter regarded the Holy Scriptures as a surer and more certain guide to truth than even the evidence of the senses;—the senses might err or be deceived, but Holy Scripture, being given by inspiration of God, was certain and infallible. On the other hand no unwritten word, notwithstanding your assertion to the contrary, is ever once mentioned in the Bible as any guide whatever, or as being possessed of any authority. The only occasions on which we ever hear of any such mode of instruction is when our blessed Lord condemns the Scribes and Pharisees for having made “void the law of God by their traditions,” and censures them for “teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” The existence even of such an authority is never even hinted at, much less asserted. You have indeed given us a string of passages, which any one whose eyes were not blinded by prejudice, would see, with half a glance, had nothing whatever to do with the matter. Here are a few of them. Matt. xxviii. 18–20; John, xxi. 21–23; relate the commission given by our blessed Saviour to his Apostles. John, xiv. 16–18, 26, contains the promise of the gift of the Holy Ghost, which descended upon the Apostles on the day of Pentecost. 2 Tim. i. 14, and ii. 2, is an exhortation from St. Paul to Timothy to discharge his duty to the Church both in his own person, and also by appointing faithful and able men to the sacred office. In 1 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 6, 1 Cor. xi. 2, and 2 Pet. iii. 1, 2, the Apostles are writing to their converts and exhorting them not to forget the instruction they had received from them, whether by word of mouth, when they were present with them, or by letter during their absence. (As I suppose you mean to lay great stress on the use of the word “tradition” in these verses, I beg to remind you of what you may possibly have forgotten, that “tradition” means anything handed down or delivered from one person to another). But the funniest proof you adduce in support of the authority of “the unwritten word,” is that taken from 2 John, 12. The Apostle is writing to a friend, Gaius, and says that he has a great deal to write about, but that instead of writing he will wait for an opportunity of seeing him, which he trusts will soon offer, and then he will tell him all he has to say! And this forsooth, is magnified into an evidence of the authority of “the unwritten word!” The other verses referred to by you relate, not to the “unwritten word,” but to the Church. This collection of inapplicable texts you follow up with the triumphant exclamation, “It is hardly possible to conceive that any one would, in the exercise of private judgment, conclude from a comparison of these several passages from the sacred volume, that the Bible, rather than the Church, is the appointed teacher of Christianity.” The sentiment contained in these words, is much the same as that previously expressed by you: “That Protestants do receive any portion of God’s word, that they admit the Christian Scriptures, while they reject the Christian Church, is a happy inconsistency.” You really, Sir, appear to have been extremely ignorant of the principles of the Church you have forsaken, or else you are labouring under a most lamentable confusion and perplexity of mind. To assert that the Church

of England rejects the Christian Church and its authority, is as absurd as it is false. You yourself refer to Article XX., which is as follows:—“The Church has power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith; and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.” You were perfectly aware, then, that the Church of England does not reject the Christian Church, though to suit a purpose you thought proper to say she does! Then as to the notion “that the Bible, rather than the Church, is the appointed teacher of Christianity”—by whom is it entertained?—not by the members of the Church of England: it is purely a notion of your own. We say this: that the Church has been appointed by her Divine head to be the teacher of his Gospel throughout the world; that it is her province to labour in this her vocation until all kingdoms of the world shall have become the kingdoms of her Lord and of his Christ; but then we maintain that she is STRICTLY the teacher of Christianity, and of nothing else; and that the wrath of God will rest upon her if she either adds to, or takes from, the Word of Life; more particularly if she (as the Roman branch has done) substitutes a modified Paganism in place of the pure Gospel; we maintain also that the Bible is the repository of the faith which the Church is required to teach; that it is the rule and test to which all the doctrines and tenets of the Church are to be brought; and that it is by the conformity or non-conformity of her teaching to the written Word that her faithfulness or faithlessness to the trust reposed in her is to be proved. How, then, do we deny, or reject, the authority of the Church? You, perhaps, will be prepared to argue that we limit, if we do not deny, this authority, whereas the injunction of Scripture is—“We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you.” 1 Thess. v. 12; and “Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls.” Heb. xiii. 17. You will doubtless maintain that these passages are sufficient to prove the absolute authority and infallibility of the Church, and the duty of all its members to submit themselves unreservedly to all its teaching. As well might you quote the commands—“Honour thy father and thy mother,” and “Children obey your parents in ALL things,” to prove the absolute authority and infallibility of parents, and that children are bound to pay implicit obedience to all the commands of their earthly parents, whatever those commands may be. The cases are parallel, and will serve to illustrate the authority of the Church over its members, and the obedience due from its members to it. As children are required and commanded by God to obey, and to be in subjection to, their parents, so are we required and commanded to submit ourselves to those who are over us in the Lord, and admonish us; as parents are enjoined not to provoke their children to wrath, but to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, so is it the duty of the Church to build up its members in their most holy faith, and to take heed to the doctrine which it has received, that it fulfil it; as parents may not command anything unlawful or sinful to their children, so may not the Church command anything unlawful or sinful to its members. To all parents and children, the Church and its members, has God vouchsafed a sure guide to a proper discharge of their respective and relative duties in the Inspired Volume. And therefore a fearful amount of responsibility rests upon all those, who, searching the Scriptures, not to learn their duty, but to justify conduct in which they have resolved to persevere, or to draw arguments from it in support of their own preconceived notions, go astray from the right path themselves, and place stumbling-blocks in the way of others. A most fearful amount of responsibility, therefore, rests upon parents, on the one hand, if they drive their children to disobedience, and on the other upon children if, through caprice or wilfulness, they disobey their parents;—and a like amount of responsibility, also, rests, on the one hand, upon any branch of Christ’s Church, if by commanding what is contrary to God’s Word, it compels those who would obey God rather than man to refuse obedience to it; and rests, on the other hand, upon the people, if, through caprice or wilfulness, they refuse to submit to the authority of those who are set over them in the Lord, in all

things lawful and honest. Like to the authority of a parent over a grown and intelligent child, is the authority of the Church over its children; and this is the position maintained by the Church of England. She claims authority as the appointed teacher of God's word; but at the same time, she places the Bible in the hands of all her children, in order that they may be fully assured of the certainty of those things wherein they are instructed. And herein she observed that "via media," that golden mean, at which you sneer; a mean which, while it avoids the one error of placing all authority in the Church, and making void the word of God, steers clear also of the opposite error, of altogether casting off the teaching and authority of the Church, and leaving all men, however unlearned and unstable they may be, to wrest the Holy Scriptures as they please, even to their own destruction.

