

Christian Guardian.

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

Vol. XIV. No. 24.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1843.

Whole No. 700.

POPE OF PUSEYISM.—No. III. THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S CHARGE.

But there is another source of Popish attraction in this doctrine of the indestructible validity of Episcopal power. Whatever be the principle of interpretation adopted, the language of the text is plain: "Whosoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. xviii. 18.) Now, this declaration comes in immediate connexion with what Roman and English Papists would call a text of Scripture—"Hear the Church,"—but which, as thus having the imperative form, both Roman and English Papists know is not a Scripture text at all. But, letting such mutilations of the word of God pass, with the single remark, that they are mutilations, and mutilations of so serious a character, as to call for the public and indignant reprobation of every faithful overseer of the church of Christ,—let it be observed, that if this be an expression of Episcopal authority, as the doctrine raised in the presence of royalty from the foregoing words, assume; then where are we? Here is no limitation immediately connected with the words, "whosoever ye shall bind." *Whosoever, not whosoever.* The same principles of interpretation which prove that Episcopal ordination is valid *inso facto*, without respect to qualification, (inasmuch that though the presence of the qualification fits for the discharge of the duty, yet its absence does not hinder the reception of official authority,) must govern us in interpreting this—"Whosoever ye shall bind on earth;" and then, are we justified in setting up our own private judgment against the official decisions of the Roman Bishops? The text refers to things, not persons; and if the mere act of Episcopal ordination of itself makes a man a Minister, because of the fitness and validity of Episcopal power; the mere act of Episcopal decision, for the same reason, must make the observances they establish binding upon the flock. Indeed, the argument is stronger for the last, than for the first. The command for the first is, "Commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Now, if this means that Bishops may ordain men who are neither faithful, nor able to teach others; then, surely, "Whosoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven," gives the power of making ordinances for the government of the Church. And if the true principle be *submission to authority*, then, though the things themselves may be wrong, and their authors liable to condemnation at the last; yet, as they who observe them are not answerable, but only required to submit, why the controversies of the Reformation? On this principle, Leo X. might be wrong in ordering the indulgences which Tetzel sold; but the people were only required to submit,—to submit, and not judge. Luther, therefore, in arguing against the indulgences, as being wrong in themselves, and calling the people to reject them, and thus to refuse their wonted submission, was himself wrong; and so were they in England who followed in the same track.

And thus are we to go steadily on towards the Popery which our fathers opposed; and, in opposing which, they were willing to perish at the stake. But even this is not all. No separate doctrine of Romanism has been more vehemently attacked than that of transubstantiation. But upon the modern High-Church principle of explaining the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, what need is there of so much opposition? The Roman dogma only explains the manner of what the others represent as a fact. We always come to this subject unwillingly. Soon may the time arrive when it shall no longer be necessary to speak either of baptism, or the supper of the Lord, controversially. But the blame must rest with those who render controversy necessary.

We say, then, that the manner in which the eucharist is described, makes the adoption of transubstantiation a mere trifling advance, if it be an advance at all; and thus prepares the way for the fullest reception of Popery. The consecrated elements are represented as themselves conveying, corporally conveying, the body and blood of Christ to the recipient. He who can receive this *imputation*, differs very little from him who believes transubstantiation. He does not differ enough to justify a departure from visible, external unity, if that unity be as necessary as the same party represents it. They are not content with the doctrine, that, in what is emphatically a *covenant rite*, he who by faith holds communion with his Saviour daily, and daily feeds on him in his heart by faith, with thanksgiving, is here blessed with the same communion more especially, and in a higher degree. This was the doctrine of the Reformers. The reception of Christ was, by faith, in the heart,—not with the hands and mouth. Most distinctly do they declare, that Christ's bodily presence is in heaven, not in the bread. They quote from Chrysostom, that it is not a feast for eyes, who keep to the ground; but for eagles, who soar aloft to the sky. But this will not suit the others. The bread and wine, consecrated by one who is in the external succession, do themselves give Christ to the recipient, and thus salvation. They make it, therefore, the chief means of grace, superior to all others,—the grand, appointed way of saving men. Preaching is nothing to it. "We," say they, "are the only persons in this nation who are sure they have the Lord's body to give to the people." Here is no directing them to elevate their hearts, eagle-like, by faith, to heaven, that (according to Augustine, as quoted with marked emphasis by Jewel) where they worship, there also they may eat. No! *He has the Lord's body to give to the people; that is, we have the consecrated elements, and they are the Lord's body.* They who go thus far are scarcely justified in breaking visible unity by refusing to go the little farther which is necessary for the adoption of transubstantiation. In one of the leading journals of the day, which of late has lent its powerful aid to the Tractarians, a letter appeared, ("Times," Saturday, December 10th,) purporting to be from a Presbyterian of the Anglican Church. This unmistakable sentence occurs in it: "The writer is referring to the presence of the Bishop of Llandaff at St. Paul's Cathedral, when the King of Prussia was there; and he asks, 'Why did he suffer the King of Prussia, a religious man, to go away with the impression, that however much the Anglican Church may value a subordinate means of grace—preaching, the light regards the chief means of all,—the reception of her Saviour's body and blood?'" He who can write thus, has already, to say the least, reached the suburbs of Rome.

Only another instance of these Romanizing tendencies shall now be mentioned. The Bishop's Charge most explicitly and strongly asserts baptismal justification and regeneration. The Reformers asserted, that justification was, by an intelligent faith in Christ, apprehending and appropriating his merits. Plain as is their language, often repeated as are their assertions on the subject, their meaning is rendered indubitable by the fact, that, besides objecting to the doctrine, their Papist opponents asserted the uselessness of contending about it in a country like this; because, whatever might be the case where the Gospel was first proposed for acceptance, here justification was conferred on infants in the sacrament of baptism. "We be all justified when we are younglings," said Stephen Gardner. And yet, knowing what their opponents said, the Reformers persisted in drawing up their official documents in agreement with the known sentiments of their continental brethren. Could they possibly have done so, had they believed on this point as the Papists believed?—had they believed in baptismal justification?

Besides, there is the New Testament. It is altogether constructed upon the first part of Stephen Gardner's supposition,—the case of those to whom the Gospel is first offered. Justification is explicitly and consistently said to be by faith; and regeneration is described as an actual change from sin to holiness, wrought by the Spirit of God in them that "obey the truth," rendered visible by its immediately and certainly following fruits. For baptismal regeneration we must come to the Fathers; that is, to tradition, the "unwritten word," as Romanists call it. Cranner, writing to Queen Mary, says, that when he quoted an ancient author who spoke in plain words as he did, his opponents replied, "that he meant not so." Thus, if the Fathers are necessary to fix the interpretation of Scripture, each generation of writers requires to be explained by the one next below it, till we come down to the living church, speaking by its living Head. If once we embark on the current of tradition, leaving the sure ground of holy writ, we cannot stop till we come to the sentence of the Council of Trent, and receive the decisions of the visible, external church, as of equal authority with Scripture. Equal? Superior! That is practically the highest, which decides finally.

High-Churchism, whether it has yet reached the Tractarian stage or not, tends directly to Popery. It is Popery in principle and germ. And all who believe that Popery itself is wrong, are called, by the peculiar circumstances of the times, firmly, consistently, and perseveringly, to protest against this which, if permitted to triumph, will unavoidably introduce it. If some who partake of the honours and emoluments of Protestantism are ashamed of the name, they who acknowledge the hand of God in the opposition to Popery of Luther and his helpers, must renew the protest, and give new life to Protestantism. That none may take upon himself the ministry who is not moved thereby by the Holy Ghost; that justification, the forgiveness of sin, is of the free mercy of God, through the alone merit of Christ, and by faith in his blood; that regeneration, the beginning of a new life of holy inclination and power, is wrought in the soul by the Holy Ghost, the Comforter: these must be the grand points of the protest.

