

# Christian Guardian.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE WESLEYAN-METHODIST CHURCH IN CANADA.

Vol. XIII. No. 17.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1842.

Whole No. 621.

## THE DUTY OF SINGING.

All believe that singing is a duty, and that prayer is a duty; but some question whether this is the case with singing. Now there is something in our very structure that seems equal to a proof of the obligation. We cannot imagine a faculty was given us which was never intended to be used; especially a faculty from which so much pleasure and advantage can be derived and communicated. We are fearfully and wonderfully made, and this power of vocal music far surpasses all mechanical performance; no instrument, however surprising or perfect, can express words; but in singing, man can speak; and inform while he delights. How shameful is it that such an unrivalled endowment should be perverted, or degraded to evil purposes! But we are not to argue against the use of a thing from the abuse of it. Let us remember that God is to be glorified in our body, as well as in our spirit. Let us say with David, "Awake up, my glory: I will sing unto the Lord as long as I live; I will sing praises to my God while I have my being."

Singing is not a ritual duty. It preceded the ceremonial law; and when our Saviour had abolished the passover, and his own supper had succeeded to it—"after supper he sang a hymn." He thereby showed that such a service belonged to the new state which he had introduced, and was to be a part of Christian worship. Accordingly the sanction of his example, which had the authority of a command, was not disregarded by his disciples, either in practice or precept. Thus the apostles at Philippi not only prayed, but sang praises in the prison, so that the prisoners heard them. And Paul says to the Ephesians: "Speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." And James adds, "Is any merry? let him sing psalms."

How should singing be performed? Sometimes when we are alone. David had his "songs in the night;" the solitary effusions of pious excitement. In the life of Joseph Allison we find that he always sang in his closet devotion, and which in the morning was never later than 5 o'clock. It should prevail where it can be established in family worship. He does well, says Henry, who with his house prays night and morning; he does better who prays and reads the Scriptures; but he does best who prays, and reads, and sings too. I fear this holy custom of our forefathers has been for a long time on the decline. The observance of it would tend much to exclude dullness and formality; and be far more interesting to servants and children than long reading and lengthened prayer. "This should be done at least on the Sabbath." An old author tells us, he remembered the time when in numberless houses, at certain hours on the Lord's day, singing might be heard as you passed, from one end of London to the other. The ninety-second psalm is called "a Song for the Sabbath-day" and, says David, "It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto thy name, O Most High: to show forth thy loving kindness in the morning, and thy faithfulness every night."

But when we enter the courts of the Lord, and engage in public worship, the command lays hold of us, "Serve the Lord with gladness; and come before his presence with singing." Here the singing should be congregational. For this purpose few things should be introduced which the people cannot soon join in. Hence all persons should learn to sing, at least decently, that when they join, they may aid and not injure. The singing in family worship would be a preparation for public devotion. What can be said for those who are well able to help, and yet seldom or never lift up their voice in this divine exercise, from sloth, fastidiousness, or pride? Who introduced the mode of sitting we know not; but surely it does not appear the most desirable one; and though the posture is not essential to the spirituality of our worship, we should be governed, even in the outward acts, by what is most preferable, by being most suitable, and becoming, useful, and scriptural. How often do we read of the people standing up to praise the Lord! What should we think to see the choir sitting while they perform? And what can the choir think, when they see us sitting during the psalmody—but that we have nothing to do with it—unless as an entertainment from them.

But what is to be said in recommendation of this duty? It is a very instructive ordinance. How many important truths are we mutually informed or reminded of by it, and which are also rendered peculiarly impressive, by the pleasing manner in which they are again and again repeated—Hence, says the Apostle, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." It is also a very edifying exercise. Nothing is so adapted to excite holy affections. Let any one, in order to prove this, read only, and then sing the very same words; and what a difference will be felt in the effects of the two! Nothing tends so much to animate to courage and confidence; and, therefore, it has always been employed in warfare. On a similar principle, there never has been a revival of religion, in any country, or in any neighbourhood, but has been attended with a fondness for psalmody. Luther knew the force of it, and much and successfully encouraged it in the beginning and progress of the Reformation in Germany.

It is the most social ordinance. In preaching and prayer one leads, and the rest silently join; but here all concur, and stimulate each other.

To which we may add, it is the most permanent of our religious engagements. Our other sacred employments will soon cease; but we shall be still praising Him. In heaven our harps will never be hung on the willows; our hearts will never be untuned. We shall perfectly and for ever sing the song of Moses and the Lamb. The work and the joy of heaven are more represented by this service than by anything and by everything else.

## THE WESLEYS BECOMING CHILDREN OF GOD.

Sunday, May 21st, 1738. I walked in hope and expectation of his coming. At nine my brother and some friends came and sang a Hymn to the Holy Ghost. My comfort and hope were hereby increased. In about half an hour they went. I betook myself to prayer: the substance as follows—"O Jesus, thou hast said, 'I will come unto you.' Thou hast said, 'I will send the Comforter unto you.' Thou hast said, 'My Father and I will come into you, and make our abode with you.' Thou art God, who canst not lie. I wholly rely upon thy most true promise. Accomplish it in thy time and manner.' Having said this, I was composing myself to sleep, in quietness and peace, when I heard one come in. (Mrs. Musgrave, I thought, by the voice,) and say, 'In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, arise, and believe, and thou shalt be healed of all thy infirmities.' I wondered how it should enter into his head to speak in that manner. The words struck me to the heart. I sighed, and said within myself, 'O that Christ would but speak thus to me!' I lay musing and trembling; then I rung; and Mrs. Turner coming, desired her to send up Mrs. Musgrave. She went down, and returning, said, Mrs. Musgrave had not been here. My heart sunk within me at the word; and I hoped it might be Christ indeed. I heartily sent her down again to inquire, and felt in the mean time a strange palpitation of heart; and said, yet feared to say, 'I believe! I believe!'

"She came up again, and said, 'It was I, a weak, sinful creature, that spoke; but the words were Christ's.' He commanded me to say them, and so constrained me, that I could not forbear."

"I sent for Mr. Bray, and asked him whether I believed. He answered, I ought not to doubt of it: it was Christ that spoke to me. He knew it, and willed us to pray together. 'But first,' said he, 'I will read what I have casually opened upon: Blessed is the man whose transgressions are forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile.' Still I felt a violent opposition, and reluctance to believe; yet still the Spirit of God strove with my own, and the evil spirit, till by degrees he chased away the darkness of my unbelief. I found myself convinced, I knew not how nor when; and immediately fell to intercession."

The fact is, this plain, illiterate woman had a deep and solemn conviction that she ought thus to address the afflicted penitent, who was weeping and praying for pardon, peace, and holiness; but recollecting that he was a scholar and a clergyman, she was afraid to do it. She durst not speak to him in this manner face to face, and with difficulty prevailed upon herself to utter these words as she stood upon the stairs. By this humble instrumentality it pleased God to produce in the heart of his servant the vital faith which he so earnestly desired.

"On Sunday morning," says Mr. Charles Wesley, "he took Mr. Bray aside, burst into tears, and informed him of the matter; objecting, she was a poor, weak, sinful creature; and should she go to a minister? She could not do it, nor rest till she did. He asked her whether she had ever found herself so before? 'No, never.' 'Why, then,' said he, 'go. Remember Jonah. You declare promises, not threatenings. Go in the name of the Lord. Fear not your own weakness. Speak your words. Christ will do the work. Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hath he ordained strength.' They prayed together; and she then went up, but durst not come in till she had again prayed by herself. About six minutes after he had left him, he found and felt while she was speaking the words, that Christ was with us."

"I never heard words uttered with like solemnity. The sound of her voice was entirely changed into that of Mrs. Musgrave. (If I can be sure of any thing sensible.) I rose, and looked into the Scripture. The words that first presented were, 'And now, Lord, what is my hope? Truly, my hope is even in thee.' I then cast down my eyes, and met, 'He hath put a new song in my mouth, even a thanksgiving unto our God. Many shall see it, and fear, and shall put their trust in the Lord.' Afterward I opened upon Isaiah xl. 1; 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins.'"