To come now to your chief reason for secession:—You say, "I saw every ground for believing that the Church in communion with the See of St. Peter, on whom it was founded, was to be unhesitatingly followed." And again—"My study of antiquity led me to recognise the necessity of being in communion with St. Peter's successor. The supremacy of the Bishop of Rome is, in my opinion, as fully set forth in the Primitive Church as the truth of Christianity itself." In the course of your "study of antiquity" did you happen to come across the following passage in Jerome—a writer who is styled by Romish divines "the most blessed of the Fathers":—"The Church of Rome is not to be thought one thing, and that of the whole world another. Gaul, and Britain, and Africa, and Persia, and the East, and Judea, and all the barbarian nations, adore also one Christ, and observe the same rule of faith. If authority is sought for, the world is greater than any one city. Wherever there is a Bishop, whether at Rome, or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, or Tunis, he is of the same excellency, of the same Episcopate. The power of wealth, or the lowliness of poverty, does not make a bishop either less or greater. For they are all the successors of the Apostles." Of course, to your mind this is conclusive evidence in favour of the Pope's supremacy! But to return. In order to make out your case you will have to prove, first, that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome; which it is necessary he should have been if the Pope is to be his successor; and, secondly, that St. Peter ever himself enjoyed the supremacy over the other Apostles, claimed for him by his so called successors. Upon the first point you offer no one particle of proof; but content yourself with asserting the fact, accompanied with the unfortunate word "admitted," which is, throughout your pamphlet, the sure and infallible sign of a false statement. You speak of "the Bishop of Rome, who is admitted to be historically the successor of him to whom Christ said, 'Feed my sheep.'" Now, so far from being "admitted," it has most emphatically been denied thousands upon thousands of times; and moreover, there are very great historical difficulties in the way of St. Peter's having ever been at Rome at all;—the most that ever has been supposed probable is, that he was there for a short time before he suffered death in the persecution under Nero. It is perfectly evident that there were a number of Christians at Rome; and that St. Peter was not there when St. Paul arrived in that city. See Acts, xxviii. 14, 15, 30, 31. But even let it be granted that St. Peter was at Rome during some time, where is the proof that he was ever Bishop of that See? The earliest writer that speaks at all about St. Peter being at Rome is Irenæus; and his statement is conclusive against the papal claim. He speaks of the Roman Church having been regularly founded and organised by St. Peter and St. Paul conjointly; and then says that those two apostles delivered the Episcopate of that church to Linus. Linus, therefore, and not St. Peter, was the first Bishop of Rome. On this point all possibility of misapprehension is removed by the fact that Irenæus gives a numerical catalogue of all the bishops of Rome down to his own time; and in that catalogue they are all numbered from Linus as the first. And the Apostolical Constitutions declare that "Linus was ordained Bishop of Rome by St. Paul; and, after the death of Linus, Clement was ordained by St. Peter." According, then, both to Irenæus and the Apostolical Constitution, St. Peter never was Bishop of Rome at all, and therefore it is impossible for the Pope to be his successor. As thus much will serve once more to show what dependence is to be placed upon your word when you assert anything to be "admitted,"—and as you do not attempt to prove the statement you have made,—I will pass on to the consideration of the question,

whether any supremacy was enjoyed by St. Peter over the rest of the Apostles. Here you do attempt a Scripture proof; and say, moreover, that you are "conscious of having been mainly influenced by it." We may reasonably expect, therefore, to meet with something very conclusive. Let us see, then, whether our reasonable expectations are realised.

Your "Scripture proofs of St. Peter's primacy" are arranged under the following heads:—

"I.—THE NAME."

Here you quote John, i. 42.—We admit that the name of "Peter" was given by our Lord to Simon, the son of Jonas; and this is all the text tells us. The argument you found upon it is not clear; but seems to imply that the word "rock," in Is. li. 1, 2, "Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn—unto Abraham your father," ought to have been translated "Peter;" since "Abraham was named because he was the father of many people;" and "Peter was so named because in him was to be founded the multitude of the faithful." If you intend to substitute the word "Peter" for "rock" throughout the inspired volume, you will, I fear, be sometimes rather embarrassed, for instance in 1 Cor. x. 4, where the substitution will prove that Peter was the Messiah! "They drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ."

"II.—THE PROMISE."

The quotation here is from Matt. xvi. 16–19. This is the passage upon which the assertion of St. Peter's supremacy over the other Apostles is chiefly based; yet you must be perfectly aware, that the most eminent of the early Fathers placed upon it an interpretation totally subversive of any such pretension. On the former portion of the text,—that which relates to the rock upon which the Church is built,—by far the vast majority of constitutions, both ancient and modern, understood either our blessed Lord himself, or the confession of faith made by St. Peter when he said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." Instance Jerome; who says, "On this rock the Lord founded his Church; from this rock the Apostle Peter obtained his name. The foundation which the Apostle, as an architect laid is one,—our Lord Jesus Christ, upon this foundation the Church of Christ is built." So also does St. Augustine expound the passage, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock which thou hast confessed, when thou saidst, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God,' I will build my Church,—that is, I will build my Church upon myself, who am this Son of God;" and again he asks, "What does this saying mean, upon this rock I will build my Church? Upon this faith,—upon that which was spoken: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.'" Others, and many Protestant divines among the number, consider it to refer to St. Peter himself, in allusion to his having been the Apostle who by his preaching on the day of Pentecost brought 3000 souls into the Church of Christ, and to his having been the chosen instrument in opening the door of salvation to the Gentiles by the conversion of Cornelius. They consider that as he was the first to confess his belief in the divine nature and mission of Jesus Christ, so, as a mark of special honour, he was permitted to be the first to lay the foundation of the Christian Church both among the Jews and Gentiles. Whether, then, the "rock" be taken to mean Peter or not, the text is equally far from proving any superiority in him over the rest of the Apostles. On the second part of the passage to which you refer you say, "Let it be remembered that though the power of binding and loosing was given to the Apostles, this gift of the keys is peculiar to St. Peter." I will answer this by a quotation from "Allwood's Lectures":—"With regard to the power of the keys, and of binding and loosing, that this conferred no superior jurisdiction on St. Peter over the other Apostles, is admitted by the learned Roman Catholic, Du Pin, who states that the ancient Fathers, with an unanimous consent, teach that the keys were given to the whole Church in the person of Peter, and that it cannot be inferred from this passage of Scripture that St. Peter received anything which was not given to the other Apostles."

"III.—THE SPECIAL GIFT."

Luke, xxii. 31, 32, is referred to. What "special gift" is conferred in these verses you do not tell us; and I confess I am at a loss to discover. The quibble on the word "I," in verse 28, is worthy of your ingenuity!

"IV.—THE PRIMACY OF RANK HELD BY ANTICIPATION DURING OUR LORD'S EARTHLY MINISTRY."

On this point you give us a whole host of texts; but the entire force of most of them consists in the name of Peter being mentioned before that of the other Apostles. How this proves his "primacy" I cannot conceive. May not the forwardness, and boldness, and zeal, which were the peculiar features in St.

Peter's character, sufficiently account for his name being generally mentioned the first, (though not always, for St. Paul speaks of "James, Cephas, and John") without supposing that any expression of "primacy" was intended to be involved in it; especially when it is remembered that he was also the oldest of the Apostles, and one of the very first converts?

"V.—THE COMMISSION IN FULFILMENT OF THE PROMISE."

You give a reference here to John, xxi. 15–17. To enable this text the better to support your views, you say that in one place, where our translation has "Feed my sheep," it ought to be, "take the government of my sheep," which you assert to be the "true meaning" of the words. As you propose the alteration we must believe that you have investigated the matter, and have rendered the Greek word in the best way you are able. Now we have a clue to all your blunders: in your Greek, Hebrew, and Latin studies, you have manifestly gone astray from want of an accurate knowledge of the originals. The Greek word which you would render "take the government of my sheep," means nothing more than "tend," as a shepherd tends sheep! With regard to the question thrice addressed to St. Peter, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?" most commentators understand it as conveying a reproach on account of his triple denial of his master. And on this very passage St. Cyprian writes, "The Lord is described as addressing himself to Simon, not to Peter. For the Apostle was then no longer Peter, inasmuch as, by his departure from the faith, he had fallen away from the rock. But the rock was Christ, and as the faith and confession of the name of Christ, and as the bearing which the verses quoted by you have upon the supremacy of St. Peter, I will direct your attention to the following extract from Whitty:—"They who hence argue for the supremacy of St. Peter above the rest of the Apostles, are vain in their imaginations: for if by these words Christ required Peter to feed all his sheep and his lambs, it is certain that he was wanting in his duty; for he never exercised one act of supremacy over the rest of the Apostles, but being sent by them obeyed, Acts, viii. 14, and being reproved by St. Paul, he held his peace; and was so far from feeding all Christ's sheep, that he never fed any of the province of St. Paul. Did he feed those Apostles on whom the same Holy Ghost fell, who had the same commission, given at the same time, and in the same words, to preach the Gospel to all nations, or to every creature? if not, they were not in the number of the sheep whom Peter is here bid to feed; or did all other pastors receive commission from St. Peter to feed Christ's sheep? Did St. Paul, who doth so solemnly declare, he had not his commission from man, neither by man?" Gal. i. 1. Did any of the Bishops of Asia? No. St. Paul assures us "The Holy Ghost had made them overseers of the flock of Christ." Acts, xx. 28. No, saith Pseudo-Ambrosius, not Peter only, "but we with him have received commission to feed Christ's sheep;" and what is here said to Peter, "Feed my sheep," is, saith St. Austin, "said to all;" and saith Basil, "Christ here gave the same power to all ensuing pastors and teachers."