And, if the past be not all delusion, the protest cannot be made in vain, when made in a right spirit. These, and these doctrines collateral with them, are the doctrines with which every outpouring of the Spirit upon the churches has always been connected. What was the preaching in Scotland, a century ago, which was followed by so glorious a work of conversion? What the preaching in New-England? What the preaching of Wesley and Whitefield? But when did the preaching of the doctrines of the Bishop of London's Charge ever produce such effects? We do not say it exultingly. But the time is come that it must be said. When did they take these views of Christianity, ever even desire that their preaching should be followed by such effects? Preaching is subordinate! The sacraments are the power of God unto salvation! Do the Scriptures say so? And if the presence of the Holy Spirit is declared by "the fruit of the Spirit," does the presence of the Spirit say so?

Against one danger, all who are interested in these mighty questions, must take most careful heed. They must not be matters of mere controversy. By Ministers they must be preached, by hearers they must be received, in distinct reference to their practical influence and results. What avails it that we know how man is to be justified, if we continue unpurged? What, that we know the nature and way of spiritual regeneration, if we abide in unregeneracy? And here, be it spoken with humble reverence, here it is, that by whomsoever the protest is made before man, by all who know and love the truth, must be the appeal be made unto God. Great as ever is the power of prayer. Let it be made unto God without ceasing. And now that the enemy is abroad, it behoves even private Christians to seek, not only to be sound in the experience of the truth, but clear and discerning in the knowledge of it; and above all, to see to it, that its results be cherished and strengthened in holiness of heart and life. Let them show that the truth is with them, by making it evident, that the truth sanctifies them, and that the doctrine they hold is, indeed, "the doctrine which is according to godliness."

From the N. Y. Observer.

MISTAKES OF MILLERISM.

BY REV. WM. R. WEEKS, D. D., NEWARK, N. J.

In my former article I pointed out twenty-nine mistakes of Mr. Miller and his friends in relation to his chronology; and stated that I had as many more. I referred to a declaration in the 5th No. of the *Midnight Cry*, that the reading in 1 Kings vi. 1 is erroneous, which allows 480 years from the departure out of Egypt to the building of the temple. I examined some of the reasons assigned for that declaration; and now proceed to others.

30. The authority of Josephus is stated among the things which prove the 480 years of Kings "to be erroneous and Mr. Miller correct." And in the same paper, in reply to an inquiry by what authority Mr. Miller gives 25 years to Joshua, when there is nothing in the Bible on the subject, it is answered, with an air of triumph, "By the authority of Josephus, as he states in his chronological table. The Bible relates the facts in the case, and Josephus gives the chronology." Question: "By what authority does he give 18 years to the elders after Joshua, when the Bible gives none?" Answer: "By the authority of Josephus." It would seem, then, that, in the estimation of Mr. Miller and his friends, the authority of Josephus is undoubted, and not only sufficient to establish a fact in chronology where the Bible is silent, but to set aside the Bible where it comes in conflict with Josephus. What time, then, does Mr. Miller allow between the departure out of Egypt and the building of the temple? 621 years. What time does Josephus allow? 592 years; a difference of 29 years. If the authority of Josephus proves the passage in Kings to be erroneous, it is a mistake to conclude it proves Mr. Miller correct.

31. Mr. Miller reckons that the temple was founded 1051 years after the call of Abraham, and Josephus says it was 1020, making a difference of 31 years.

32. Mr. Miller reckons it 1479 years after the flood, and Josephus says it was 1440, making a difference of 39 years.

33. Mr. Miller reckons it 3135 years from the creation, and Josephus says it was 3102, making a difference of 33 years.

34. Mr. Miller reckons 80 years for the government of Enoch, and Josephus seems to do the same. But in the next chapter, (Ant. v. 5. 1.) he represents their oppression by Jabin as coming upon them "before they had a short breathing time after the slavery of the Moabites." And his editor concludes, from this, that Josephus must have reckoned eight years instead of eighty, as Theophilus of Antioch affirms it was in his copy.

35. Mr. Miller allows 23 years for the government of Tola, and Josephus omits him altogether, and puts Jair next after Abimelech.

36. Mr. Miller allows 24 years for Samel after the death of Eli before the reign of Saul, and Josephus says it was 12 years.

37. Mr. Miller reckons the reign of Solomon at 40 years, but Josephus says it was 48 years.

38. Mr. Miller reckons the reign of Jehoram at 5 years, but Josephus says it was 8 years.

39. Mr. Miller puts an interregnum of 11 years between Amaziah and Azariah, but Josephus makes Azariah succeed his father immediately, without any interregnum at all.

40. According to Mr. Miller, the kingdom of Judah lasted 521 years, from the beginning of Saul's reign to the end of Zedekiah's; but Josephus says it was 592 years, 6 months, and 10 days, making a difference of 11 years, 6 months, and 10 days.

Several other instances might be given, where the authority of Mr. Miller is contradicted by the authority of Josephus. I do not say Josephus is right; but I think if the authority of Josephus is reckoned by Mr. Miller and his friends sufficient to prove the Bible erroneous, it ought to be regarded by us as quite sufficient to prove Mr. Miller erroneous.

41. Not only do the followers of Mr. Miller quote Josephus, with an air of triumph, as though his authority was unquestioned and unquestionable; but Mr. Miller himself often quotes him without any suggestion, that I have seen, of any doubt. In his chronological table, (View, p. 37.) he refers to him, just as he refers to the Bible. In his lecture, p. 84, he states that on a certain occasion the "Greeks left besieging Jerusalem, upon the command of the Romans, and as Josephus and Maccabees tell us, never returned to trouble the Jews any more." In p. 257, he refers to the same event, and says, "as Maccabees tell us in his first book." Now, Mr. Miller is extolled by his disciples as a man of wonderful historical and biblical knowledge. And this fame of his, no doubt, greatly contributes to give currency to his notions. For this reason it seems proper that his pretensions should be tested. And what do we discover in these quotations? We discover a mistake that would scarcely be excusable in a Sabbath-school child. Mr. Miller thinks Maccabees was a man, who wrote some books of history, which are received into the Apocrypha. He classes him with Josephus, and tells us what he says "in his first book." But there was no such man. Maccabees is not the name of a man, any more than *Paulus* or *Chronicles* is the name of a man. And it would be just as proper to tell us what *Chronicles* says in his first book, as what Maccabees says. This is a small matter to take notice of; and if Mr. Miller's uncommon knowledge was not trumpeted forth, and made the means of imposing upon the multitude, it might be passed over in silence. As the matter is, it seems important to show how utterly disqualified he is by his ignorance to be an expounder of prophecy.

42. But, he appeals to Josephus as authority. And though that authority, whatever it is, has been shown to be much more frequently against him than for him, it may be proper to examine it a little further. It would be a great mistake for any one to depend upon the correctness of Josephus's numbers; for the following items will show: Ant. 1. 3. 3. Josephus says the flood "began 2056 years from Adam the first man." In the next section he gives the several ages of the patriarchs, sometimes following the Septuagint, and sometimes the Hebrew; and when they are added together they make 2256 years, being 400 years less than he had stated in the preceding section. B. 1. 6. 5. he says, "Abraham was the tenth from Noah, and was born in the 292d year after the deluge." He then gives the time of each patriarch before the birth of his son, following the Septuagint, partly, but the Hebrew not at all, and when they are added together they make 993 years, being 701 years more than he had just affirmed it to be. Adding the ages of these patriarchs makes 3249 years from the creation to the birth of Abraham. Add Abraham's age at the birth of Isaac, 100, and Isaac's age, 185, and it makes 3534 years from the creation to the death of Isaac, when he had stated at the beginning of the book that it was 3533, making a difference of 299 years. At the head of B. V. he says it was 476 years from the death of Moses to the death of Eli. But in his list of the judges he omits Tolai, to whom the Bible gives 23 years, and does not state the duration of Abdon's government, which, if supplied as in the Bible, would make the sum 433 years, making a difference of 17 years. At the head of B. VI. he says it was 32 years from the death of Eli to the death of Saul; and then he gives 12 years to Samel before the reign of Saul, and 18 after the commencement of Saul's reign, and then 22 more to Saul after Samel's death, making a difference of 20 years. B. VIII. 3. 1. he says, the foundation of the temple was 592 years from the departure out of Egypt. But adding all the particulars he has given, makes 606, a difference of 14 years. He says it was 1020 from the call of Abraham; but the addition of his several particulars gives 961, a difference of 59 years. He says it was 1440 after the flood, but the addition of his several particulars gives 2029, making a difference of 599 years. And he also says it was 3102 from the creation; but the addition of his several particulars makes 4285, a difference of 1183 years. B. IX. he says contains the interval of 157 years, from the death of Ahab to the captivity of the ten tribes. His details of the kingdom of Israel make it 1554 years, and his details of the kingdom of Judah for the same time make it 1331; the first falling short 11 years, and the other over-running 26 years. B. X. he says contains the interval of 182 years and a half, from the captivity of the ten tribes to the first of Cyrus, but the details added together make it 235, a difference of 531 years. He also says the captivity was 70 years from the destruction of Jerusalem under Zedekiah, to the first of Cyrus, but the details added together make it 103, a difference of 33 years.