"I now found myself at peace with God, and rejoiced in hope of loving Christ. My temper, for the rest of the day, was mistrust of my own great, but before unknown, weakness. I saw that by faith I stood; and the continual support of faith, which kept me from falling, though of myself I am ever sinking into sin. I went to bed still sensible of my own weakness, (I humbly hope to be more and more so,) yet confident of Christ's protection."

When Mr. John Wesley left the sick-bed of his brother this morning, he went to one of the churches in London, to hear the celebrated Dr. John Heylyn preach; and afterward assisted the doctor in the administration of the Lord's supper, the curate having been taken ill during the service. On leaving the church, says he, "I received the surprising news, that my brother had found rest to his soul. His bodily strength returned also from that hour. 'Who is so great a God as our God?'"

When Mr. Charles Wesley first believed with the heart unto righteousness, his faith was weak; so that, to use his own expressive language, he held the Saviour "with a trembling hand." But by prayer, spiritual conversation, and the practical study of the inspired volume, his confidence waxed stronger, and his evidence of the divine favor became increasingly distinct and vivid. He was now more sensible of his own weakness than he had ever been before, even when sin had the dominion over him. He felt that all his sufficiency was of the Lord; so that he realized the apostolic paradox, "When I am weak, then am I strong." Indeed, the very act of faith is a renunciation of self, and a laying hold upon Christ as our

"Strength and righteousness, Our Saviour, and our all."

Mr. John Wesley was doubtless greatly encouraged by his brother's happy experience, in the pursuit of the same salvation, for which he had long intensely hungered and thirsted; and with respect to him also the time of liberty drew near. On the day after Charles had found peace, he says, "My brother coming, we joined in intercession for him. In the midst of prayer, I almost believed the Holy Ghost was coming upon him. In the evening we sang and prayed again." They did not pray in vain.

"In the evening of the following Wednesday," says John, "I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate-street, where one was reading Luther's 'Preface to the Epistle to the Romans.' About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from all iniquity and death."

"I began to pray with all my might for those who had in a more special manner despatched me, and persecuted me. I then testified openly to all there what I now first felt in my heart. But it was not long before the enemy suggested, 'This cannot be faith; for where is thy joy?' Then I was taught that peace and victory over sin are essential to faith in the Captain of our salvation; but that, as to the transports of joy that usually attend the beginning of it, especially in those who have mourned deeply, God sometimes giveth, sometimes withholdeth them, according to the counsels of his own will."—Vol. I, pp. 133-137.

## SCOTLAND—WALTER SCOTT—STAFFA—IONA.

About Scotland no reader of history, poetry, or story, can be indifferent. This land of mountains and lakes, shepherds and poets, is enough to inspire almost any traveller with something of romance, even though he be passing beyond the age of that feeling. The very first sight of Scotland, from the last of those hills which formerly divided it from England, is most captivating to the soul and eye. The mountains, rivers, valleys, which are spread before you, are beautiful to behold. In a little time you are brought into the midst of scenes rendered so celebrated by the poems and other works of Walter Scott, of the region of ruins, of monuments, of abbeys. On one hill may be seen the colossal statue of Wallace; on another, the great monument of Wellington; in one valley, the Abbey of Dryburgh; in another, that of Melrose, both in ruins and not far, either, from the curious mansion of the talented author, Abbotsford.

I tarried a day in the neighbourhood, and visited Abbotsford, finding it within and without such as might be expected from the former owner, being filled within, and surrounded without, with all the military curiosities and antiquities that could be collected.

While I could not but admire all these things, neither could I otherwise than ask myself, what is genius?—what fame?—what the monuments of the departed? The works of Sir Walter Scott were not of avail to save him from the miseries of debt while living, and what will they avail him if he has nothing infinitely better before God. Next to the Bible, the writings of Scott were the cheapest and most abundant I met with in Scotland; but were they next to the Bible in spirit also, although amongst the most innocent of their kind? He once tried his genius on the composition of two sermons, having succeeded in every thing else; but how far were they from the Gospel of Christ! I heard nothing in Scotland to raise the estimate I had formed of his religious sentiments and character. I understood that the report of his being an elder in one of the churches was unfounded. His writings, however, and the monument on Castle Hill at Edinburgh, will long preserve his memory to Scotland. From the romantic region of Abbotsford, I proceeded to Edinburgh, which is decidedly, by confession of all, the most interesting and beautiful city in the world;—the modern Athens, and by some thought in most respects superior to the ancient. Not less was I gratified with those of its inhabitants with whom I became acquainted. I tarried while there in the hospitable abode of the Rev. Mr. Drummond, an Episcopal minister, well known for his warm-hearted zeal. A wife of kindred spirit is one of four or five sisters, all married to ministers, and from whom more than one American bishop have received much kindness. While in Edinburgh I became acquainted with the Rev. Mr. Marshall, a minister of the Church of Scotland, who married one of the daughters of Leigh Richmond, a true child of such a father, whose character is seen at once in her face, and heard in every tone of her voice.

Leaving Inverness on Monday morning, I came down the canal as far as Oban, on the western coast of Scotland. From this point usually go during the summer season by a steamer to visit two remarkable places among the Western Islands,—the island of Staffa, where is the famous cave of Fingal, so celebrated by Ossian, and which must be one of the greatest wonders of the world,—and the little island of Iona, once the centre and source of religion and learning to Europe, now as barren and desolate as Tyre or Sidon. Such, however, was the tempestuous state of the weather, that the steamer was afraid to venture out to sea, and I was obliged to content myself with such information as I could obtain concerning these places by reading and conversation, during the day I was at Oban; a part of which I was happy to be able to spend with one of the Noels, who had left his parish in England for a few weeks, and brought his family to the seashore for a short recreation.

Being prevented from visiting Iona, let me fill up this letter, by a brief notice of it in its connection with the religious and literary history of Scotland. Considering that it is a mere speck in the ocean, the least among the little islands which scarce deserve the name, it is almost incredible what an influence, and for centuries, it exerted over the religion and literature of Europe. Let us hear the testimony of Dr. Johnson, who found this spot, at least, in Scotland, worthy of praise—"We are now treading that illustrious island which was once the luminary of the Caledonian regions, where savage clans and roving barbarians derived the benefits of knowledge and the blessings of religion." To abstract the mind from all local emotion would be impossible, if it were endeavored, and would be foolish if it were possible. Whatever draws us from the power of our own senses; whatever makes the past, the distant, or the future, predominate over the present, advances us to the dignity of thinking beings. Far from me and my friends be such frigid philosophy, as may conduct us, indifferent and unmoved, over any ground which has been dignified by wisdom, bravery, or virtue. That man is little to be envied whose patriotism would not gain force upon the plains of Marathon, or whose piety would not grow warmer among the ruins of Iona."

Not less striking is the witness of Leigh Richmond, in a letter to Mrs. Richmond, while on a visit to it in 1819: "Iona is delightful; you can form no idea of the characteristics of every thing and every body around me. The novelty, simplicity, and singularity—the *tout ensemble* is indescribable. Here amid the ruins of ancient grandeur, piety, and literature, surrounded by the graves and mouldering grave-stones of kings, chieftains, lords of the isles, bishops, priests, abbesses, friars, and nuns—the scene decorated with the fine and romantic remains of cathedral, colleges, nunneries, chapels, and oratories, with views of islands, seas, rocks, mountains, interspersed with the hut of these poor islanders! I am just preparing to preach to as many of them as can understand English, in the open air—a rock my pulpit—heaven my sounding-board—and may the echo resound to their hearts." Would any one imagine that all this would be said of one out of an hundred little islands on the coast of Scotland, itself not more than three miles in length and one and an half in width?