"VI.—THE PRIMACY OF POWER AND AUTHORITY AFTER THE ASCENSION."

In support of this position you have brought together a number of texts for no other reason, apparently, than because the name of Peter occurs in them, since not one of them is of the slightest service to you. It would be tedious to go through the whole of them, and show how utterly inapplicable they are to the point under discussion. I will, therefore, take two as a specimen, and these two will, unfortunately for you, prove the direct contrary to that in support of which you adduce them; though from the artful and garbled manner in which your quotations are made, this fact is not at first sight apparent. I will give the passages as they stand in your pamphlet.

"Acts, xi. 2–18. When Peter was come to Jerusalem, . . . he rehearsed the matter from the beginning. . . . When they heard these things, they held their peace." Now what are the real circumstances of the case? St. Peter had, in obedience to a vision from God, gone to Cornelius, a Roman centurion,—preached the Gospel to him, and to his kinsmen and near friends,—been made instrumental in their conversion, and had baptised them. "When Peter was come to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them." What fearful arrogance and presumption to address in such a style as this, "The Prince and Chief of the Apostles," "The Vicar of Christ upon earth!" How dare they call him to an account

for that which, in discharge of his high and holy functions, he had thought right to do? Surely he at once exercised the authority with which he was invested, and silenced those who contended with him by the exercise of his supremacy. Not at all. St. Peter seems to have been in a state of most profound ignorance both of his own dignity, and of the consequent respect due to himself; for he actually consented to enter upon his defence! "he rehearsed the matter from the beginning and expounded it by order unto them." He laid the whole case before them, and stated the reasons of his conduct to them, as though he were conscious that they had a right to call him to account. And when he had made his statement, what did those who had contended with him do? express any regret for having presumed to question the acts of him who was their "Chief," and that too without cause? No, they were indeed silent, but it was because they were convinced by the Apostle's explanation that he had done rightly. They held their peace, and glorified God, saying, "Then hath God also unto the Gentiles granted repentance unto life."

The next passage I will take is equally conclusive against you. It stands thus in your pamphlet:—"Acts, xv. 6—And the Apostles and elders came together to consider of this matter; and when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up and said, &c." "Then all the multitude kept silence, and James answered, Simon hath declared, &c." These words you adduce in support of the supreme authority of St. Peter, and would have your readers to infer that his word was law, and at once decided the matter under discussion. Let us see whether this passage, like the last, does not prove the direct contrary. We read that "certain men which came down from Judea" to Antioch "taught the brethren, saying, except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved;" and "no small discussion and disputation" having in consequence arisen, it was determined "that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other with them, should go up to Jerusalem:—who to?—to Peter?—no; but unto the Apostles and elders about this question." On their arrival at Jerusalem, "the Apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter. And when there had been much disputing," after much discussion, "Peter rose up,"—what for?—to determine the question by his decree?—no; but simply to express his opinion; and so far was that from being final, even after he had spoken, Paul and Barnabas addressed the assembly; "then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience unto Barnabas and Paul." When the debate was at length ended, by whom was the question decided?—by St. Peter, "the Prince," "the Chief," "Christ's Vicar upon earth"?—no; but by him who was the president, by St. James. "And after they," (and St. Peter among them, remember) "had held their peace, James answered, giving his decision in an authoritative manner, saying, 'My sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned unto God.' He does indeed allude to St. Peter's speech, because it was doubtless influential from the correct view taken by that Apostle of the matter under consideration; but so far was St. James from treating it as authoritative, that he does not scruple to examine it by the written Word of God. "Simoon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written." (Surely, by the way, you must now be ready to admit the supreme authority of Scripture, when you thus find the sentiments of even St. Peter himself tested by it!) But, as has been before observed, "The decretory sentence was given by St. James, and not by Peter. 'My sentence is, 'I judge,' saith St. James; that is, saith St. Chrysostom, 'I with authority say this; and this determination of the question was made by St. James, saith Chrysostom, 'because he had the government committed to him.' (Whitby.) So much for the evidence in favour of St. Peter's primary authority by these two passages from the Acts of the Apostles! Now I would willingly submit these passages to any man, no matter of what religion, provided only he were possessed of common honesty and common discernment, and leave it to him to decide whether they do not prove the direct contrary to that in support of which you adduce them. If, Sir, you thus garble your quotations from the Scriptures; if, to serve your purpose, you do not hesitate to misrepresent and pervert the meaning of God's word, what confidence can be placed in anything that you write? This is a fact to which I would especially direct attention. You have announced a pamphlet, in which you propose to give "a list of" what you are pleased most insultingly to call "the garbled

quotations, misrepresentations, and direct falsehoods, contained in Mr. Allwood's Lectures on the Papal Claim." As in that publication you will be dealing with authors out of the reach of most men, and making statements, the truth or fallacy of which can only be detected by scholars, you have had the kindness—for which you deserve the thanks of all honest but unlearned men—to afford a gauge by which your own honesty, intelligence, and truthfulness, may be measured. Let all, then, into whose hands your forthcoming pamphlet may fall, refer to the use you have made of Acts, xi. 2—18, and xv. 6; if they find that you cannot even ground an argument upon Scripture without being guilty of dealing in "garbled quotations, misrepresentations, and direct falsehoods," they may form a just estimate of the value of your extracts from the Fathers:—if they find that you will indulge in "garbled quotations, misrepresentations, and direct falsehoods," in a case where detection is easy, and exposure certain, by a simple reference to a book in everybody's hands; they may infer with confidence that you will be nothing loth to give full swing to those propensities where detection is less easy, and exposure less certain. People will at once see, either that your mind has become so uninged that you are incapable of appreciating evidence, and rightly understanding English; or that your moral sense has become so depraved that you are not ashamed to "handle the Word of God deceitfully," in order to serve a purpose. Believe me, Sir, the intelligence and honesty you have displayed in your use of Acts, xi. 2—18, and xv. 6, will effectually brand all your future publications with the word "Beware." Before quitting this subject, I will point out to you a few more texts which are utterly unintelligible, if Saint Peter really possessed the supremacy you claim for him; "Acts viii. 14. When the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God they sent unto them Peter and John." See also, 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11; Gal. ii. 6—14.—"Were we disposed," says Stanley Faber, "to make out a plausible case, from Scripture, of a Universal Episcopacy confided to ANY man, Paul, not Peter, would be the Universal Bishop: for, if we captiously take his words in their grammatically literal signification, the great Apostle of the Gentiles has declared; that the care of ALL the Churches came upon him daily, 2 Cor. xi. 28. Can the Romanists or the Tractarian Seceders produce any equally specific text in proof of the Universal Episcopate of Peter?" "Why," you ask, "do men set up the foolishness of their own speculations against the plain Word of God?" Ah! why indeed!—You can best answer your own enquiry.