These inconsistencies and contradictions in Josephus I have taken pains to collect and expose, that the true character of his chronology may be understood. The learned have long been acquainted with it; but Mr. Miller and his friends seem not to know it. Scott, in his commentary on Acts xiii. 20, says, "It is well known that the chronology of the Septuagint and of Josephus is erroneous and confused, in no ordinary degree." And if any one will take the trouble to look at the places I have mentioned, he must necessarily come to the same conclusion.

51. I proceed now to the kings of Persia. In the paper before quoted, some questions are stated as having been put in some other paper, by what authority Mr. Miller fixes the several periods he allots to these kings, and it is answered, "Rollin is the authority—on the authority of Rollin—by the authority of Rollin." And Mr. Miller, in his chronology refers us to Rollin; stating the volume and page. For Cyrus he allows 6 years, and refers to Rollin, vol. i. p. 354. But in the volume and page referred to, it is expressly said, that Cyrus reigned 7 years alone, after the death of his uncle.

52. For the reign of Cambyses to that of Darius, Mr. Miller allows 7 years, and refers to Rollin, vol. i. p. 366. But the page referred to tells us that Cambyses reigned 7 years and 5 months, and that Smerdis the Magian then seized the throne, and held it during the time of certain transactions, which he details, and which would at least make up one year with the 5 months given to Cambyses.

53. Mr. Miller allows 13 years for Xerxes, and refers to Rollin, vol. ii. p. 9. On that page I do not find it stated, but on p. 46 of that volume it is said, "The reign of Xerxes lasted but 12 years."

54. In the above-cited paper, and in reference to the periods assigned to Cyrus, Cambyses, and Xerxes, it is said, "These last three questions relate to periods not fixed by the Bible." In the space between the Old and New Testaments, we adopt the common chronology. Why sneer at that? It is proved to be correct in the total by the fulfilment of the 70 weeks, or 490 years. What does this mean? Does it mean that the reigns of Cyrus, Cambyses, and Xerxes were included in the 70 weeks? That appears to be its meaning. For if that is not its meaning, the remark is entirely foreign to the subject in hand, which was the reign of those three kings. But it is a mistake to suppose that all, or any of them, were included in the 70 weeks. They were all previous to the 70 weeks.

55. There are sundry mistakes of Mr. Miller in relation to Ferguson's Astronomy. He refers us to that work to prove the correctness of some of his dates. And in the *Midnight Cry*, of Jan. 27, appended to a new edition of Mr. Miller's chronology, is a note respecting Ferguson's manner of proving the time of the birth and death of our Saviour, and then it says, "Thus the great time measurers in the heavens undeniably prove that this year is 1810 years from the crucifixion. This is a great point to which the prophecy of Daniel refers, is fixed by astronomy, the most exact source of proof."

But, if Ferguson's authority is sufficient to prove Mr. Miller to be right, where it agrees with him, it must be sufficient to prove Mr. Miller wrong where it disagrees with him. Ferguson agrees with Mr. Miller that our Lord was crucified in the year 33, and that the 70 weeks began in the year B. C. 457. But Ferguson gives 536 as the date of the proclamation of Cyrus, while Mr. Miller puts it in 520, making a difference of ten years.

56. Ferguson puts the foundation of Solomon's temple in the year B. C. 1012, while Mr. Miller puts it in 1022, making a difference of 10 years.

57. Ferguson puts the departure out of Egypt in the year 1491, while Mr. Miller puts it in 1443, making a difference of 48 years.

58. Ferguson puts the call of Abraham in the year 1924, while Mr. Miller puts it in 2073, making a difference of 149 years.

59. Ferguson puts the flood in the year B. C. 2351, while Mr. Miller puts it in 2501, a difference of 150 years.

60. But there is one thing particularly worthy of notice. Ferguson tells us how the correctness of ancient dates is discovered, when they happen to be connected by the historian with any eclipses of the sun or moon which happened at the same time. It is easy to make the calculation now, and see whether an eclipse could have been observed at the time and place mentioned. And he quotes a number of eclipses, connected with historical events, from a catalogue of Ricciolus, p. 271. Among them is the following: "B. C. 523, July 16, an eclipse of the moon, which was followed by the death of Cambyses." Here, then, the death of Cambyses is "fixed by astronomy, the most exact source of proof;" to the year 523; but Mr. Miller puts it in the year 513, a difference of ten years. It is proved, then, by his own witness, that, as certainly as astronomers can calculate an eclipse of the moon, just as certainly is Mr. Miller at least ten years out of the way in that part of his reckoning.

I have now gone through Mr. Miller's chronology, and pointed out sixty mistakes in relation to it. I have not thought it necessary to make out a chronology for myself, in order to determine in what year of the world is this present year 1843. I think the Scriptures have purposely left it in uncertainty, because it is not for us to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. But I have done enough to show that Mr. Miller's chronology is utterly destitute of credibility. So far, then, as Mr. Miller's scheme depends upon his chronology, it is shown to be unworthy of belief.

His lecture on the Great Sabbath appears to be designed to prove that the work of Redemption is to be carried on during 6,000 years, and no longer, and that the seventh thousand is to be the Great Sabbath of rest. He says, (View, p. 162) "Christ will have finished his work of redemption before the great Sabbath." Page 163—"The Sabbath, which God has given to us as a sign, does indicate the time of the Great Sabbath of rest." Page 169—"If Jesus Christ does his work in six days, and rests from all his labours on the seventh, when may we expect this great event to take place? I answer—if a thousand years is one day with the Lord, then six thousand years from the first creation the new one must be formed."

It appears from these extracts, that Mr. Miller places great dependence upon his chronology to make out 6,000 years from the creation of the world to the present year, 1843; and that this is a principal ground of his expectation that this year is to be the end of the world, the coming of Christ, and the creation of a new heaven and new earth. It is not at all admitted that he looks for the right events at the end of the 6,000 years. But it is not necessary now to inquire what events are to come then, since it has been shown that Mr. Miller is entirely at fault in his calculations about the time. He is at least some hundred and fifty years or more out of the way in the time. In the next number I propose to take up Daniel's 2,300 days, in relation to which also Mr. Miller abounds in mistakes.

From the Christian Advocate and Journal.

REV. E. WASHBURN'S NARRATIVE—ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION.