What England is to the whole world, or Rome, or Athens were formerly, that and much more by comparison, was Iona to Christendom. It was originally called the "Isle of Druids," the Druidical religion having prevailed there, and a school of their theology having from time immemorial been established at Iona. In the year 563, Columba arrived from Ireland at Iona, and by the aid and protection of one of the Kings of the Scots, notwithstanding the opposition of the Druids, founded a monastery, which for centuries continued to be the first seminary of learning in Europe. It is said that in his lifetime he founded one hundred monasteries and three hundred and sixty-five churches, and ordained three thousand priests. These monasteries, however, were not what monasteries became in after times. For a long period after Columba's death, Iona was comparatively pure, and protected against the corruptions of the Romish Church, as they began to spread themselves

over Europe, until at length one of her own abbots became infected, and betrayed her into the arms of the enemy. Even in the seventh century, as a seat of learning, Iona was in advance of any other in Europe, and from all parts of Europe she was applied to for teachers and learned men to preside over their literary institutions. By such was the University of Paris founded, and a certain writer speaks of fifty-six who were sent to Ireland. At length, in the year 796, the Scandinavian spoilers, who had infested, for some years, the maritime coasts of Scotland, burnt the famous monastery of Iona, the only sanctuary of real learning, according to Campbell, which Europe, even at that time, possessed. The history of Iona's institutions, from that time, was one of various fortunes, being rebuilt and demolished again and again, until the period of the Reformation, when the last blow was given to it, under the act of the Convention of Estates of Scotland, for demolishing "all the abbey of monks and friars, and suppressing all the monuments of idolatry remaining in the realm."

And what is now the condition of this celebrated spot, where for more than six hundred years the kings of Scotland and its islands were buried, with hundreds of her chieftains, and her bishops and abbots, and to which Europe for centuries resorted for her best religion and learning? One cathedral mouldering away, and some poor huts of a few poor families, with the ruins of temples and tombs, are all that is left to attract the traveller to the almost deserted Iona. For fifty years one man has been their schoolmaster and minister, until very recently, when the government, in pity, provided him some help in his old age. Thus she who for centuries sent forth by hundreds and thousands ministers and learned teachers to all the nations, is now glad to receive from the charity of government this poor return.

"Lone isle! the storm that round thy turrets rode,  
Though their red shafts have sear'd thy marble brow,  
Thou wert the temple of the living God,  
And taught earth's millions at his shrine to bow.  
Though dissolution wrapt thy glories now,  
Still thou wast a marvel through all time  
For what thou hast been; and the dead, who rot  
Around the fragments of thy towers sublime,  
Once taught the world, and sway'd the realm of thought,  
And ruled the warriors of each northern clime."

## EVERY THING FOR ETERNITY.

"I paint for eternity."—The ancient artist who thus replied, when asked why so cautious in drawing his lines, so slow in using his pencil, unwittingly uttered a truth which is applicable to all the thoughts, words and actions of all men. All are registered in a book which all ages will not make old, and in characters which eternity will not efface. Every motion of the mind is written on a tablet more durable than if engraven with an iron pen upon the rock. Every utterance of the tongue is borne with wings and flies directly into eternity. Every deed of the life is more durable than adamant. There is no power to annihilate that which has been once said, or done, or thought. The heavens may pass away; the earth and all things that therein are, may be burnt up; but the conduct of accountable creatures can never be obliterated.

The preacher preaches for eternity; and it will then be seen whether he handed the word of God deceitfully, or rightly divided the word of truth; whether self or Christ were the most prominent; whether he sought to gain the applause of man, or to win souls; whether he chose the best subjects and presented them in the best manner, according to his ability, and kept in view the best end, or whether his subjects were taken up at random and thrown at random, rather than aimed at his hearers to do his own or his Master's work. Eternity will declare all this to the preacher, when all his studies and all his sermons are brought to his remembrance, and made to pass in honest review before his mind.

Heaven hears for eternity; not intentionally, we grant, but of necessity. They have not done with the sermons they hear, when the speaker's voice has ceased to vibrate. His words have passed away indeed, but the recording angel has put it down, whether they have affected the heart or not. The truth rejected, the promise slighted, the warning despised, the precept forgotten, will all re-appear, and show the thoughtless and the sceptical learner to be without excuse.

Merchants buy and sell for eternity. They lay up goods only for a few years; but the motives and moral character of their business transactions will survive when life is measured by the flight of years. Though riches take to themselves wings and fly away, they heap treasures together for eternity—treasures either of indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, or treasures of glory, honor and peace, according as they have bought and sold "as unto the Lord, or unto man."

They who live in indolence or pleasure *now* for eternity, and they will reap a harvest of thorns and briars that will reach them when their lives were madness. Eternity will be a retrospect of time, and it will then be seen whether there is satisfaction in reviewing the past. It will be seen whether our pursuits here sprung from fond and engendered appetites that eternity can gratify. The predominant desire and relish here will be the predominant passion there; but there will be no revel, no song, no dance, no stage, no sumptuous living there; no, not a drop of pleasure, so called, will there be found to cool the parching tongue.

The lawyer pleads and the judge decides for eternity. Argument, and decisions are rejected in the court of appeal above. It will then be seen whether counsellors have pleaded when guilt is proved; whether opinions have been given from interest or honest conviction; whether they have argued from false premises to a desired conclusion, or from true premises to a false conclusion. And the judge will see and feel when he is before the Judge of the world, the fatherless and the widow, whether he has decided uprightly, or from prejudice, passion or partiality.

The same truth is applicable to every calling, condition, station and action of life. "Life is a passage to eternity, and ought to be a meditation of eternity, and a preparation for eternity."

Love God, love truth, love virtue and be happy;  
—The terms on which  
True peace was given to man, unchang'd as God,  
Who in his own essential nature bleeds  
Eternally to virtue happiness,  
Nor lets them part through all his universe.  
[Western Episcopal Observer.]

## THE GOODNESS OF GOD.—By the Rev. R. NEWTON.

"Through all thy attributes, divinely fair,  
Thy full perfection, glorious God! declare;  
Yet if one beam's superior to the rest,  
O let thy goodness fairest be confessed."—Boyer.

The goodness of God is a subject, of all others, the most interesting to man. And that God is good, we are not left to conjecture from indications which may seem to authorize such a conclusion; we are not left to infer from premises themselves doubtful. The goodness of God is a truth so clearly revealed, and so variously attested, that we might with as much show of reason affect to dispute the divine existence as to doubt the divine goodness. The more we examine the subject, the more clearly we discover that by every mode of reasoning by which it can be proved that God is, it may be established that he is good. He who is God, cannot but be good—goodness is essential to the divine nature. Goodness is that which sheds a lustre on all the other attributes of the Deity. Goodness is the character by which Jehovah delights to make himself known; it is his name; and this name is inscribed, as with his own hand, on every part of his works. Wherever we turn our eyes, innumerable proofs of this crowd upon our vision. In the visible heavens above—in the earth below—around us and on every side, we have the most indubitable and convincing proofs of beneficence: the earth is full of the riches of his goodness. If we survey the different orders of animated beings—their nature and circumstances—their orders and usefulness, the goodness of the Deity is more apparent still: "The eyes of all wait upon him; and he giveth to all a portion of meat in due season." But especially if we contemplate our own species, we trace his goodness: goodness in calling us into being; in placing us so high in the scale of being; in preserving our lives, and supplying our wants; in "giving us richly all things to enjoy." If we review the past, and trace the way in which God has led us, shall we not feel compelled, in gratitude, and in justice too, to acknowledge, "Goodness and mercy hath followed us all the days of our lives?" But, while "God is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works," there is one expression of his love which infinitely transcends all the rest, and without which all the rest would be in vain to us. And this is so great that no combination of language can describe its magnitude; so great, so glorious, that, like the orb of day, it can only be seen in its own light.