I have thus endeavoured, as briefly as possible, to point out some of the most glaring sophistries and misrepresentations with which your work abounds; many, and those of no slight importance either, yet remain, which time and space prevent my noticing. Enough has, however, been said, I trust, to prevent any persons being led away by your "Reasons;" at any rate, sufficient to show that if that publication has not been replied to before, it has not been (as I hear the Romanists are confidently affirming) because it was unanswerable, but simply from the natural disinclination which any one would feel to meddle with a production which, he was conscious, was intrinsically weak and contemptible. But now that the cause of silence has been misunderstood and misrepresented, it is right to be no longer silent.

With the expression of a sincere and earnest hope that the time may yet come, when, by the blessing of Almighty God, the eyes of yourself and your unhappy companions in error may be opened to discern the truth as it is in Jesus,—when, leaving all vain dependence upon human merits, you may look for pardon and salvation to that adorable Redeemer alone, who offered himself once for all upon the altar of the cross, as a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world;—when, no longer trusting to the mediation of saints and angels, you may betake yourselves to him who is our only advocate and intercessor with the Father; when, re-membering from whence you are fallen, you may repent and do your first works, and forsaking a system fundamentally opposed both to the spirit and letter of the Gospel, you may again worship the Triune God in the scriptural services of our Church,

I remain, &c.

REVENUE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.—The total income of the United Kingdom in 1845 was £58,590,217; in 1846, £57,692,268; and in 1847, £58,437,891. The national expenditure during the same years was, in 1845, £55,103,648; in 1846, £53,873,061; and in 1847, £55,583,023.—*Atlas*.

THE LEADING OF GOD'S LIGHT AND TRUTH.

PSALM xliii. 3.

"O send out thy light and truth: let them lead me; let them bring me to thy holy hill, and to thy tabernacles."

[Abridged from a Sermon by the Rev. THOMAS DALE, M.A., Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's.]

THIS Psalm is referred by commentators to that period of David's eventful history, when the unnatural rebellion of Absalom and the subtle treachery of Ahithophel had cut him off for a season from his accustomed enjoyment of the temple-worship; and his soul thirsted for God, yea, for the living God; so that the fervency of his desire found utterance in the inquiry, "When shall I come and appear before God?" But, is it not equally applicable to those among ourselves, who may have been debarred, by sickness, or by travel, or by any strong necessity, from the privilege of public worship, from the companionship of united prayer, from the profit and the blessing of meeting together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus? The separation from religious ordinances is the only adequate test of their real value. Oftentimes we do not estimate them aright, while we continue to possess them; just as we know not, or regard not, the usefulness of rain during the vernal season, when the showers daily descend, and it would seem that one more or one less would make no perceptible difference in the effects of fertilizing moisture, or in the produce of the prolific soil. But when the summer sunbeams have attained their full intensity, and genial rains are long withheld, and the surface of creation is blackened by unusual drought, who see not how grateful and how general the change which is wrought in the aspect of nature by the welcome descent of even a solitary shower? So it is with the Christian's attendance in the house of his God. One opportunity thus withheld may seem to make little difference in the warmth of his affection, or in the amount of his knowledge, or in the strength of his principles; but continued absence, unless caused by absolute necessity, and compensated by added earnestness in the use of private means, will either create in the soul an intense and increasing thirst for the waters of life, or wither the plants of grace, and canker the fruits of righteousness which before were growing in the heart. We must all be partakers of David's experience; we ought, therefore, all to be interested in David's prayer: "O send out thy light and thy truth: let them lead me; let them bring me to thy holy hill, and to thy tabernacles."

Now it is manifest to the eye of sense, than when a flood of light suddenly pervades the force of nature, and the sunbeams penetrate in an instant through the interposing veil of storms, many objects become distinctly visible which were altogether unseen before. In one direction we are struck by unanticipated beauties; in another, it may be, we are met by un-

suspected dangers. If we are pursuing a journey, fresh light is thrown upon our path: we know by its assistance how to avoid every impediment and to avail ourselves of every aid. Just in the same manner it is God's light that enables us to apprehend God's truth. It is the Spirit of God who enables us to appropriate and to apply God's word. Then it is no longer a perplexing riddle, a confused maze, a sealed book; it becomes a mirror in which our own image is reflected, a map on which our own course is traced, a portraiture in which our own lineaments are discerned. The Holy Spirit first convinces of sin; and the sinner, thus awakened to a sense of his own indwelling pollution and consequent peril, cannot rest until he is also convinced of righteousness; convinced that God has provided a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, atonement, and satisfaction for the sin of the whole world, in the Lamb of God, whose blood cleanseth from all sin. The truth of scripture, in this wondrous development of redemption, is commended by its suitability to his own discovered and experienced necessity. This is he of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did speak; and this is he who is "able to save unto the uttermost all that come unto God by him." Thus we deduce the order in which God is for the most part pleased to operate his mighty work of conversion to the soul. First, light; then truth: first, the illumination of the Spirit; then the acceptance and appropriation of the word. Hence it is no uncommon thing to observe most of practical and experimental knowledge of the holy scripture where there is least of that which is technical, critical, formal, acquired by study and by reading—not of the heart, but of the head. Man may, by the force of his natural reason and the exercise of his natural capacity, attain to the understanding of all mysteries and all knowledge: but only the Spirit of God can open his heart to a full perception of the value and excellency of the promises, or teach him to build on them as his own foundation of life, and to plead them before the throne of God as his own title to pardon, his own covenanted claim upon the free grace of the mercy of God. It makes all the difference here, whether a man walks in the true light, the light from heaven, or in that of the sparks which his own fire hath kindled; whether he have been taught in spiritual things of God, or only by himself or by his fellow-man. And never, we may be sure, never can any walk aright with God until he has offered in the closet the prayer of the psalmist—"O send out thy light and thy truth;" until he has learned to walk by faith not by sight; and until his faith stands, not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.

How, then, it may be asked, do the light and the truth of God lead the returning and repentant sinner in the way of life? We answer, by teaching us to look in-

wardly to conscience and outwardly to God's word; by preparing us to do whatever is enjoined by one, and to leave undone what is forbidden by the other; and by casting us, in every time of discovered and experienced need, on the promises of God for succour and for safety; teaching us to pray, "Hold thou up my goings in thy paths, that my footsteps slip not." True it is, indeed, that the light from heaven, which beams across the wilderness of this world, and discloses to the expectant and exploring eye of faith the path that leads upwards to the paradise of God, will not always or often indicate the direction which the natural man would follow—will not point where all is bright and smooth, and still and calm, with most of flowers to attract the eye, and of fruits to gratify the taste, and of waters to cool and to refresh. At one time it may seem to glance upward to a steep and precipitous ascent, the summit of which is lost in mist and cloud, while the sides are rugged with protruding rocks, or perforated with many clefts and fissures, or broken with obscure and dizzy chasms; at another it may appear to lead through the darkly-rolling river, or across the treacherous morass, where the soul can only look to experience what David so touchingly describes: "I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing: I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me." At one time it may point to a dark and frowning forest, which may be the lair of the lion, or the lurking-place of the stealthy and venomous serpent; or across the waste howling wilderness, the barren and dry land, where no water is, but where the storm puts in motion the driving sand, within which armies might find a living tomb. But, wherever the light falls, thither he must follow it; just as Paul went bound in the spirit to Jerusalem, foreknowing that bonds and afflictions awaited him there, yet shrinking neither from persecution nor from danger, when they encountered him in the path of duty, and ready, as he himself declared, not to be bound only, but even to die at Jerusalem, for the name of the Lord Jesus.

Truly, the entrance of God's word, through the promise of his Spirit, giveth light. It imparts understanding to the simple: it unfolds a succession of great and precious promises to the soul, as within its own power to attain; and to any of God's commandments it attracts by every variety of powerful persuasion, appealing to our hopes and our fears, our desires and affections, our instinctive dread of death, and our irrepresible yearning after mortality: it holds out a bright prospect of "the recompence of the reward;" it ensures the end of our faith—the attainment of the crown of life, as the reward of faithfulness unto death: it certifies that "faithful is he that calleth us, who also will do it."