When I commenced the work of the ministry I fully believed in every point of Methodist doctrine contained in the Articles of our Church. I endeavoured to preach every part of Methodism, and designed to conform my life to the doctrine I preached. As respects the great doctrine of Christian perfection, I preached it by stating the doctrine, proving it by the Scriptures, and obviating the objections brought against it by other denominations. This I did theoretically, without the experience of the work of sanctification in my own breast, and without the enjoyment of the inestimable benefits flowing from such an experience. I often desired it, and ardently prayed for it. I frequently felt my own soul stirred up and quickened while preaching it, and had various evidences that God rendered it a blessing to others. When going to the Lynn conference in 1835, I attended a Quarterly meeting in Tolland, and preached on the subject of holiness, and there was the shout of a king in the camp of Israel; and the next year I went to a camp-meeting at Square-pond, and as I entered the grove an aged man met me and accosted me very familiarly. I looked at him, but could not recognize him. He said, "You do not know me, but I know you, and I know that you preached the word of God into my soul last June, in Harvey Howard's orchard, and it remains there yet." I recollect, when on Granville circuit, there was a place where we had preached several months without any visible effect. I preached a sermon on sanctification, and a number of souls were awakened. But when I came to New London, I sent I felt the importance of being more fully devoted to God, and earnestly prayed to him for a clean heart. The second time that I preached in New London I spoke in the morning on "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace." During the intermission, as I was walking the floor, in a room by myself, I was contemplating on this verse: I verily believe the doctrine I have preached this morning. I have no doubt but it is the Christian's privilege to experience and enjoy all the holiness for which I have contended, and why am I living so far beneath my privilege? There were a number of books lying on a table, and as I passed by them I rather inadvertently took up one and opened it, and the first words that caught my eye were in substance as follows: "Thus it plainly appears that the great reason why we are not more holy is because we have never, in heart, intended it."—(Law's Serious Call to a Holy Life.) I paused, and then inquired, Is it so? In all my desires for, and my prayers and tears, that I might experience it, I have been hypocritical, and never yet intended to be holy in heart and in life? I continued to read, and soon became convinced that, with all my desires for the blessing, I had never intended to have it at the expense of all things. I clearly saw that if I would have that pearl I must sell all that I had in order to purchase it. I fell on my knees before the Lord, and asked for light to direct my course, and the Spirit to help my infirmities, and there covenanted with God that, by his grace assisting me, I would never give up the strife till I as fully knew Christ to be my sanctification as I ever knew him to be my justification. From that time I felt as deep conviction of the necessity of perfect love as I ever did of the necessity of the pardon of my sins. On the evening of the third day, while wrestling with God in secret, I thought there was nothing of an earthly nature which I could not freely sacrifice for Christ, and I was enabled to say, by faith, Here Lord I give myself away, soul, body, and spirit, with all my powers and passions, and all I have, to be at thy disposal; henceforth I repose my trust in thee for wisdom and righteousness, for joy and peace, for life and death. That moment Christ revealed himself to me the second time unto full salvation. The change I then experienced was as great as that of my first conversion, and far more glorious; I felt that I not only loved God

more than anything else, but more than all things else combined. Though this was thirty-six years ago, I have never wholly lost the witness I then received. My enjoyments have not been always alike, but there has not been a day in which I have not felt the inward witness of perfect love. I have had sore temptations, but Christ has not sent me a warfare at my own charges, he has not suffered me to be tempted above that I was able, and has always with the temptation made a way of escape; and my experience has been, that temptations, so far from impeding my divine progress, if resisted steadfastly in the faith, are overruled for the furtherance of the soul in spiritual enjoyments: for every temptation I overcome I gain a fresh testimony that God is propitious to my prayers; and though of myself I am nothing, yet, through Christ, I am victor over the assaults of the devil. I have tried and proved the excellence of religion about forty-four years; I have found it good under all the circumstances and conditions through which I have been called to pass. In sickness it has been my support, in affliction my comfort and consolation, in seasons of persecution and temptation my hiding-place and never-failing defence, in scenes of poverty a rich treasure, far more precious than that of gold or silver.

Witnessed, Nov. 10th, 1842.

E. WASHBURN.

[The following letter, by the Rev. J. A. JAMES, of Birmingham, was read at a recent meeting at Craven Chapel, in London, for the promotion of Christian Union. The writer is a highly-esteemed Minister of the same class with Fuller, Hall, Pearce, and Jay, and in this letter shows the anti-sectarianism of his intelligent mind.—Ed.]

CHRISTIAN UNION.

TO THE REV. DR. LEITCHFIELD.

Edgworth, December 29, 1842.

"MY DEAR FRIEND,—I had intended to reply before this to your interesting and welcome letter. It is truly grateful to my heart to see any symptoms of the practical working out of the theory which I have ventured to propose for the consideration of the body of Christ. Alas! not for poor humanity, but for our poor Christianity, that it should be a problem yet to be solved, a theorem yet to be demonstrated, whether the begotten of the Father should recognize and acknowledge their brotherhood. There must be not only something, but much, that is wrong, perhaps, with us all. Such is the present alienation, as well as divided state of the different sections of the great body of Protestant Christians, that it almost becomes a question, whether our first object ought not to be the union of the Church, and not the conversion of the world: for how can it be expected that God will honour and bless our labours to any extent while the spirit of dissension is rife among us? What success in any great measure can an army, invading an enemy's country, and carrying on a war of aggression, expect, while the various regiments that compose it are engaged in fierce strife with each other? It is said, I forget where, that on an occasion when there was a mutiny in the camp of Mahomed, he ordered the Koran to be lifted up before the rebellious soldiers, and all was quelled. Shame upon us, that the crescent should have more power to harmonize and unite its followers than the Cross!"

"I am glad and thankful that you are beginning the experiment whether Christians can let the world see that they own and love one another. I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the attempt; and many more will thank and bless you. It will be a beginning,—yes, the matter will not end there. You are fighting a friendly battle on a hill which many will see, and to which many will flock. I shall be with you in spirit, though absent in body. You will have my earnest as well as sincere prayers, that the Heavenly Dove may hover over our assembly, and shed healing by the vibration of his wings upon you. You will feel an influence as refreshing and fertilizing as the dew of Hermon, and as the dew which descended upon the mountains of Zion;—the Lord, I believe, will command his blessing, even the beginning of a richer enjoyment by his church of the life that is to be for evermore."

"I rejoice to believe that since the subject has been put forth there is a deeper interest felt in it. Responses have been made to the announcement which have delighted my heart and excited my hopes. Ireland is ripening for union. Scotland has put forth, by the Commissioners of the General Assembly, a scheme analogous to, though far more elaborate than the one I have ventured to send out. Wales, so far as the Calvinistic Methodists are concerned, has also returned from its mountains and valleys, the echo of the blessed note, and is asking for Union. Yes, my beloved brother, growing old as you and I are, hoary, and somewhat feeble, as regards myself, in the ministry, we may yet live to see the friends of the Cross brought nearer to the Cross, and to each other, by the Cross. Let us hope, and first let us believe, and then let us pray, and work and wait. The cold-hearted smile, and say we are visionaries, following after a utopian object. Let them smile—but have we not the prayers of the Redeemer—the predictions of Prophets—the prayers of the better and holier part of the Church—the yearnings of a multitude longing and interceding for the accomplishment of our plans and purposes? O that you may have such a taste of the blessedness of union as shall make all long for the feast. If there be one spot on earth above most others where Christ will delight to be, it is Craven Chapel when you shall be assembled next Monday, to blend your sentiments, and your sympathies, and your prayers, as his professed followers, who love one another, despite your lesser differences, for His dear sake alone. Grace be with all that love Him in sincerity, whether with you or not!"

"I remain, in great haste, but with greater affection, your sincere friend and brother,

J. A. JAMES."

SIMPLICITY.

BY THE LATE REV. R. BRACKENBURY.

Simplicity, the fairest flower That grows in Eden grew, Ere Adam fell the trumpet's power, Or gold and evil knew.	Dives deep, and in the sacred word Mysterious truths explore. Content and cheerful is the heart. Where reigns simplicity: It knows not how to act a part, Or disingenuous be.
But replanted now in soil Where heavenly graces shine, Their every motion the controls With energy divine.	Ready the good of all to seek Compassionately kind; Humble in want, in trouble meek, In every station resigned.
O what a paradise to move Flower her pleasing way! While halcyon hours from above Are scattered all the way.	Fixed to the central point of bliss, Ne'er from its base moves; Jeans its rest and source is Object of all its loves.
Ten thousand charms adorn her mien Which money and grace; And joy, pure pleasure of peace within, Smiles smiling on her face.	Would any at their Lord's command Fly from themselves and sin? His loving arms wide open stand To take the outcasts in.
Riches and honours here abound, And rest and liberty; And every blessing waits around To live in simplicity.	Would any try to cooling streams, Or to a shelter run, To hide from them the scorching beams Of tribulation's sun?
The evil eye sees nothing right, Is envious and ill; It turns the sunshine into night, And virtue into vice.	In Jesus happily conjoined, Let none his gift refuse: A fountain and a rock we find For every pilgrim's use.
Not on the main whose single eye Discerns both false and true; Error in vain its specious hue Exposes to its view.	How can we fly from Jesus' arms Who have been born in sin; Or doubt to sweeten all our charms, Of sweet simplicity.