HABITS OF DISTINGUISHED MEN.—Huet was so studious that his wife was obliged to drag him from his books to his dinner. Thuanus studied seventeen hours a day for seventy years; that he might lose no time, some one read to him while dressing or at meals. Cicero says of himself, that he occupied his mind with literature and philosophy, at home and abroad, in the city, and in country, walking or riding. Pliny in a letter mentions that even in bear-hunting he employed the intervals of the chase in reading; but this was contrary to the rule of doing one thing at a time. When Sir William Jones was young, having a singular thirst for knowledge, he often asked questions of his mother; her answer was, "read, my son, and you will find out." He followed her advice. Gibbon says in his life of himself, "I would not exchange my love of study for all the wealth of the Indies." Bayle mentions an author, that was also a printer, who printed a large book directly from his head, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter. The same writer mentions another author who wrote the whole of a large book with only one quill. Erasmus composed in his chaise, while on a journey to Italy. Sheridan sometimes wrote his plays on the paper that came round his tobacco.

## THOUGHTS FOR PARENTS.

Here we address the following exhortations to all persons, parents or tutors, who are charged with the task of education, beseeching them to give serious attention thereto.

1. Be what the children ought to be.
2. Do what the children ought to do.
3. Avoid what they should avoid.
4. Aim always, that not only in the presence of the children, but also in their absence, your conduct may serve them for an example.
5. Are any among them defective? Examine what you are yourself, what you do, what you avoid—in a word, your whole conduct.
6. Do you discover in yourself defects, sins, wanderings? Begin by improving yourself, and seeking afterwards to improve your children.
7. Think well that those by whom you are surrounded, are often only the reflection of yourself.
8. If you lead a life of penitence, and seek daily to have grace given you, it will be imparted to you, and through you to your children.
9. If you always seek Divine guidance, your children will more willingly be directed by you.
10. The more obedient you are to God, the more obedient will your children be to you; thus in his childhood the wise Solomon asked of the Lord, "an obedient heart," in order to be able to govern his people.
11. As soon as the master becomes lukewarm in communion with God, that lukewarmness will extend itself among his pupils.
12. That which forms a wall of separation between God and yourself, will be a source of evil to your children.
13. An example in which love does not form a chief feature, is but as the light of the moon; it is cold and feeble.
14. An example animated by an ardent and sincere love, shines like the sun, it warms and invigorates.—London S. S. Magazine.

## RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE.

In reading the life and remains of Rev. R. Houseman, a simple, graphic, and interesting account of a clergyman who, through the sincerity of his piety and the earnestness of his religious zeal, became the founder of what is called the Cambridge or Evangelical party in the Church of England, we were struck with the following instances of the power of intolerance in breaking the ties of natural affection. The lady referred to (Mrs. Adams) was the mother of Mr. Houseman's wife.

"Mrs. Adams, whose maiden name was Bateman, had suffered persecution for the truth's sake. Being greatly affected by the preaching of George Whitefield, whom she had incidentally heard in the neighbourhood of her home, she determined to ally herself to the party of which that very remarkable man was so distinguished a representative, and, after much and careful deliberation, announced her intention to her father. Mr. Bateman, a thoughtful, extravagant, and imperious country gentleman, who prided himself on his relationship to Lord Bateman, (he was his second cousin) had conceived, in common with the bulk of his order, a deadly horror of the Methodists, and, on finding his daughter smitten with the infection, his hatred broke out in furious anger against his offending child. He told her that of course she had a perfect right to please herself in the choice of a religion, but that he accompanied the concession in the true spirit and after the established habit of intolerance, with a peremptory declaration that if she did please herself he would disinherit her. The poor girl, encompassed by difficulties, took time to consider: she consulted her friends; she laid her case before the Lord in earnest and frequent prayer; and the result of her consultations and applications was a conviction that she ought to serve God rather than man, and a heroic resolution to abide by it. Her father, on hearing this decision, was as good as his word. He had permitted the liberty of private judgment, and he was prepared to inflict the penalty. Taking on his purse, he presented his daughter with a shilling—opened the door of his house—and, commanding her to see his face no more, bade her farewell. Mary Bateman, cut to the heart by conduct so unfeeling, took the proffered gift, and exclaiming, as she passed the threshold, 'With this and God's blessing I will go through the world,' left her unrelenting parent and the home of her youth for ever. Circumstances such as these could not remain untold. They reached the ears of Lady Huntington, who, with characteristic generosity, offered the desolate sufferer an asylum in her own house. The offer, so frankly made, was no less frankly accepted; and the acquaintance thus providentially begun soon ripened into profound friendship. Mrs. Adams never forgot the obligations she owed to her noble protectress and Lady Huntington had reason to bless God for giving her a companion at once pious, affectionate, and judicious."—Westminster Review.

## LOVE FOR THE BIBLE SOCIETY.

At the late anniversary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Rev. Thomas Smith closed his speech in these words:

I can easily conceive how it might happen, that by one of the greatest calamities that can befall man, whose glory is his immortal mind, my understanding might be obscured or eclipsed; and, worse still, I can imagine how my heart might be perverted to evil, and led to love every thing which I now hate, and to hate every thing which I now love; but in no other case can I conceive the possibility that I should ever cease to admire, to love, and to advocate the claims of the British and Foreign Bible Society. I dare say that few of the persons whom I have now the honour to address were born, like myself, on the other side of the Tweed; it may therefore be a trial of your patience, if I close these expressions of my attachment to the society by repeating some stanzas from a northern poet.—There is but one word—you will readily perceive which—that requires another to be substituted for it.

"The bridegroom may forget the bride  
Whom he has wedded yesternight;  
The king, he may forget the crown,  
That on his head an hour has been;  
The mother may forget her babe,  
That smiles so sweetly on her knee;  
But I'll remember thee, *Gleaner*,  
And all that thou hast done for me."

From Herbert's Church.

## GRIEVE NOT THE HOLY SPIRIT, &c.

And art not grieved, sweet and sacred Dove,  
When I am sour,  
And cross thy love?  
Grieved for me? The God of strength and power  
Grieved for a worm, which when I tread,  
I pass away and leave it dead?

Then weep mine eyes, the God of love doth grieve:  
Weep foolish heart,  
And weeping live:  
For death is dry as dust. Yet if ye part,  
End as the night, whose sable hue  
Your sins express; melt into dew.

When sunny mirth shall knock or call at door,  
O cry out, Get hence,  
Or cry no more.  
Alas! God doth grieve, he puts on sense:  
I sin not to my grief alone,  
But to my God's too; he doth groan.

Oh take thy lute, and tune it to a strain,  
Which may with thee  
All day complain,  
There can no discord but in ceasing to be.  
Maidens can weep; and sadly strings  
More lowly have than such sad things.

Lord, I adjudge myself to tears and grief,  
E'en endless tears  
Without relief.  
If a clear spring for me no time forbears,  
But runs, although I lie not dry;  
I am no crystal, what shall I?

Yet if I err not, since still to wait  
Nature denies;  
And flesh would fail,  
If my deserts were masters of mine eyes:  
Lord, pardon, for thy Son makes good  
My want of tears with store of blood.

## KNOWLEDGE AND IGNORANCE CONTRASTED.

Ignorance is injurious; knowledge is advantageous. Ignorance is the parent of error—knowledge is the nurse of truth. Ignorance engenders crime—knowledge strengthens virtue. Ignorance fosters barbarity—knowledge promotes civilization and refinement of manners. Ignorance leaves the amazing powers of the mind unoccupied—knowledge is the fruit of their exercise. Ignorance debases human nature—knowledge exalts and ennobles it. Ignorance proportionally deprives us of happiness—knowledge is a source of the most refined enjoyment. Ignorance is a fruit of the fall, and consequently a part of our punishment—knowledge is therefore a partial recovery of our primal glory. Ignorance is akin to brutity—knowledge assimilates us to angels. Ignorance is subservient to sophistry and the purposes of a low and degrading infidelity—knowledge detects and exposes them. Ignorance is the tool of oppression—knowledge breaks the iron yoke. Ignorance occasions contempt—knowledge commands respect. Ignorance is darkness—knowledge is light. Ignorance perplexes—knowledge directs. Ignorance contracts the mind—knowledge expands it. Ignorance incapacitates us for extensive action—knowledge qualifies us for abounding usefulness. Ignorance is weakness—knowledge is power.—Rev. J. Cor.



## CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN.

Wednesday, February 16th, 1842.

## LIBERALITY OF CHURCHMEN AND METHODISTS—THE WESLEYAN-METHODIST CHURCH—RENEWED ATTACKS OF "THE CHURCH."

We take the following convincing letter by the Rev. Egerton Ryerson from *The Church* of the 5th inst., and the Reply of the Editor of that paper; the former containing facts too credible to our body for us not to make them known to our readers. It may be asked why we touch any controversy between Mr. Ryerson and *The Church*; and we have an answer, at least, satisfactory to ourselves, much as we have desired to have no controversy of the kind to touch. It will be recollected we very lately copied, from *The Church* of January 1st, a letter written by Mr. Ryerson, and remarks on it by the Editor of that paper, which even a cursory reader of them must have perceived bore unfairly on the *Guardian*. As, however, the Editor professed a wish for peace, which Mr. Ryerson was anxious to promote, we, though attacked, refrained from remarks lest that very desirable object should not be reached. Before a month elapsed the Editor was before the public in his old character of an antagonist of our journal and church; thus, unprovoked by us, unless by our silence, renewing hostilities, which have since then been continued; thus leaving us no other alternative, than, either to cringe to injustice, or defend ourselves. We choose the latter as a solemn duty imposed on us by our Conference, and shall undimly perform it until *The Church* shall learn to be modest or moderate. Another reason is, Mr. Ryerson is from home, and will be for some weeks, and has not a favourable opportunity for replying to *The Church*. Again: *The Church's* reply below is condemnatory of our Church and its organs; and independent of every minor consideration, culpability would rest on us were we to shun their vindication. We may as well say, not a number of *The Church* appears, but in its editorials, communications, or selections, or all together, Methodism and Dissent are still held up to contempt; it is the *anti-dissent* battering ram of Canada, incessantly in motion to crush our Christian churches. The duty of defence is one most thankless to us, and great will be our joy when *The Church*, by works as well as by words, consents to live in peace with us.

To the Editor of the *Church*.

Sir,—It is a common law of the newspaper world to allow the medium of misstatements for their correction. Although you will not grant us the designation of a *Church*, which has been granted both by Royal Charter, and Act of Parliament, I trust you will not deny us an act of justice due from man to man. I refer to the statements contained in last Saturday's *Church*, especially your article on the Wesleyan Methodist Church in this City. Of your attack, I say nothing. I admit your right to attack whom you please, even females, and that for doing a work, kindred to what ladies of the Church of England have done both in this City and in Kingston, and for what I have heard of the Church of England, at the meetings of the Bible and Church Missionary Society in London, commend ladies for doing in England, and what they could not do without calling on "offices" or "private houses"; but I think you have no right to make statements both unjust and injurious to a whole body of people. I am persuaded you would not have made the statements of which I complain had your residence in this country been longer, or your acquaintance with its religious history been more extensive. In the article to which I refer, and in another editorial article, you assert two things, both of which I consider as incorrect and unjust; but of the latter of which only I will furnish any formal correction.

First, you represent every one dissenting from, or not of the Church of England, as an enemy to it, and that even his professions of regard are to be viewed as the deceitful pretensions of a supplanting Jacob in Esau's clothing. I deny this as strongly, as I disbelieve that every member of the Church of England is an enemy to every other Church, and that his professions of regard for any other Church are but the schemes of Jesuitical hatred and determined deception.

But, secondly, you assert, in different places and forms, that the liberality of any members of the Church of England to our Missionary Society is never reciprocated. You may indeed meet with instances of bigoted and peevish Methodists as well as Churchmen; but your assertion is not only a most unjust imputation upon a whole body, it is also opposed to many facts—some of which are the following:—

1. To the House of Industry, or Strangers' Friend Society, in this City, Methodists have contributed from the beginning; yet the books will show that there have been as many hundred members of the Church of England relieved by it, as there have been individual Methodists.

2. Very few Churches of England have been built in Canada to which Methodists have not subscribed more or less; although they have to support their own clergy and institutions, from which the members of the Church of England have, in a great measure, been relieved by public endowments and grants from England.

3. Clergymen of the Church of England have been accustomed to officiate in Methodist Chapels in various parts of the Province where there were no Churches. In former years this was very common; indeed there were few other places of worship but Methodist Chapels. The only time that I ever heard the late venerable Dr. Stewart (afterwards Bishop of Quebec) preach, was in a Methodist Chapel, and I recollect of his stating that Methodist Chapels had been every where open to him, and that he had been entertained at the houses of Methodists. I know of no instances in which the use of Methodist Chapels (when unoccupied) has been refused to a Clergyman of the Church of England as such, although I believe there have been two or three refusals on account of alleged conduct or statements affecting the individual Clergyman himself. Such courtesies and accommodations have been universally refused to our Ministers on the part of your Church. Applications for them on your part have been lately less frequent, on account of the discussions of late years, and the increased number of Churches. But I know of instances in which Clergymen of your Church have officiated regularly in Methodist Chapels, for the purpose of raising money for the support of their own places; and, on inquiry, you will learn, that a Clergyman of your Church regularly officiates in a Methodist Chapel in Streetville in this District, and is listened to, I trust with pleasure and profit, by many members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

4. Many hundreds of Church people, in various parts of the Province, have been supplied with the preaching of "Christ crucified" by Methodist Ministers and Missionaries for years, during which they were wholly destitute of the ministrations of their own Church. This fact is too notorious to require amplification. In the absence of all Sabbath ministrations, the religious and social feelings of many, in the persons of members of the Church of England, will be of other Churches, as the Lord Bishop of Toronto has, in printed discourse, ably shown, declined to such a degree that the whole man—the once Christian—becomes, as it were, "materialized into a mere mass of bones and muscles." The laborious Methodist Missionary has revived and kept alive in the bosom of many a Churchman religious sentiments and feelings, which have subsequently developed themselves in most active exertions to secure the, to him, more valued ministrations of his own Church. The grateful recollections and feelings of many a Churchman and Presbyterian in Canada will bear witness to the truth of this remark.

5. And in the last place, let it be recollected that the entire field of our Missionary labours has been occupied, when in a state of complete religious destitution, and in, at the present time, for the most part, wholly dependent for religious ministrations upon the labours of our Missionaries.

I submit, that in view of such facts, and under such circumstances, our Church is not liable to your sweeping charge, any more than benevolent members of the Church of England are censurable for contributing to aid our Missionary Society to supply the *desolate* settlers and *Indian tribes*, with the cardinal doctrines of the Church of England itself, as preached by Cramer and Latimer.

Yours, very respectfully,  
E. RYERSON.

P. S.—As one reason to induce Church-people not to subscribe to our Missionary Society, you say—"We have heard of instances where charitable societies among Dissenters in this City, after having obtained funds from Church-people, have refused to relieve any but those belonging to their own sect." If you did not in this passage refer to the Methodist female benevolent Society in this city, you convey a false impression against our Church; if you did refer to that Society, I reply as follows, upon the authority of its Depository and Books: 1. That only six Methodists have been relieved by the Society since its establishment in 1838. 2. That at least nine out of ten of the 1650 garments and articles of clothing distributed by that Society, have been given to relieve poor Members of the Churches of England and Rome. 3. That no poor person properly recommended has ever been refused relief when the Depository had the means of granting it. The correction of a statement so grossly false, so injurious to many suffering poor, and so unjust to the benevolent managers of a Society so purely catholic in its charities, ought to be made in the most ample manner. I think imputations upon benevolent institutions ought not to be made upon hearsay, or without careful inquiry.