The light and truth of God, sent forth in answer to the prayer that is the language of the heart, will lead to the holy hill of

God, to "the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

If by the hill here spoken of is intended in a figurative sense the city of God, the heavenly Jerusalem, which St. Paul declares to be the mother of us all; if by the tabernacle is symbolized what the same apostle calls the true tabernacle which God hath pitched, and not man; that temple, of which the glory of God is the abiding splendour, and the Lamb is the light thereof; then how can human tongue describe what the heart cannot conceive; the glories which are reserved for the heir of life and immortality; the moral and intellectual beauty and perfection to be realised by those who shall be made like unto the Son of God; the joy that knows no limit, and the peace that dreads no end; the praise that can never weary, and the love that can never cease or change? Who is sufficient to speak of these things? Who can convey even a partial notion of their existence, when the apostle himself, burning with the fresh and fervid inspiration of the Holy Spirit, humbly declines the overwhelming task, simply declaring that the recompence of the reward will be exceeding abundant, above all that we can ask or think; that the blessings and the glories of the inheritance of the saints in light are inestimable as the sacrifice and death by which they were purchased, unsearchable as the love by which they have been provided and prepared?

If, however, the eye is dazzled with excess of splendour, when it is fixed upon the Light of life, there is happily no difficulty in the practically most important question—"Lord, who shall dwell in thy tabernacle? and who shall ascend into thy holy hill?" Those, we reply, and those alone who are led thither by his light and his truth: those who are born anew of God's spirit, and formed anew by God's word; those who, having been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, and, being born of water, are born also of the Holy Spirit; those who habitually take the Word of God for the light to their feet, and the lantern to their paths; in whom it is the subject of all faith, the ground of all hope, the source and spring of all charity; who desire habitually to regulate their conduct by its precepts, and to stay their souls upon its promises, and who know and confess that they can do so by the power of the Holy Ghost alone, since "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." It is those, therefore, who commence every day of life by repeated earnest prayer for the promised illumination of God's Spirit in the heart (which is God's light), and, who, having done this, unclothe the sacred volume (which is God's truth), in the hope and with the desire that they may not only read but understand; not only hear, but heed; not only assent to, but apply it; that, before they enter into the world, in order to the performance of the duties which have been assigned to them

by the providence of God, they may furnish themselves with armour of proof against all the open assaults of their enemies, and equally with a sure and sovereign antidote to the subtle poison which is insidiously presented by the traitor hand of Satan. It is those who habitually refer to the love of God, to the example of Christ, to the witness of the Spirit, to the tenor of the Gospel, as the standard of moral right and wrong, and to whom the interests of true religion in their family and among their connexions and throughout the world around them, are dear as their own.

OF THE ANÆSTHETIC AGENTS ETHER AND CHLOROFORM.

"None, whose portion is so small
Of present pain, that with ambitious mind
Will covet more."—MILTON.

THAT pain is an evil no person will dispute. "So great is our abhorrence of it," says Locke, "that a little of it extinguishes all our pleasures: a little bitter mingled in our cup leaves no relish of the sweet." To the surgeon pain is no less terrible; and one of his most observant and celebrated brethren has written, that "pain when amounting to a certain degree of intensity and duration, is of itself destructive;" that "when in excess, it exhausts the principle of life, so that either its continuance without intermission, or the superaddition of the slightest shock, subsequent to its endurance for a certain period, is fatal. In operations protracted by unforeseen difficulties, as &c., &c., the patient has begun to die on the table." We can ourselves fully subscribe as to the justness of the above statement, and have more than once known death to occur where the mental misery of anticipated pain, or physical pain itself, could be ascribed as the only cause. We would avoid distressing our readers with the painful details of cases in illustration, and will only quote (not quite verbatim) a few from Mr. Travers's excellent treatise on constitutional irritation:—

A lady who, concurring as a point of duty with the advice of her surgeons, reluctantly submitted to the removal of a small tumour in her breast, unexpectedly and without any apparent cause died on the morning following the operation. It was then for the first time ascertained that she had prognosticated her death.

I saw a man expire suddenly on the table during the steps preliminary to an operation, which from the state of symptoms and post mortem appearances, might be said to have afforded the fairest prospect of relief.

Sir Astley Cooper relates the case of a brewer's servant, a man of robust frame, who had suffered much agony for several days from a rheal abscess occasioned by a splinter of wood penetrating beneath the nail of the thumb, and who, a few seconds after a deep incision was made, raised himself up by a convulsive effort, and instantly expired.

The same author relates the particulars of several other operations in which death followed without any other assignable cause than the shock occasioned by pain. How valuable then is the discovery of the anæsthetic effect of the vapour of ether or chloroform. It is to the surgeon and obstetrician no less a boon than the means

of annihilating pain in the practice of their profession, and what is no less valuable, of rendering convalescence more certain and speedy. We who have seen the sufferer soothed, and have witnessed the boundless gratitude of wondering and delighted patients, can but regard this means of preventing physical suffering as a blessing from the Giver of all good. And this is our feeling after twelve months' active observation and experiment. In the history of medicine, we must consider the discovery of Doctors Morton and Jackson as approached only by those of Harvey and Jenner. That ether and chloroform should have their opponents is not surprising, when it is remembered that the immortal Harvey complained that his practice fell off considerably after the publication of his treatise on the circulation of the blood, and what we now esteem as the greatest and most original discovery in physiology was not for a considerable time after he gave it to the world received by any physician who was more than forty years old! The prejudices against vaccination are of much more recent date, and who among our not very aged friends can forget them? That some persons should have died after undergoing dangerous surgical operations preceded by the inhalation of ether, is not at all wonderful, when it is remembered that the mortality after some operations is always great, and that in the statistics of one of the most famous hospitals in Britain, the deaths after amputation of the leg, (far from the most formidable operation in surgery), are four out of ten. It is right to state, however, that cases have occurred where coroner's juries, (by no means infallible judges of such matters), have given verdicts that death was caused by ether; but we, besides our own judgment, have the highest medical authorities in Britain, for asserting that there was *no sign* in these cases of death having been caused by the inhalation of the vapour of ether. We may mention *en passant*, that in one of them, a gentleman *upwards of seventy* suffered amputation, and that he lived nearly *four days afterwards*. The advocates of ether never promised that recovery should follow all operations performed under its influence; but we would ask its opponents to cite us a single case from among the *hundreds of thousands* etherised by dentists, of death having followed the extraction of a tooth. We allow that some temperaments are not so pleasurable affected by ether as others, and that slight hysterical and other unimportant effects have followed its inhalation, which have terrified or *appeared* to terrify the anti-etherists; but we believe that many even of these consequences are attributable either to impure ether, defective apparatus, or inexperienced operators. We surely need not fear the effects of ether or chloroform during the few minutes required for the performance of a surgical operation, when Professor Simpson, of Edinburgh, has been for months in the

practice of keeping parturient patients hours under their influence, and with none but the most happy results.