RUINS OF LAODICEA.

Leaving Derzike, we visited the ruins of Laodicea and Hierapolis,—the former Thracia, and the latter about ten miles distant, toward the north. These spots, so interesting to the Christian, are now utterly desolate. The threatening expressed in Revelations iii. 16 has been fulfilled, and Laodicea is but a name. In the midst of one of the finest plains of Asia Minor, it is entirely without inhabitant. Sardis, like manner, whose church had a name to live but was dead, is now an utter desolation. Its soil is turned up by the plough, and overgrown by rank weeds; while in Philadelphia, since the day when our Saviour commended those who had there "kept the word of his patience," there has never ceased to be a nominally Christian church. Oh that the spirit of those ancient disciples might be shed abundantly on their degenerate descendants and successors!

The ruins of Laodicea and Hierapolis are very extensive. The stadium of the former city, and the gymnasia and theatres of both, are the most complete which I have any where seen. Hierapolis is remarkable also for the so-called frozen cascades—a natural curiosity, in its kind probably not surpassed for beauty and extent in the world. It consists of a deposit of carbonate of lime, white as the driven snow, assuming, when closely examined, various forms, and covering nearly the whole southern and western declivities of the elevation on which the city was built. It is visible for many miles, and has procured for the place the name, by which alone Hierapolis is known among the Turks, of the Cotton Castle. Hierapolis was famous in ancient times for its medicinal waters, and its baths were much frequented. The warm water still flows abundantly, and still bubbles sparkling down the sides of the hill, increasing the deposit which has been forming for so many ages. The old deposit, covering many acres of the site of the ancient city, is now a dark-coloured hard limestone. The recent deposits are perfectly white, and not harder than lime plastering two or three weeks old. We bathed in the water near its source, and found it exceedingly refreshing after the fatigues of our journey. Mr. Adger suggests that the vicinity of these distinguished waters to Laodicea might have occasioned the use of the figure employed in our Saviour's address to that church, Revelations iii. 16,—"Because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor

CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN.

Wednesday, April 5th, 1843.

THE SAFETY OF THE NEW CONVERT.

We cast our eye over the wide field of our Church's operations in this country and see labours abundant, and successes numerous and heart-cheering: our institutions are well-sustained and efficient; the ministry of God's word is plain, practical, and powerful; the circuits and missions are insatiable with Divine life; special efforts have been and are general, vigorously made, and gloriously owned of God; hundreds of souls are awakened—justified—joined to our Church. Amidst these objects, holy activities and results, and the joys which they call forth, one object more than any other at this period stands out with an interesting prominence, fixes our attention, excites our solicitude, stirs our fears, and calls forth our intercessions to God; that object is the New Convert. Placed as we are in some sort to care for every thing which belongs to our Church, we cannot witness an increase of thousands in our numbers without caring for him. We think of his delinquencies as one just exposed to Christ and his people, but most of his dangers from the world, the flesh, and the devil. Even his joys will be a snare to him unless he be evangelically instructed; and his ignorance of the word, of himself, and of the adroitness and strength of his enemies, will be perilous to him without supernatural light and energy. We know the anxieties of our brethren—the Ministers of our Church—for those who have lately been brought in, and their sincere deprecation of a neglect of the means of spiritual security on the part of the converts. We profess ourselves one with our brethren in these anxieties, and now ask, *What is the safety of the New Convert?* Will every such character among us favour us with attention while we briefly answer the question? The answer is, The closer is his safety. There he is to go frequently, and while meditating in the Scriptures, and pleading in the name of Jesus, obtain fresh light and grace to ensure his faithfulness to God. The Closet is the Christian's oracle when perplexed; his resting-place when weary; his refuge when endangered. Absence from it is all evils in one. The authority for using the Closet is divine and imperative. "But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." Public prayer is to be offered; but long prayers, and vain repetitions, to be heard of men, are not. New Convert, "Enter into thy Closet."

Where is thy Closet? It is any place of retirement found most convenient. Scripture informs us that Isaac made the field his closet; Nathaniel the fig tree; and Peter the house-top. It is not every Christian that has a spare room to retire to; but the barn, the shop, the garden, the field, or the woods can be made the place of secret devotions. When it is utterly impossible, under pressing circumstances, to find seclusion in any of these, the heart can be the closet. Retirement must be had; and he who has fellowship with God can hold it when necessary in a crowd. In this country of scattered habitations and almost unbroken forest, many are the facilities for undisturbed, secluded worship. Improve them.

When art thou to enter thy Closet? And no answer is to be given which would seem to lessen the importance and necessity of constant mental, silent devotional acts; for "continuing instant in prayer" is an inspired injunction. We answer the question of time by saying, Often, steadily, and regularly. David says, "Evening and morning, and at noon, will I pray." Of Daniel it is said, "He kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed." Still more: David says, "Seven times a day do I praise thee." These are Scripture-examples deserving attention. It has been said, When a person has not his time at his own disposal, he cannot have stated times for prayer; and there is some correctness in the remark; but we deem it difficult to show that even a person employed by another cannot bow the knee in private three times a day. In the morning when the day's labour has not commenced, and in the evening when it is ended, it can be done, and little contrivance is needed to steal fifteen minutes from the dinner-hour to do it. Eminent pious men have spent hours morning and evening in devotion by encroaching on the time taken by others for sleep. Though it will be seen we state the number at three times a day, we add, it is to be, and can be, at least, this. Not long ago a pious woman told us, that for some time after her conversion she prayed "ten times a day;" and a man informed us, that so long as he prayed only three he found it almost impossible to retain his religion; since then he had prayed "five times, some days six or seven," and that now he was "strong in the Lord." If it be not an impossibility, fix your times, and observe them conscientiously, punctually, and perseveringly.

How art thou to enter thy Closet? With an humble, thoughtful, imploring, believing spirit. When time permits, some portion of the Bible is to be perused for devotional purposes, and the mind is to be employed on itself, on God, on redemption, and providence; but the chief end of retirement is intercourse with God. Peruse, ponder, and pray. To profit by these exercises care should be taken that the soul is prepared for them when the Closet is entered. The place and the purpose are sacred. It is the holy apartment next the Holy of Holies, and conducts to it. Secularity, self, and sin, should be left at the door. An object should be in view when it is entered. How many go into the closet because the time is come, and conscience must be kept quiet, while the professed purpose is forgotten! You go to worship. That is not all. You should go to be blessed, and not leave the place without a blessing. This makes the difference between warm and lukewarm Christians. Wrestle and believe for a present blessing.

Why art thou to enter thy Closet? God commands it. This might suffice; but thy condition requires it. A sceptical mind will insinuate, "Does not God already know thy state altogether?" He does; but he will be intrigued by the house of Israel. He knows us, but we do not know ourselves; and strange as the remark may appear, it is not until we begin to pray that we can know ourselves. We pray, in part, to become better acquainted with our own wants, and the more deeply to have them impressed on our hearts. Besides, we know little of God; without his prayerful influence are destitute of his forgiving and renewing grace; have not the ability to please Him; cannot reckon on His presence and protection. Omission of Closet-duties is self-will, pride, self-dependence, spiritual destitution, condemnation.