E. R.

[The Editor of the *Church* offers the subjoined remarks on the Rev. Egerton Ryerson's letter.]

We can never grant the title of a *Church* to the Methodist body. We consider the ordination of their preachers to be invalid. Mr. Wesley, their founder, had no more right to ordain, than any layman in the diocese of Toronto has at this present moment. Neither a Royal Charter, nor an Act of Parliament, can make a Church; they may recognize and endow, but they cannot make one. We contend, in the language of our Prayer-Book, that "it is evident upon all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." Methodism has not been ordered, and therefore is not a Church. Besides, if there is one Methodist Church in this Province, there must be several; for Methodism here is divided into many distinct, and some hostile, bodies. Therefore, there must be three or four Methodist Churches, or none at all. It is impossible that there should be three or four, and therefore there is none at all.

The female collectors had better be left undisturbed, for no defence can be made for them. They are called on persons designated as "carnal," "infructuous," &c., by their own official organ, edited by one of their own ministers, and speaking the language of their own conference. This was bad enough. Their conduct too was objectionable and annoying. To female agency we do not object; we highly commend it, and consider it indispensable. But it must be exercised with propriety.

Dissent, we repeat, is and always will be hostile to the Church. Our proofs, to which we again refer, were irrefragable. Mr. Ryerson does not venture to touch them.

The liberality of Churchmen is not, as a general rule, reciprocated by the Methodists.

1. The House of Industry is principally supported by Churchmen. The number of Church-people relieved by it has not been in proportion to the sums contributed by Churchmen. This, however, is no case in point. For the poor are not relieved as members of any particular denomination, but as suffering from want. This charitable institution has no distinctive religious character, and for Mr. Ryerson to press it into his service, shows that his position is a very weak one.

2. A Methodist here and there may help to build one of our Churches, but in most cases our people do not apply to them, or any other Dissenters. In Toronto, for instance, the rebuilding of the Church (the present Cathedral) cost about £20,000. How much of this did the Methodists give? We doubt whether there is a single name upon the Subscription List for this purpose, of a person belonging to any other denomination but our own. It may be that there is, but it is a solitary exception to the general rule. Mr. Ryerson, the Rev. Mr. Leach, and perhaps some other ministers, on the occasion of the fire, offered us the use of their places of worship; but their offer was gratefully and courteously declined. "We have heard that a few of the British Methodists, on the suggestion of a Churchman, desired to contribute, but their assistance was declined, and the individuals who were round to collect subscriptions, made a point of calling on none but members of the Church. According to their principles they might have asked a Dissenter for his assistance, and yet, when called upon to return the compliment, have declined it as inconsistent with their duty as Churchmen. But they acted with a delicacy which leaves no room for the charge of selfishness, when they refused to accept of any Churchman out of sums of money, of which the Church stands largely in need."

3. Clergymen doubtless have officiated, and still do officiate in Methodist Chapels in various parts of the Province. Some of these Chapels, we believe, were built on the understanding that they should be open to all denominations, and the money of Churchmen has gone towards their erection. Besides, the Methodists will admit almost any Protestant Minister to the use of their Chapels, and would be acting injuriously to their interests if they refused to do so. Of course our Church has invariably refused the use of her places of worship to any but her own Clergy, for she does not consider that Methodist preachers have any more right than a layman to exercise ministerial functions. At Streetville, it is true, that a Clergyman officiated in the Methodist Chapel, but only after very strong attempts had been made to prevent his holding service there. An Irish Churchman, who joined the Methodist Society some years ago, because there was no Church in the neighbourhood, but who still retains an attachment to the Church of England, and whose children love it and are determined to support it,—this venerable Protestant interfered to prevent some arrangements which were devised virtually to exclude the Clergyman from the Chapel, and even was prepared to resign the office he held among the Methodists, had any more obstacles been thrown in the way of the performance of Church service there. To the Church-people, therefore, of this warm-hearted Irish Protestant, and the other Clergymen of the same denomination, is the Church-people, in this instance, indebted for the use of the Chapel. Such is our version of the matter at Streetville, and we write upon excellent authority.

4. And 5. The Methodist Missionaries may have been the irregular means of doing much good in the earlier days of Colonial history; but, from all that we have heard, we consider that they did much harm, both in a political and religious point of view. Far be it from us to deny that some of them have died beneath the pressure of duties conscientiously undertaken and zealously followed up; but, regarding them as a body, we do not believe that they have effected so much good as Mr. Ryerson ascribes to their exertions. We say this to ourselves.

We now proceed to remark, that the hostility of the Methodists towards the Church of England in this Province, while comparatively weak and struggling against combined denominations, was systematically bitter and persevering. Mr. Ryerson himself, though he has had the manliness to avow an alteration in his feelings, has been the most determined enemy that our Church ever had in this Province. Whether he was right or wrong, is not at all to the question. He has written against the Church in such a manner,—whether intended or not,—as to stir up the people, not only against its temporal rights, but its spiritual existence. Such has been the effect of his writings on the popular mind, that he has not the least right to regret that he has done so. The *Christian Guardian*, speaking the sentiments of the Methodist Conference, still manifests the same spirit of hostility, except upon the eve of a missionary meeting, when some unprincipled Churchman is to be decoyed into the chair. As to the Methodists in general, they are still hostile to the Church. One fact will suffice.—A Methodist chapel was built in a town in this district, last because it bore a resemblance to the places of worship of the Church of England the Methodists refused to assemble within it, and for this reason, it has been sold to the Church of England. If this is not hostility, and that in a matter of mere externals, we know not the use of terms. And if the exterior fabric of the Church of England is to be destroyed, how much more so its religious character, and its distinctive characteristics?

The Methodists are a most exclusive body, and ought to be the last persons to talk about liberality. At p. 73 of the "Doctrines and Discipline of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada," printed by order of the Conference, and sold at the office of the *Christian Guardian*, is the following rule, instructing Methodists how "they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation":—

"By doing good, especially to them that are of the household of faith, or avowing so to be. EMPLOYING THEM PREFERABLY TO OTHERS; BUYING ONE OF ANOTHER, helping each other in business; and so much the more, because the work is to be done, and the work only."

This rule is anything, we are told, but a dead letter. In plain and fair English, it means buy your meat of a Methodist butcher, your bread of a Methodist baker, your clothes of a Methodist tailor, your shoes of a Methodist shoemaker, and every thing that you want buy it of a Methodist if you can.—What if Churchmen should imitate this exclusive dealing; "buy of one another," and employ Churchmen "preferably to others"? What if they should "evidence their desire of salvation" in such a manner? This rule, it must be borne in mind, is not the dictum of an individual, but an injunction of Conference. Were the sentiments of individual Methodists to be taken as the voice of the whole, we might be questioning the orthodoxy of a corresponding article of the *Guardian* of the 13th January, who, in denouncing the British Wesleyans, very modestly asserts, "The Province is ours by right: it is our native soil." Without hazarding a conjecture as to whether this expression may be fairly taken as the opinion of the Methodists belonging to the Canadian Conference, we are quite content to let the liberality of Methodists be tested by their own Book of Discipline.

P. S.—Circumstances, over which we have no control, have prevented us from inserting into the case mentioned in Mr. Ryerson's Postscript. We will not however omit to institute the necessary investigation, and if we find ourselves wrong, we will promptly correct our error. But either way, it will have little effect upon the main argument.

In conclusion we will state that the money and land given by Churchmen to the Methodist Church at Cobourg, and the Presbyterian College at Kingston, would almost build two or three churches, similar to that lately erected near the Toll-Gate. On the low ground, then, of expediency alone, Churchmen ought to supply the wants of their own church and aid the noble exertions of the two great English societies, before extending their assistance to other denominations. Let them be just before they are generous; let them supply the wants of their own mother, and not divert that which ought to nourish her, to the sustenance of the stranger and, sometimes, of the enemy.