So much has of late appeared in the public journals, on this subject, that it will be unnecessary for us to dilate at any length on the effects of the inhalation of ether or chloroform on the individual. These agents are *medicinal*, and should be *employed only by medical practitioners*, with the exception, perhaps, of the *very few* well educated dentists. We owe this important augmentation of our means of doing good to two American physicians, Doctors Jackson and Morton, but it is interesting to observe how near we were to the discovery in the last century, truly verifying the adage, "Nothing new under the sun." Before 1796 Dr. Pearson, of Birmingham, employed the inhalation of the vapour of ether as a remedy in certain pulmonary diseases, and one of his modes of administering it was by wetting with it a handkerchief which was held before the nose and mouth, (which is now the most approved method after the invention of all the inhalers and letheons.) The effects were described to be immediate relief to the oppression or pain in the chest; "that sleep followed, and a good night's rest." Dr. Thornton, at the end of the last century, mentions a case in which the inhalation of ether *gave relief in a painful inflammatory affection of the breast*, and Sir Humphrey Davy, who experimented much upon himself by inhaling different gases, remarks, that "as nitrous oxide in its extensive operation, appears capable of destroying physical pain, it may *probably be used with advantage during surgical operations*." Sir Humphrey Davy inhaled nitrous oxide to remove headache, and also the pain of cutting his wisdom teeth, with most successful results. In some of the latest works on *Materia Medica*, we are told, that the inhalation of the vapour of ether is useful in spasmodic asthma, but there is a caution about the lethargic state which it may induce. We need not say that this is the state of insensibility to pain in which operations are now performed. We have dwelt on the facts of our near approach to the great discovery, as interesting, and not with the view of detracting from the merits of Doctors Jackson and Morton, to whom we must feel that all credit is due. And our unprofessional readers will perhaps pardon us if we give Dr. Jackson's own account of his discovery.

A folded cloth, saturated with highly rectified ether was placed over the mouth, the air being freely drawn through it, and the inhalation was continued until I lost all power over myself, and sank back in my chair in a state of peculiar sleep or reverie. I experienced at first a sense of coolness, then of exhilaration and warmth, followed by loss of consciousness. But it was not till a subsequent trial that I became aware that this loss of consciousness was accompanied by insensibility to pain; and a severe bronchial irritation, produced by the inspiration of a large quantity of chlorine gas, was for the moment relieved, and the peculiar distress occasioned by that gas was not felt, so long as I was under the influence of ether, though as that passed off it returned. I had several times occasion to mention these facts to my friends, and it is now a year since I urgently advised Mr. J. Peabody, who was associated with me

as pupil in chemistry, to inhale the ether vapour as a means of preventing pain, which would arise from extraction of two of his teeth. He consented to try the experiment, and was preparing some ether for the purpose, but on consulting the works in which the effects of ether are mentioned, he found all the authorities arrayed in opposition to my views, and that they warned against its inhalation, as I have before stated, and he therefore did not complete the experiment.

About the last of September, or early in October, I communicated my discovery to Dr. W. T. G. Morton, an enterprising and skilful dentist of this city (Boston), whom I occasionally advised, and who called at my laboratory to borrow an india-rubber bag, which he said he intended to fill with atmospheric air, to cause a refractory patient to breathe it, hoping to act on her imagination, and induce her to allow him to extract a tooth. I dissuaded him from this attempt, and explained to him that I had discovered a process by which real insensibility to pain might be induced. I showed him sulphuric ether, and described the method of administering it, assuring him that if my directions were carefully followed, no danger would ensue. I advised him to try its effects on himself, in order that he might better understand its mode of operation. He followed my instructions, and was successful in the first trials, in the extraction of teeth, unattended with pain, the results proving exactly as I had predicted. I then proposed to him the trial of ether in a surgical operation at the Massachusetts general hospital, where it was administered by Dr. Morton, and proved successful; but some persons who witnessed the first operation doubted the entire freedom from pain, since the patient said he "felt a scraping." I was therefore desirous of testing it in a capital operation, the severity of the shock being the best test with regard to the degree of insensibility. Dr. J. C. Warren politely consented to have the trial made, and its results proved entirely satisfactory, an amputation having been performed under the influence of ethereal vapour, without giving any pain to the patient.

We need not dwell upon the sensation that the announcement of this discovery created. The most active investigations were immediately entered upon by medical men in America, Europe, and throughout the world. They did not spare *themselves* in their experiments, and observations were also extended to the lower animals. The desire was to ascertain whether the great good were really unalloyed by any attendant dangers, or more than compensating ill, and we delight in saying that ether has stood the test. Much ingenuity was employed in the invention of inhalers or letheons, and more than one patent was taken out, but these are now superseded by the more simple apparatus of a saturated sponge or handkerchief. One obvious course of investigation was the endeavour to discover some more potent and agreeable anæsthetic agent than ether. Chemists were immediately busied in making ethereal preparations of various drugs, and medical men were as assiduous in experimenting as to their operation on the animal system. At length Professor Simpson made the discovery that chloroform, or more properly the perchloride of formyle, possessed many advantages over ether, its effects being more rapid and certain, less permanent, all traces of them being gone immediately after its use; the inhalation being also much more agreeable. The profession at once perceived the value of Dr. Simpson's discovery, and we believe that chloroform has now generally superseded the use of ether. It may be interesting to our readers to know that chloroform is a fluid, in appearance like water, but nearly half again as heavy, much more

volatile, having a pungent, fruity, and to most persons agreeable odour. It is distilled from a mixture of chloride of lime, water, and alcohol, but its preparation requires much care, and as it is probably liable to spontaneous decomposition, it should be freshly prepared, and always tested before use. By its influence the most painful operations may go on during a delightful sleep, and there have been cases in which this state of insensibility to pain has been prolonged many hours without other inconvenience to the patient than a little sickness, and even this has not always followed. We have never seen such rapid and excellent recoveries in surgery and midwifery as where these agents were used; and we certainly now have the means of almost invariably giving the patient the choice of pain or no pain. A few cases have come under our observation, in which to be far on the side of safety, we have abstained from the employment of any anæsthetic agent; but we are not sure that even in these, we have not permitted suffering, which we might with safety have prevented; and we cannot conclude these observations without expressing our firm conviction that the employment of ether or chloroform, by the experienced medical practitioner, can but be attended with the most beneficial results to humanity.

Poetry.

HYMN.

(WRITTEN AT THE HOLY SEPULCHRE IN JERUSALEM.)

SAVIOUR of mankind, Man, Emmanuel!
Who sinless died for sin; who vanquish'd sin;
The first fruits of the grave; whose life did give
Light to our darkness; in whose death we live—
Oh! strengthen thou my faith, convert my will,
That mine may thine obey; protect me still,
So that the latter death may not devour
My soul, seal'd with thy seal. So in the hour
When thou (whose body sanctified this tomb,
Unjustly judged, a glorious judge shall come
To judge the world with justice, by that sign
I may be known and entertain'd for thine.

GEORGE SANDYS,
Born 1837, died 1843.

Register of Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

APPOINTMENTS.

THE Rev. P. T. Beamish, B.A., to be minister of Dapto, Illawarra.

The Rev. P. P. Agnew to be minister (temporarily) of St. Andrew's, Sydney.

Rev. T. W. Bodenham to the Chaplaincy of the Gaol, Darlinghurst, and the duty at the Temporary Church, at the Victoria Barracks, during the time of the Rev. Mr. Agnew's officiating at St. Andrew's.

NEW CHURCH FOR THE PARISH OF ST. PHILIP, SYDNEY.

On Monday, 1st of May, being the festival of St. Philip and St. James, the foundation stone of a new church, for the parish of St. Philip, to supply the place of the present inconvenient and dilapidated building, was laid with the usual ceremonies.

At eleven o'clock there was divine service in St. Philip's Church—the prayers being read by the Venerable Dr. Cowper, Archdeacon of Cumberland, who for nearly forty years has been minister of the parish; and the communion service by the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Sydney. During the reading of the sentences the offerings of the congregation were collected by three deacons. The amount collected was £53 10s.

After the service the congregation proceeded to the ground, where there was a large assemblage of people.