What are the benefits of entering thy Closet? "Thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." New Convert! Thy Father's eye is in thy Closet—fixed, propitious: his ear—open, bent; his smile—benignant, gracious; his hand—full, open, beneficent. Here is a four-fold reward in thy Closet; and there is a manifold reward, "openly," out of it. The wisdom obtained in it will enable thee to walk worthily in the world. Thy spirit there will be simple, affectionate, and attractive; and He will confer honour on thee, and on his cause for thy sake. The spiritual might obtained in private will give thee power over the world, the flesh, and the devil, and God will make thee triumphant. The love and faith obtained in thy Closet will make thee solicitous to benefit thy fellow-men, and He will grant thee success in their salvation. He will reward thee in these ways, and make thee known as a man of charity and good works. He assures thee of this in these words: "They that honour me I will honour." He "shall reward thee openly." Our race are to congregate on the last day, and the righteous to be separated from the wicked; and before worlds thy love and labours will be proclaimed, and the music of this plaudits break on thine ears. "Well done, good and faithful servant."

If then thou hast been at all neglectful of this duty, confess thy sin, and in future repair the injuries thou hast sustained. To be safe from sin, and wrath, and hell, seek thy Closet. Nothing can be found a sufficient substitute for secret prayer. Resort with the multitude to the sanctuary to hear the Gospel minister, and unite in public supplications; offer thy devotional sacrifices in thy family; read thy Bible much; occupy thy time in works of benevolence;—but if retirement, such as we have spoken of, is not esteemed a delightful privilege by thee, thou art not Christian, and thy works will be condemned at last. In our day of active piety men are much in danger from publicity. Thou knowest how much Closet-prayer thou offeredst when pardon was bestowed upon thee, and the witness of the Spirit was clearly enjoyed. Thou needest as much now, and ever will. Forsake thy Closet and thy God is forsaken. Thy profession then is pretence. Let not the Church thou hast espoused have to mourn in anguish over thy Christless Christianity—nor over thy nominal Methodism. Take the example of Christ, and follow it. He prayed whole nights. Take the example of Fletcher, and follow it. His biographer says of his Closet-wall, "that part of it against which he was accustomed to kneel, appeared deeply stained with the breath which he had spent in supplication."—Holy man! May thou, New Convert, and the writer, be like him!

HIS EXCELLENCY SIR CHARLES METCALFE, we are gratified to state, arrived at Kingston on Wednesday afternoon, having been conducted some distance by the Corporation of Kingston and several public Companies. The reception of His Excellency was every way worthy of the occasion and very honourable to Kingston, chastised as the rejoicings were by the painful fact of His Excellency Sir Charles Bagot's protracted and lamented affliction.

The *Chronicle* says,—"At 4 P.M., His Excellency went to Alvington House to visit Sir Charles Bagot. On the following day, Thursday the 30th inst., His Excellency met the Executive Council and the Judges at Alvington House, and in presence of the Naval and Military Authorities and Heads of Departments was sworn into office, after having the Royal Commission appointing him Governor-General, &c. &c., opened and read. It was, we have understood, the anxious wish of Sir Charles Bagot to be present at this ceremony, and to transfer to his successor the Great Seal with his own hands. The Executive Council were also sworn in. Much of the display usual upon such occasions, was dispensed with out of deference to Sir Charles Bagot, in his state of health, which would not admit of his presence at the installation of his successor. His Excellency was not permitted by his medical attendant to leave his bed. At a later hour, the whole of the Members of the Executive Council had an interview with Sir Charles Bagot, in compliance with his special desire, at which Sir Charles took an impressive and affectionate leave of his late advisers. The scene and the moment were calculated to affect all minds; and we have been assured that all present were deeply moved."

On Thursday the Corporation waited on Sir Charles Metcalfe with their Address; and at the same time the Sheriff of the Midland District presented another Address on behalf of the inhabitants of that District. Both Addresses, with the Replies, will be found in another column, and we are greatly mistaken if they are not satisfactory to every lover of Britain and Canada. His Excellency says in his reply to the address of the Corporation, "My earnest exertions will be devoted to the welfare of Canada and the happiness of every class of its inhabitants." In replying to the District Address, His Excellency says, "The welfare and happiness of every class of the people of Canada will be the constant objects of my devoted attention." With such intentions, so unequivocally expressed, we are sure Her Majesty's Representative will receive a cordial welcome from every class of the people of Canada.

THE SCOTCH CHURCH QUESTION.—We have from time to time, as our space would permit, made extracts and remarks to show our readers the progress of the great affairs of the Scotch Church—affairs of absorbing interest, not only in their present aspect, but future bearing and results. Having been informed that some of our best subscribers, among whom are a number of intelligent Scotchmen, wish for more plain information on the subject, we publish to-day, to the exclusion of other matter, the last official document of Her Majesty's Ministers relating to the question, and the Church of Scotland's opinion of it. The first article is headed, "Sir James Graham's Reply to the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland." The second article is headed, "Abstract of the Minutes of the General Assembly's Special Commission on Sir James Graham's Reply." Both are from the *London Watchman*, and the Abstract was prepared by the Editors of that paper. We intend next week to publish the Assembly's plan of future operations, in case a disruption takes place, and some other information relating to these painful differences.

The present difficulties and dangers of the Scotch Church appear to have originated in the presentation, on the part of patrons, of ministers which the Church could not accept, and in the interference of the Civil Courts compelling the Church to employ such non-accepted ministers. The Church states and vindicates her spiritual prerogatives in the matter of receiving a presentation, and denies the right of the Civil Court to force a presentation on the Church against her will. It comes to this; the Church Court and the Civil Court are at war. We have an opinion of the contest, but shall withhold it; for we give to give it, we should in the first place have to go back to the first three centuries of the Christian era to show our views of Christian simplicity, purity, and freedom, and certainly should not be able to dispose of the subject without denouncing with severity of language the evils of Popery and Puseyism, in their various forms—all attributable to too close an alliance between secular and spiritual concerns.

The *Watchman* uses the boldest (we do not say the best) language in speaking of Sir James Graham's Reply—it is a "Jesuitical" document—contains "ingenious subtleties"—its wisdom is "political craft"—its arguments "apocryphal fallacies"—its facts "misrepresentations"—its remonstrances and appeals "clap-netraps of deception!" This is the tone of the *Watchman* in a matter which does not immediately belong to Methodism. We hope the Providence of God will conduct the affairs of the Scotch Church to such a termination as will bring honour to Christ as the Head of the Universal Church, and greatly conduce to her spirituality, success, and glory.

On Monday, the 20th of this month, the Rev. Dr. McCaul, the Principal of Upper Canada College, took his leave of that institution, after the reading of the address of the day. His parting remarks, listened to with unbroken attention and stillness, were full of the feelings so natural to the occasion, and were delivered in touching and impressive manner. The happy intercourse of four years, the uniform obedience and cheerful respect evinced towards him and his office by the boys, and their satisfactory advancement in their studies, were successively dwelt upon by the learned and reverend speaker. He then exhorted his young friends to maintain, in future, the reputation already won for the College, and expressed the hope that he should live to behold many of those who had passed under his care exalted to the highest offices and positions in this colony at no distant date, and that above all they could always show forth in their conduct the fruits of that Religious and Scriptural instruction, which it had ever been his endeavour to instil into their minds, and which, having found incorporation with the system of education pursued at the College, he had sought to transmit unimpaired to his successor. These are but faint outlines of the sentiments expressed; their effect was best testified, not by loud cheers, but by the boys drawing themselves up in two lines from the College building to Dr. McCaul's house, and saluting him with a respectful silence as he passed through—*Church, March 31.*

Dr. McCaul has resigned his office in U.C. College to enter on his important duties as Vice-President of the University of King's College, on the 24th inst. On the morning following the day of his resignation, the *Church* says, the Rev. Chas. Matthews, A.M., took charge of the College until a new Principal is appointed. On Wednesday, the 22nd of March, the Masters of the College presented an Address to Dr. McCaul; his reply to which is marked by great beauty and feeling, and in which he allows the request of the Masters to have his Portrait placed in the College Hall. The number of pupils during the four years of his Principality has increased from 142 to 194. It is understood "that the College Boys intend to present suitable tokens of their respect and gratitude to Dr. McCaul on his retirement." These are honours due to the retiring Principal; and, from all we know of his attainments and catholicity of spirit, we doubt not they are honours which will be multiplied during the discharge of his higher duties at King's College.