There are several statements in Mr. Ryerson's letter we shall not notice, as *The Church* has not refuted them, and they are of less importance, and one or two of them have been already noticed by us. Others must not be overlooked. There is what refers to Mr. Ryerson himself; what refers to the *Guardian*; the legitimacy of our Church; its utility; its Discipline.

And, first, what refers to Mr. Ryerson himself. Whoever offers opposition to a minister of our church while he is carrying out the wishes of the Conference is an enemy to it, and subjects himself to a rebuke. This is the ground we take on the present occasion. *The Church* asserts, "Mr. Ryerson himself, though he has had the manliness to avow an alteration in his feelings, has been the most determined enemy that our Church ever had in this Province." This conveys the impression, Mr. Ryerson has been the decided offensive enemy of, without ever receiving any provocation from the Church. What is the fact in this long agitated case? We have not left his writings unread, and whether believed or not, we remark, I. They cannot be shown to be an attack on the Church of England. With her, unconnected with Canada, he never had any controversy; but when her introduction into this country was attempted, that she might have a dominant influence, and bring within the range of that influence rights and privileges which belonged to others, he spoke, as he had a right to speak; he spoke with a force of argument and an eloquence not excelled, if equalled, by any other colonist; he spoke only in defence of his church and his country. 2. The Clergy Reserve question was his subject, and whence had he his arguments? He drew them from the Bible itself; from the genius of Christianity; from the precepts and principles and practices of the Apostles; from the history of the Primitive Church; from the history of the Church in every age; from the history of the Church of England itself; from the native freedom of man's mind; from the Constitution, and conscience, and judgment, and wants, and petitions, and Legislative Acts of his struggling country—Canada. His arguments have to the present day proved to be irrefragable. We have not space to show the accordance between his leading views and those of eminent Colonial Secretaries, Colonial Governors, Colonial Legislators, and the Colonial Press. 3. Mr. Ryerson has not only had the sanction, but smile and support of the Conference whose distinguished servant he was and is; whose approbation of his abilities and indefatigable labours has been again and again expressed; and whose most important and dearest interests have been extensively and permanently promoted by his invaluable services. 4. The Editor of *The Church* speaks of the effect which Mr. Ryerson's "writings" have had on the "popular mind." They were intended to have an effect; and an effect they have had. The Editor should not have stopped short at the "popular mind," but have added, the popular condition. Canada at the present moment owes her peace, happiness, and prosperity to the advocacy of, and action upon, the great principles which he and others have promulgated; principles which have been and are abhorred, denounced, and opposed with an unspontaneous hostility by *The Church*. 5. Has there been no severity—no animosity on the part of *The Church*? Is the odium of contention to fall unmitigated, and unshared by others, on Mr. Ryerson? It would be an easy task to show that his enemies have only themselves to blame for the lacerations his pen has inflicted. Still, after all, that gentleman generously says to

*The Church* in that paper of January 1st: "The enthusiasm of youth and the provocations and excitements of personal and public discussions, often prompt to many things that the experience of years and the coolness of mature deliberation and calm retrospect will not approve." In replying to this, *The Church* remarks, "No exertion, no proper forbearance on our part shall be wanting to foster the overtures of concord into a long religious peace." And in his reply inserted by us to day, he observes, that Mr. Ryerson "has had the manliness to avow an alteration in his feelings." If this be "manliness," does it not call for a return on the part of the Editor of *The Church*, at least reciprocal if not friendly? But no; after Mr. Ryerson's concessions, and *The Church's* professions of love of "concord," the Editor has not "manliness" enough to avoid this taunt:—Mr. Ryerson "has been the most determined enemy that our Church ever had!"

In referring to our journal *The Church* observes, "The *Christian Guardian*, speaking the sentiments of the Methodist Conference, still manifests the same spirit of hostility, except upon the eve of a Missionary Meeting, when some unprincipled Churchman is to be decoyed into the chair." Here is a charge of deception and a wish to entrap, without a vestige of proof. Our Missionary Meeting was held on the 10th of January. Will the *Church* point to the articles in the numbers of the *Guardian* published the week and week before previously, that it may be seen that on the "eve" of the meeting we laid a snare for Churchmen? He will find only one article, and that an answer of the Editor of *The Church* himself to one of his opponents. Does he mean that by admitting that reply we set a trap for Churchmen? We thought we were doing the Editor an act of justice, which his sense of honour would never construe into a decoy. Then does he not know that the Meeting was held ten days after he published Mr. Ryerson's recommendation of peace, and his own determination to promote "a long religious peace"? We approved of the recommendation, and of *The Church's* professed determination, and for near a month forbore remarks until *The Church* renewed hostilities. During that month the meeting was held, and now, to be sure, our love of peace, and silence, are pronounced a decoy. Whatever *The Church* has failed to learn, it is not this lesson: "Charity hopeeth all things." His whole reply to Mr. Ryerson, given to-day, seems to breathe the spirit of a splanetic charity; at a loss for something to say, he has said much at random and petulantly; and the *Guardian's* forbearance is made to be settled hate.

The next paragraph refers to the legitimacy of the Wesleyan-Methodist Church in Canada. *The Church* says, "We can never grant the title of a Church to the Methodist body." From the Apostles' time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Methodism has not these orders, and therefore is not a Church. The whole of the controversy turns on this one point. Were the bishops of the earliest Christian times of a third order, and did no man preach the gospel unless first inducted into the ministry by a bishop? We make four remarks. 1. In those times men who preached the gospel were not ordained by Diocesan bishops, but by presbyters, who were bishops, but not of a third order in the ministry, —not Diocesan bishops. St. Paul writes to Timothy, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." 2. We were so disposed it would be no difficult thing to show, that it is not a matter of absolute necessity that a preacher of the gospel be recognized by the ministry in order to be useful. We deem it strictly proper for Christ's servants to obtain such a recognition, unless when utterly impracticable; but the most distinguished of the Apostles spent the first three years of his ministry without it. St. Paul, who was converted and called by God in a peculiar manner, says, "Neither went up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again into Damascus." Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter." Dr. Adam Clarke, whom *The Church* has several times placed in opposition to the Canada Conference, shall speak his mind for the information and condemnation of the High Church. He remarks, "It appeared of great importance to St. Paul, to defend and vindicate his divine mission. As he had none from man, it was the more necessary that he should be able to show plainly, that he had one from God. Paul was not brought into the Christian ministry by any rite ever used in the Christian Church. Neither bishop nor presbyter ever laid hands on him; and he is more anxious to prove this, because his chief honour arose from being sent immediately by God himself; his conversion, and the purity of his doctrine, showed whence he came. Many since his time, and in the present day, are far more anxious to show that they are legitimately appointed by man than by God; and are fond of displaying their human credentials. These are easily shown; those that came from God are out of their reach. How idle and vain is a boasted succession from the Apostles, while ignorance, intolerance, pride, and vainglory, prove that those very persons have no commission from heaven! Endless cases may occur, where man sends, and yet God will not sanction. And that man has no right to preach, nor administer the sacraments of the Church of Christ, whom God has not sent; though the whole assembly of Apostles had laid their hands on him. God never sent, and never will send, to convert others, a man who is not converted himself. He will never send him to teach meanness, gentleness, and long suffering, who is proud, overbearing, intolerant, and impatient. He, in whom the Spirit of Christ does not dwell, never had a commission to preach the Gospel. He may boast of his human authority, but God will laugh him to scorn." 3. The Wesleyan-Methodist Church is disallowed to be "a Church" at all, because the first preachers sent by Mr. Wesley to the American States, (from which Canada was in the beginning supplied with preachers) were ordained by him when he was not a Diocesan bishop—a bishop of the third order. It will be seen we could readily defend him on apostolic ground: not that he had a call from God as peculiar as St. Paul's; but he had one as purely divine, resulting, in its exercise, in effects of the same nature; and though not as illustrious, yet gloriously remarkable in the conversion of men. We defend Mr. Wesley in accordance with the practice of the apostolic and primitive church. Timothy was ordained by the presbytery; earliest church history shows this was the common usage: Mr. Wesley, even Churchmen allow, was an elder, or presbyter, (or if you please, a priest); and, therefore, a bishop of the primitive order, and could ordain, as Mosheim, Lord King, and others, have clearly shown. We marvel at the stress which is laid on the importance of Mr. Wesley being in the "succession" of High Church bishops to be useful. That succession, to have transmitted gifts and grace from age to age, must first be proved to be authentic and genuine. Whereas some of the links in the imaginary chain are of so gross a material, that they can never have been conductors of what is wise and holy. It is not every substance that can carry along the electric fire, and it is only one which can convey the holy fire from above to man. 4. The Wesleyan Methodist Church of Canada has all the attributes, and is blessed with the legitimate success, of a Christian Church. Her ministers have the internal call of God, and the external call of his providence; the sanction of men converted, sent, succeeded by Him; the doctrines they preach are not objected to by *The Church*, for they are his own; nor are their ordinances,—they are his own. Do not they possess and evince the spirit of Christ—a spirit of holiness, love, zeal, faith, devotedness to the glory of God? and what effects, as to their character, did the Apostles produce, or have Church of England ministers produced, by their preaching of the Gospel, which Methodist ministers have not produced, and are not now producing, favoured as they have been, and are, with Divine influence? Is there so much more ability and spirituality in Church of England ministers, and so many more persons brought to God by them, that they can justly claim an exclusive call to the work, and to be of the only Christian church? If we must submit to their claim, let it be made apparent to us, that there is more divinity in their call, more truth in their ministrations; more sanctity in their membership than there is in those of the Methodist Church. For this we look, and look in vain.