The 132nd Psalm, the third chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and the collect for the day, having been read,—

The Lord Bishop, who it had been announced would lay the stone, said—Mr. Archdeacon, I hope

there will never be any dispute between us respecting the duty or service which we owe to our Divine Master, but that we shall always be desirous to honour him, and that the only strife will be which of us can render him the highest and the most acceptable service. It appears to me, that on account of the long period during which you have been the minister of this parish, and the constant services which you have afforded the people, the honour of laying this foundation stone properly belongs to you. I therefore now request you will have the goodness to perform this duty, which, under other circumstances, I should have had great pleasure in performing.

The ARCHDEACON then received the trowel from the Bishop, and said,—My Lord Bishop, It seems expedient that I should acknowledge the honour which your Lordship has thus kindly conferred upon me. I acquiesce. It is not my choice; but I submit, and will do it in the best manner I am able. I feel, however, that I am altogether unworthy of such an honour. This, indeed, is a day, or an event, which I have long desired to see. I have, through many years, ardently wished that a new and commodious church could be erected for the spiritual benefit of the people in this parish. Often when I have looked round and seen splendid or elegant dwellings, decorated shops, also costly warehouses erected, or in the course of erection, and then viewed my poor unsightly old church, I have felt ashamed and grieved at heart, because no better house was provided for the ever gracious and all-glorious God. It is true, he dwells not exclusively in houses made with hands, yet he requires that, for the edification of his people, his ordinances be duly and decently administered in some suitable edifice. Again, when I thought of the costly tabernacle even in the wilderness, and of the rich temple in Jerusalem which Jehovah commanded to be erected, I felt more anxious that some appropriate building, even here, should be erected for the honour of our merciful God, and for the dispensing of his gospel blessings. Then I resolved, if he should be pleased to afford me the means to assist in such a good work, I would contribute freely—and now I am gratified to see the sacred undertaking in such a state of progress; and I trust it will proceed to completion in due time, and be a house of God for the salvation of many souls through faith in the blessed Redeemer. I pray that an abundant effusion of the Holy Spirit may be vouchsafed, that this new or latter church may become in every way more glorious than the former, to the welfare and happiness of this, and of generations to come.

The ARCHDEACON then laid the foundation stone, saying, "I lay this as the foundation and corner stone of a church, to be built in this place, to be named St. Philip's Church, and to be set apart for the preaching of the right Catholic Faith, which we believe and confess, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—Amen."

After this the Apostle's Creed was repeated, and a prayer offered up for the Divine blessing upon the work, and those engaged in it, when the people were dismissed by the Bishop with the benediction.

The following is a brief account of the Old Church:—The first part erected was a tower, which was built of brick, and finished in December, 1797. This original tower fell down on the 4th of June, 1803, when the present stone tower was commenced. The body of the present building was commenced in 1800, the foundation stone being laid on the 1st of October. Although not quite finished in August, 1809, it was fitted up with pews, &c., and service was performed in it by the Rev. William Cowper. It was completed towards the close of 1810; and on Christmas day in that year it was consecrated by the Reverend Samuel Marsden. The porch was added in 1821, and the vestry and the school-room at the back were added, we believe, in 1829. A handsome communion service of silver (consisting of a flagon, two chalices, and two patines), was presented to the church by his Majesty King George the Third.

Such is the history of the old church.

The plan of the new building (the estimated cost of which is about £5,000) is in that style of church architecture commonly known as the perpendicular of the reign of Henry VI. When completed, the church will consist of a nave and two aisles, clerestory, chancel, vestry, northern and southern porches, and a western tower in three stages. The dimensions of the nave and side aisles will be ninety by fifty-three feet, giving accommodation for about nine hundred adults on the floor. Its position is on the summit of the hill, bounded by Jamison-street on the south,

and by the continuation of York and Clarence-streets on the east and west. The enclosed portion to the north is appropriated to the schools.

In this noble and commanding position, the church will be a very great ornament to the city and neighbourhood of Sydney. The tower, which is to be one hundred feet in height, will be visible to all the surrounding country, and from every point of view—whether from the harbour or the river, the North Shore, or the wilds about and beyond Botany, it will form a beautiful and striking object.

No official information of the state of the building fund has yet been given, but we believe most of the subscribers have pledged themselves to pay a certain sum quarterly or annually for five years. The subscription was opened by the Venerable Incumbent with the handsome donation of £500. The Bishop gives one perch of masonry every week.

PLYMOUTH.

The use of a room in this suburb of Sydney has been granted by Mr. Day, for the performance of Divine Service, which was celebrated for the first time by the Rev. Mr. Agnew, in the afternoon of Sunday, the 14th May, to a large congregation. Being within the limits of the parish of St. Andrew, it is under the superintendence of the Rev. Mr. Agnew, who will be assisted in the duties by Mr. G. E. Gregory, (a theological student of St. James's College), who has been licensed by the Lord Bishop as a Catechist.

DIOCESE OF NEWCASTLE.—No new appointments have been announced in the diocese of Newcastle during the present month. The Lord Bishop has been on a visit to the Upper Hunter and Wollombi districts, and has been most cordially and respectfully welcomed. His Lordship intended to embark in the Tamar for Moreton Bay yesterday morning, and will remain in that part of his diocese about three weeks.

DIOCESE OF MELBOURNE.—The Lord Bishop of Melbourne has been on a visit to the western district of his diocese, on which he proceeded as far as Port Fairy. On his return to Geelong his lordship attended a meeting, at which he announced his intention of forming a Melbourne Diocesan Committee, and also that he intended to create an Archdeaconry of Geelong, but he could not make the appointment until £100 per annum towards a stipend was raised in the district. It was resolved that a Geelong Branch of the Melbourne Diocesan Society should be formed, the first object of which should be to raise an Archdeaconry fund. The Bishop stated his intention of conferring the appointment of Archdeacon upon the Rev. Dr. McCartney, one of the clergymen who accompanied him from England. The Archdeaconry will for the present comprise the whole of the western district of Port Phillip.

TO THE CLERGY.

A FEW copies of this new periodical, which the Proprietors trust will prove beneficial to the interests of the Church of England in this colony, are sent to each of the Clergy, in order that, if they approve of the objects and principles avowed in the Introductory Address, they may distribute them among such of their parishioners as they may think likely to become subscribers.

They would also confer a favour by transmitting to the publishers the names of subscribers previous to the issue of the second number.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

THE Clergy and Churchmen throughout the colony are requested to assist the Conductors of this periodical by contributing articles, as well as by forwarding intelligence of events connected with the Church in their respective localities, authenticating their communications with their names, confidentially if thought desirable.

Address (pre-paid) to the Editors, at Messrs. Colman and Piddington's, George-street, Sydney.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

THE SYDNEY GUARDIAN offers an advantageous medium for all announcements of WORKS IN GENERAL LITERATURE AND THEOLOGY, SCHOOL-BOOKS, SCHOOLS, AND TUITION GENERALLY, LIFE ASSURANCES, and in short, any DESCRIPTION OF ADVERTISEMENTS FOR WHICH PUBLICITY IN THE MOST RESPECTABLE QUARTERS IS DESIRED.

SCALE OF CHARGES.

Six lines, and under,.....	£0 3 6
Each additional line,.....	0 0 6
Half a column,.....	0 15 0
Whole column,.....	1 5 0

Advertisements will be received by Messrs. Colman and Piddington, the publishers, until the 25th of each month.

ST. JAMES'S GRAMMAR SCHOOL, SYDNEY.

Head Master.....The Rev. T. W. BODENHAM
Second Master...Mr. THOMAS DRUITT
Assistant Master...Mr. WHITEHEAD.

THE attention of the public is invited to the Educational advantages attainable through the medium of this Institution.

It is under the patronage and direction of the RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF SYDNEY, and affords such an education to the pupils as will fit them for commercial pursuits, or prepare them to enter with advantage upon the course of study pursued at St. James's College, Lyndhurst.