"BEAUTIES OF PUSEYISM."—We have met with a column of scraps in the *London Watchman* having this heading, and certainly they are novelties, if not "beauties." It appears from a few prefatory editorial observations that the Rev. Mr. Paget, Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford, is writing Novels full of Puseyism, and thus giving to that term an insinuating circulation. The title of his last production is *The Warden of Berksgholt*, from the pages of which the following specimen of ridicule, in the form of a highly displayed advertisement, is taken. The object of it is to bring into disrepute Bible and Missionary Meetings—precisely the object aimed at in certain attempts of a certain Canadian Editor, which we have not failed to blame as they have been made. Puseyites and Puseyites are agreed not to allow true Protestants to distribute the Word of God and save their fellow-creatures. Their agreement is fully—

"UNPARALLELED ATTRACTION. SPLENDID COMBINATION OF TALENT."—The Religious Public are respectfully informed that a Meeting of the Berksgholt Ladies' Association of the *Clackington Auxiliary Bible Society* will be held in Berksgholt Church, on Monday Evening, August 24th, when the Rev. Rory O'Flannigan, of Liverpool, will appear on the Platform to advocate the claims of the Institution, accompanied by the Reverend Lothario Swinham of Cheltenham, Joseph Miller of Manchester, Willis Maddison of St. Luke's, Berksgholt Green, and Skimie Gadd, Travelling Secretary of the Parent Society. It is likewise hoped that Count Wierter von Spitzbube, from Prussia, (now in the neighbourhood), and several eminent Ministers of various denominations will attend the Meeting. The Rev. Jeremy Swamp, Perpetual Curate of Berksgholt, will take the chair at 7 o'clock precisely, and deliver a Prayer appropriate for the occasion. In the course of the proceedings Hymns will be sung by the Members of the Clackington Melodist Club, who have most liberally offered their gratuitous services on this occasion. The Church is warm, and will be well lighted. Refreshments for the Ladies, Church Lane.—(*Scudlerize, Printer and Publisher, Berksgholt Press.*)

The *Watchman* remarks on this,—"It is to be remembered that respected Clergymen are individually and personally pointed at in this scandalous production. For instance, it is well known that by the Revs. Rory O'Flannigan, Lothario Swinham, and Joseph Miller, it is intended to caricature the Revs. Hugh McNeille, (of Liverpool), Francis Close, (of Cheltenham), and Hugh Stowell, (of Manchester). A writer in the last Record directs particular attention to the insult intended to Chevalier Dunsen, whose name is not acquainted with the German language may not perceive. The name which Mr. Paget has adopted for him is compounded of two German words, *spitz*, a wolf dog, and *bube*, a knave,—the whole signifying a *rogue*. Well may the Editor of the *Record* observe, 'We humbly submit to the Bishop of Oxford, whether, by continuing this person, Mr. Paget, as his chaplain, he chooses to compromise this gross insult offered to the King of Prussia, in the person of his representative.'"

MILLERISM.—A series of irrefutable articles on Millerism, by the Rev. Dr. Weeks, is now being published in the *N. Y. Observer*, and as this is making some stir in a few places in Canada, we to-day insert on our first page a good part of one of the articles, which may be useful to some persons. We can hardly say how many postponements of the End Mr. Miller has already announced to the world; nor do we think all his followers are insincere in their dissemination of his notions; but whatever Millerism may be, Millerism is most certainly about to add to the number of doubters, scoffers, and infidels. The following information from the *Northern Advocate* makes it pretty plain that the system of improbable prognostication is some centuries old:

"In the year 1212 it was prophesied by an ingenious seer that the Mediterranean Sea would be dried up, and that believers could go to Jerusalem on foot. Italy, it is said, became crowded with German pilgrims, but the sea obstinately refused to depart.—In 1524 a great terror pervaded all Europe, from the prediction of John Stofferorus, a mathematician and astrologer of Subbia, that a great deluge was approaching. Many of reputation as wise men coincided and suggesting means of escape from the impending danger. In France the terror was so great that many were near madness, and some built up arches to save themselves. President Auriol, of Thoulouse, built up four high pillars, with a boat at the top; which, however, was not needed, as no deluge came. This prophet, however, nothing daunted, though the stars were against him, continued to prophesy, and predicted the end of the world in 1586, which we may conclude did not take place.—A Lutheran divine, by the name of Michael Stilleus, in an arithmetical sermon, predicted the end of the world in 1533. He was preaching on the very day appointed, and his hearers were in great thunder and lightning, which, with their fears, created an irresistible trouble. But soon the storm ceased, the winds were hushed, and the sky became serene. The people, made furious by the deceit practised on them, dragged the prophet from his desk, and beat him so severely as nearly to have realized his prophecy, so far as himself was concerned.—Lord Napier, the inventor of logarithms, was among those who prophesied the end of the world at a certain time; but he, like many other enthusiasts, outlived his prediction.—In the year 1716 two men appeared in Cologne who said that they came from Damascus. The results of that town went to them, and talked with them in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Chaldean. They said they were come, by order of Heaven, to turn men to repentance out of the impiety which they practised. The Constantine old! Among the rest of their prophecies, they predicted that Constantinople would be destroyed in 1786; the true God acknowledged by all nations; 1767; a valiant man give his testimony to it, 1768; England to be overthrown; 1769; an earthquake all over the world, 1770; the fall of the sun, moon, and stars, 1771; the globe of the earth burnt, 1772; the universal judgment, 1773.—All these fanatics had their favorites for a season; and so long as superstitious ignorance, and the love of novelty reigns in the breasts of men, false prophecies will arise and many follow them. And we are taught the constant necessity of disseminating true knowledge, and advancing that light which shall scatter the darkness of superstition and spiritual ignorance from the human mind, God speed the conquest of truth!"

It affords us much pleasure to learn that the health of His Excellency Sir Charles Bagot is rather more favourable than it was last week. It is said that arrangements are in progress for the departure of His Excellency to England at the opening of the navigation.

We are happy to be able to say that our esteemed colleague at the Conference Office, the Book Steward, has returned from Hamilton somewhat improved in health, by the blessing of Providence on the skillful and unwearied attentions of Dr. Kellogg of that town.

VICTORIA COLLEGE.

THE FIRST ANNUAL PUBLIC EXAMINATION OF THE STUDENTS IN *Victoria College* will commence on Monday, April 17th, and close on Thursday the 18th, when a PUBLIC EXHIBITION will take place.

The number of Trustees required by the Charter request a Meeting of the BOARD, in the College, on Thursday, April 20th. All the Trustees and Visitors are respectfully requested to attend.

ROBERTSON, Principal.

CONDENSED MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

The *London Record* says, that, at a recent meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Mr. Campbell, the Secretary, distinctly stated "that the fact of holding the views advocated in the *Tracts for the Times* neither is, nor ever has been, a ground of objection to Clergymen offering themselves to be employed by the Society."

Sir Peter Laurie is said to have given up his pew in Dr. Penfold's church on account of Puseyite practices in the services, and to have offered £1,000 towards erecting a church where those practices shall not be allowed.

Mr. Newman has again become Editor of the *British Critic*.—Mr. Mosely having resigned, being offended with the Bishop of London's Charge.

Mr. Moffat, the African Missionary, lately addressed a congregation of more than 3,000 Sabbath-School children in a church in Edinburgh.

The Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem, who is building a "church there," has been informed by Izet, the Pacha of Jerusalem, that he has no authority for building it, and has caused the works to be suspended.

The Wesleyan Centenary Committee in England, in February, presented £1,000 to the British and Foreign Bible Society, as a token of regard and esteem, and in consideration of the liberality of the Society to the Wesleyan Missionary Society in making grants of the Holy Scriptures on many occasions. Lord Bexley acknowledges the donation in a very valuable manner.

It seems from the *Watchman* that the Mayor of Kingston and Dr. Alder had an interview in London with Sir Charles Metcalfe on the subject of Wesleyan Missions in Western Canada; but it is not said whether justice is to be done to the Canada Conference by the Missionary Committee.

At the Baltimore Conference of the M. E. Church, just held, a standing rule was read disapproving of the Ministers uniting with the Order of Odd Fellows.