Again: *The Church* remarks respecting the labours of the first Methodist Preachers in Canada, "Regarding them as a body, we do not believe that they have effected as much good as Mr. Ryerson ascribes to their exertions." Laborious as they were, *The Church* begrudges them the honour they earned; and objections will become him who must know that when Church of England Ministers were too educated and polished to come to Canada to seek the settlers in their solitude, as Dr. Strachan has said, Methodist Ministers were their shepherds in labours and afflictions more abundant. And if they had not sought them, what would now have been the moral lot of the country? When the roads were good enough, and the houses comfortable enough, and the beds downy enough, then came Churchmen, to enjoy the comforts they had produced; disturb the Churches they had formed; and deny and destroy the good they had done. This is the gratitude of a Church which would scarcely have had a name in the Province, but for the pioneer toils and sacrifices of the Ministers of the Canada Conference. We can bear the ingratitude of *The Church*; but shall never leave uncontradicted her reiterated misrepresentations.

*The Church* attacks our Discipline thus: "The Methodists are a most exclusive body, and ought to be the last persons to talk about liberality." He then gives a part of one of the Rules of the Society, "instructing Methodists how they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation." "By doing good, especially to them that are of the household of faith, or growing so to be; employing them preferably to others; buying one of another; helping each other in business; and so much the more, because the world will love its own, and then only." . . . In plain and fair English, it means buy your meat of a Methodist butcher, your bread of a Methodist baker, &c. &c. We do not know whether the Editor of *The Church* is endowed with obtuseness or wilfulness of mind. He has forgotten another part of the Rule from which he gives the foregoing extract, which requires that our members do "good of every possible sort, and as far as possible, to ALL MEN." Then, where does he find in the Rule the word METHODIST on which he lays such emphasis? It is not to be found in it at all. Our members are to do good "to them that are of the household of faith;" not to the Methodists only, but Churchmen, and ALL other Christians. This part of *The Church's* reply to Mr. Ryerson is written in a reckless mood, and is discreditable to the Editor's professions of literary honesty. And he is prepared to affirm that the members of a Christian church ought not to evince a preference for Christians in temporal matters? Every Christian loves all men and will render useful services to all, even to the unthankful; while he is prompted by ardent affection to love Christians most. The words of St. Paul have an application here; and he it remarked they are part of very important advice given to Timothy as a minister of Christ: "If any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." *The Church* ought to cover his face for very shame. The article of his which called forth Mr. Ryerson's letter, was intended to prevent Churchmen from giving any thing except to their own Church; the Editor's reply which we now publish says the same thing. We must have a Church Bible Society, Missionary Society, Tract Society, Temperance Society, all are to be established: not a farthing is to go out of the Church; no, not to save a soul from perdition! No church does more for its own members than the Methodist, and none does more for mankind. If this, as the *Church* asserts, be exclusiveness; then is it liberality for the editor to write, and scold, and scold again, to compel the Church of England people to give every copper they can raise exclusively to the Church of England?

MISSIONARY MEETINGS AND REVIVALS.—We have received too late for publication to-day we know not how many letters of the most acceptable description, from the Rev. Messrs. J. Ryerson, P. Jones, S. Ross, J. Measmore, &c. &c. Prosperity is the watch-word of all our respected brethren in the Province; and prosperity crowns their exertions and prayers. There is an item or two in Mr. Ryerson's letter we cannot keep from our readers till next week. He says the amount of collections and subscriptions at the Muncey Missionary Meeting is £27! And while on his tour through the Thames Circuit he received an anonymous letter containing a donation to our Missionary Society of £12 10s.

A MISSIONARY OFFERING.—An unknown friend sends us a note, enclosing two dollars, containing the following words: She will please accept our thanks in behalf of our Missionary Society:—

"For the Treasury of the Lord. In aid of the Wesleyan-Methodist Missions. A Widow's Alms."

CHINA.—A late arrival of the ship *Probus* at New York, from Canton, brings intelligence that everything remains the same at that city; that the Chinese are repairing their fortifications; and that Amoy has been captured.

We thank Messrs. Rogers, Thompson, and Co., of this City, the printers and publishers, for a neat, cheap, useful pamphlet, containing the District Municipal Council Act, District Court Act, Common Council Act, and School Lands Act.

## ADDITIONAL MISSIONARY MEETINGS.

Richmond Hill	Mon Feb. 21, 6	Snyder's, Senhoro	Tue March 1 6
Red Mill	Wed .. 22 6	Barton's	Wed .. 2 6
Reynolds or Lower	Wed .. 23 6	Reesorville	Thurs .. 3 6
McDougall's	Thurs .. 24 6	Hewitt's	Frid .. 4 6
Bum's	Frid .. 25 6	Hewitt's	Mon .. 7 6
Cumner's	Mon .. 28 6	Humber	Tue .. 8 6

## TABLE OF MERIT.

Names of Students meeting public distinction in Victoria College, from 21st October, 1841, to January 20th, 1842.

Names.	Spelling.	Reading.	Writing.	Grammar.	Arithmetic.	English Grammar.	Book-keeping.	Algebra.	Geometry.	Day's Mathematics.	Calculus.	Physical Astronomy.	Geography.	History.	Natural Philosophy.	Physiology.	Logic.	Metaphysics.	Human Antiquities.	Scripture Lesson.
John Atkins	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
J. R. Armstrong	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Thos. Baxter	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
W. S. Beatty	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
John Denton	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
G. H. Deuter	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Chester Dean	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
James Echlin	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
N. F. English	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
G. Horiburt	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
James Kerr	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
E. L. Koyl	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
James Piper	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
W. Powell	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Charles Page	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
E. F. Ryerson	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Jos. Robinson	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
O. Springer	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
John Shaw	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
N. Powell	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
G. A. Purvis	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
J. VanNorman	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
S. H. Wright	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
W. Wilson	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
C. Whittier	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
S. J. VanNorman	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
W. P. Wright	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
C. A. Weller	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Robt. Carter	68	68	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6







Books, Pamphlets, Cards, Circulars, Blanks, Handbills, Placards,  
Labels, &c. &c., correctly, neatly, and expeditiously Printed at this Office.

J. H. LAWRENCE, PRINTER.