To such of the pupils as may desire it, tuition in the French, Spanish, Portuguese, or other modern languages, with instruction in Drawing and Vocal or Instrumental Music, is afforded by highly qualified masters.

Where it is intended that pupils, on quitting school, shall enter upon mercantile pursuits, peculiar attention will be given to their advancement in the various branches of a sound Commercial Education.

Fencing and Dancing are taught by approved masters, and arrangements made for Military Gymnastic Drill, by one of the Sergeants of the Garrison.

THE SPECIAL ATTENTION OF PARENTS is invited to the circumstance, that a JUNIOR DEPARTMENT has been established under a kind and well-qualified assistant, in which children too young for the older classes are carefully trained up by him, under the eye and supervision of the Head Master, until sufficiently advanced to enter the senior school; and that a separate play-ground is provided for their use.

Religious Instruction in accordance with the principles of the Church of England is sedulously and systematically afforded.

The Quarterly Fee for Day Scholars is Two Guineas, payable in advance from the day of entrance. Boarders may have the additional advantages of a residence in the Head Master's or Second Master's family, on terms having reference to age and other details, of which the particulars may be learned on application at the School-room, in Phillip-street, near to St. James's Church; or at Mr. BODENHAM's residence, 347, Castlereagh-street North.

Sydney, 1st June, 1848.

ON SALE BY THE UNDERSIGNED—BLACKWOOD'S CHEAP NOVELS.

Peninsular Scenes and Sketches. In folscep 8vo, price 3s.

A singularly stirring volume, full of interest and adventure, more thrilling than the boldest fictions of romance.—*Glasgow Observer.*

Dramatic and original in incident, picturesque and characteristic in description, this little book bears a stamp giving it a charm beyond that of a mere imaginary narrative.—*John Bull.*

We hardly know where we could lay hands on a more entertaining or interesting little book.—*Literary Gazette.*

Lights and Shadows of Scottish Life. 3s.

What child will not hang over the Tales of the Covenanters in Lights and Shadows of Scottish Life!

We have already said a word or two on this delightful volume—the work of one of the most amiable of contemporary minds—a genius which shines with equal felicity in the tender and humorous.—*Quarterly Review.*

The Trials of Margaret Lindsay, by the author of "Lights and Shadows of Scottish Life." Folscep octavo, 3s.

The Foresters, by the author of "Lights and Shadows of Scottish Life." Folscep octavo, 3s.

Tom Cringle's Log, complete in one volume. Folscep octavo, 4s.

The Cruise of the Midge, by the author of "Tom Cringle's Log," in one volume. Folscep octavo, 4s.

The Life of Mansie Wauch, Tailor in Dalkeith. Folscep octavo, 3s.

The Subaltern, by the author of "The Chelsea Pensioners," Folscep octavo, 3s.

Nights at Mess, Sir Frizzle Pumpkin, and other Tales. Folscep octavo, 3s.

The Youth and Manhood of Cyril Thornton, by the author of "Men and Manners in America." Folscep octavo, 4s.

Valerius, a Roman Story. Folscep octavo, 3s.

Reginald Dalton, by the author of "Valerius." Folscep octavo, 4s.

Some Passages in the History of Adam Blair, and History of Matthew Wald, by the author of "Valerius." Folscep octavo, 4s.

COLMAN AND PIDDINGTON,

Booksellers and Stationers,

Opposite the Barrack Gate. 485, George-street.

REDUCED FROM £1 1s. TO 14s.

PLUNKETT'S AUSTRALIAN MAGISTRATE, a Guide to the Duties of a Justice of the Peace, with numerous Forms; also an Appendix, containing the Rules and Regulations relating to the Crown Lands, the new Jury Act, the Laws of Landlord and Tenant, with the Tenements Act, and Act for facilitating the Granting of Leases, and the Recovery of Small Debts Act. New edition, by Edwin C. Sutor, Esq., Barrister at Law. 8vo, cloth.

The undersigned respectfully desire to inform the Australian public, that they have bought the entire interest and stock of the above publication, which they have decided on offering for sale at the lowest price consistent with profit. It is almost unnecessary to remark that the utility of the work is conclusively established from the fact of the rapid sale of the whole of the very large impression of the first edition; indeed every individual connected with the Colony by property, whether the Settler, Banker, Merchant, or Trader, should be in possession of a copy.

COLMAN AND PIDDINGTON,
Booksellers, Stationers, and Bookbinders,
485, George-street.

Directly opposite the Barrack Gate.

BIBLES AND PRAYER BOOKS.

IN CASES.

JUST OPENED, and on Sale by the undersigned,

An invoice of Bibles and Prayers, Prayers and Lessons, and Common Prayers, with and without the Rubric, printed in red, in every variety of binding, morocco gilt, oak boards, with antique edges, painted edges with bar clasps, in velvet, with perforated silver-gilt edge, in vellum, in reticulate cases, with scent bottle and tablet, morocco with enamelled sides; Church Services, in one and two volumes, with or without cases.

COLMAN AND PIDDINGTON,

Booksellers, Stationers, and Bookbinders,
Opposite the Barrack Gate. George-street.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

Manton's Practical Exposition on the General Epistle of James, edited by the Rev. T. M'Donough, 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

Burnett's Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, 8vo., 8s.

Pearson on the Creed, 8vo., 8s. 6d.

Newton (Bp.) on the Prophecies, 8vo., 8s. 6d.

Horsley's (Bp.) Sermons, 8vo., 8s. 6d.

Butler's (Bp.) Works, 8vo., 8s. 6d.

Barnes's Commentary of the New Testament, 9 vols. cloth, £1 10s.

Keith's Signs of the Times, 2 vols. 8vo., last edition, 18s.

Evidence of Prophecy, 12mo. cloth, 10s.

Horne's (Rev. T. H.) Introduction to the Study of the Bible, 12mo. cloth, 12s.

Quessel on the Gospels, 3 vols., 16s.

Sturm's Contemplations on the Sufferings of Jesus, 8vo., 8s. 6d.

Evening Devotions for every Day in the Year, 7s. 6d.

Horne's Critical Study and Knowledge of the Scriptures, 5 vols., latest edition, £3 10s.

Leighton's Works, (Abp.) by Pearson, 2 vols. 8vo., 18s.

Paley's Works, 1 vol., 8s. 6d.

Hooker's Works, by the Rev. John Keble, M.A., 4 vols. 8vo., £1 18s.

Tracts for the Times, 6 vols., £2 2s.

The Complete Works of Jeremy Taylor, 3 vols. very large 8vo., £2 10s.

Taylor's Holy Living and Dying, 8vo., 6s.

Robinson's Scripture Characters, 2 vols. 8vo., 18s.

The Protestant Preacher, 8vo.

Bunson on the Constitution of the Church of the Future, 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Futurity, (Dr.) Works, 25 vols. cloth, £5 5s.

Serle's Works, by Bickersteth, 12mo., 4s. 6d.

Burder's Village Sermons, 12mo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

The Great Commandment, by the Author of the Listener, 12mo., 7s.

Wilson on the Attributes of God, 4s. 6d.

Luther's Manual of the Book of Psalms, 12mo., 4s. 6d.

Pictet's Christian Theology, 12mo. cloth, 4s. 6d.

Morrison's History of the Protestant Reformation in all Countries, 8vo., 7s.

COLMAN AND PIDDINGTON,

Booksellers, Stationers, and Bookbinders, George-street, opposite the Barrack Gate.

Printed for the Proprietors, by CHARLES KEMP and JOHN FAIRFAX, 586, LOWER GEORGE-STREET; and published by Messrs. COLMAN AND PIDDINGTON, Booksellers, George-street, Sydney, Thursday, June 1, 1848.