The venerable Bishop Roberts, of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, is dangerously ill.

Subscriptions are now being made in the States for the inhabitants of the Island of Antigua suffering by the late earthquake there.

A member of the American Congress, Mr. Young, is about to publish a work in which he attempts to detect many errors in the philosophy of Sir Isaac Newton.

The *Greenfield Gazette* of 20th ult. says:—"We learn that some of Miller's disciples in Amherst, on Wednesday last, clothed themselves in their ascension robes, and waited patiently till night, fully believing that this world was to be burned up on that day. Not finding their anticipations realized, they concluded to wait a while longer for the end of all things earthly."

Temperance is still advancing in Washington, U.S. During the last 16 months 1400 names have been added to the total abstinence pledge. A committee has been appointed to procure subscriptions for the erection of a Temperance Hall in that City.

The removal of Pews in Churches in England,—a measure which has been strongly advocated of late by the *Times*, and other organs of the Puseyites, and sanctioned by the Bishop of Norwich, and other dignitaries of the Anglican Church,—is being carried into effect in some parts of the country.

Lord Seaton (formerly Sir John Colborne) has been appointed Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands.

A canal is about to be cut through the Isthmus of Panama, to cost, it is estimated, £500,000.

A meeting was lately to be held at London, C. W., to devise a remedy for relieving the destitute there; the winter having made many sufferers.

Congress has appropriated the sum of thirty thousand dollars to be applied to the construction of a line of Electro-Magnetic Telegraphs under the superintendence of Professor Morse, of such length and between such points as shall fully test its practicability.

At a meeting of the Regents of the University of the State of New York, on the 28th day of February, 1843, the distribution of \$40,000 of the income of the Literature Fund for the last year was made among the several academies entitled to participate therein.

A meeting of gentlemen engaged in scientific pursuits was held on Wednesday at Dr. Hodgkin's, in Lower Brook-street, London, for the purpose of forming a society for investigating "the natural history of civilized, as well as uncivilized men, in a scientific point of view."

Sentence of death was on the 8th ult., at the Court of Queen's Bench, in Montreal, passed on Hugh Cameron, for killing his wife.—He is to die the 6th instant.

The population of Montreal, according to the last census, is 40,047, nearly 17,000 of whom are of French origin.

The Exports of Flour from Canada by sea in 1842, were 311,000 barrels.

The Hon. W. H. Draper, M. P. P., has accepted a seat in the Legislative Council, which the *Church* says has been offered to him as a mark of Her Majesty's favour, and that he owes it exclusively to Sir Charles Bagot's favourable recommendation.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"Common Sense" and "Observer" shall appear.—We acknowledge, with "A Leader," the importance of the subject on which he writes; but it being, as he says, "very delicate," we fear to overstep the limits of prudence by publishing his article.

THE EXAMINATION OF MRS. HURLBURT'S ACADEMY, at Cobourg, will be held on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 13th and 14th instant.

J. HURLBURT.

Cobourg, April 1st, 1843.

Religious Intelligence.

From the London Watchman of January 18th.

SIR JAMES GRAHAM'S REPLY TO THE MODERATOR OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

Whitkell, January 4, 1843.

REF. SIR.—At the close of the last General Assembly, I had the honour of receiving from the Lord High Commissioner two addresses, which His Grace undertook to transmit to me; that they might be laid before Her Majesty; and I have lately received a memorial of the Commission of the General Assembly, addressed to Sir Robert Peel and to the other members of Her Majesty's Government.

The first address is described in the memorial of the Commission of the Assembly as "An address bringing under the notice of Her Majesty the claim, declaration, and protest, against the encroachments of the Court of Session on the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church."

The second is set forth as "An Address praying that Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to direct measures to be taken towards effecting the abolition of church patronage in Scotland." When I received these two Addresses from the General Assembly to Her Majesty, I informed the High Commissioner that if the presentation of these documents to the Queen could be held to imply an adoption of their contents, I did not hesitate to declare that a sense of duty would restrain me from laying them before Her Majesty; but, as they purported to be a statement of grievances from the supreme ecclesiastical authority in Scotland, I was unwilling to intercept their transmission to the throne. I should, therefore, lay both addresses before the Queen; but I formally declared to the Lord High Commissioner that I was not to be regarded as an admission, whether either of the claim of right or of the grievances set forth in these two documents.

Having made this declaration, I presented the addresses to the Queen. I received no commands from Her Majesty,—but Her Majesty's servants, although it did not appear to them to be their duty to tender at that time any advice to Her Majesty, carefully and anxiously deliberated on the contents of these addresses, the importance of which was neither undervalued nor disregarded.

You state in the memorial of the Commission of the Assembly, that "if the same result is not forthwith the inevitable result, must be a disruption of the present established church of Scotland;" and "that the prospect of such a result demanded the immediate and serious consideration of the claims submitted by the church."

Moreover, you intimate an opinion that the silence of Her Majesty's Government is inconsistent with the respect due to the authority of the General Assembly.

If Her Majesty's servants could have entertained the propositions for which you contend, and could thereby have averted the calamity which you forebode, a day would not have passed before they would have seized the opportunity of giving contentment to the church, and of progressing a scheme from which unhappy consequences may be apprehended.

But when we consider the nature and extent of your demands, we find them to be no less than the reversal of the solemn judgments of the supreme courts of law,—the repeal of the statute under which for a period of 130 years patronage has been administered in Scotland, and the concession of privileges, not such as are ascertained and defined by constitutional law or the recorded decisions of competent tribunals, but privileges such as "the church considers to belong to her."

We did not misapprehend the scope and object of the claim and declaration of right when we formed this estimate of your demands; for in the memorial annexed to the address you state, "that you are entitled to know whether the Government of the country are to rest upon the views of the constitution of the church now acted upon by the courts of law; or are willing to adopt measures for securing her in the possession of those privileges which she considers to belong to her under that constitution;" and again your prayer is, "that we should advise Her Majesty to direct such steps to be taken as may be necessary for the protection of the Church of Scotland in its constitutional rights and liberties, and for the redress of her grievances, as justly complained of, and the removal of the great cause out of which the chief part of her grievances have arisen."

We must even allow the redress which were transmitted at the same time, and the contents of the claim and declaration, and of the address against patronage, are studiously combined in the memorial. We could not advise Her Majesty to acquiesce in these demands. We thought them unreasonable and trusted that they would be reconsidered. In such circumstances, silence on our part appeared to us to be equally consistent with sound discretion and with respect for the Church of Scotland.

But you now claim an answer to an application for redress of grievances, as the common right of Her Majesty's subjects; and especially on account of the character and constitutional standing of the body which you represent, and also on account of the demands which you make, resting, you assert, on the final authority of the realm, and on the faith of a national compact. The refusal of an answer after such a demand might be considered disrespectful, and inconsistent with the relations which Her Majesty is most anxious to maintain with the Church of Scotland, whose discipline, rights, and privileges, as established by law, the Queen is bound to preserve inviolate.

The allegation is not distinct, that "the constitution of the country has been broken," and that vested rights and privileges, secured by statute and solemn national treaty, have been violated.

The question at once arises when, and by whom? I look for the date in the protest and declaration of right, and I find no cause of complaint, even after the year 1834,—the year in which the statute passed in the 10th of Anne, which restored to patronage the right of presentation which has regulated the exercise of this right for more than a century; and which, until 1834, commanded for many years the tacit assent of the General Assembly itself.

But some "encroachment" has been committed in violation of a national settlement.

Did Parliament interfere? Did the civil courts make some aggression on the spiritual jurisdiction of the church?—Quite otherwise.

In the year 1834 the General Assembly passed an act, which gave to the heads of families in each parish, being commoners, a veto on the presentation of the patron, and the House of Lords, by their judgment in the first Annetter case, pronounced this act of Assembly to be illegal and practically incompatible with the civil right of patronage, as fixed and determined by act of Parliament. It would seem, therefore, that this attack on vested rights, secured by statute, is of modern date, and that the civil authorities were not the aggressors.

It is clear from the claim, declaration, and protest, that the pretensions of the church proceed on the assumption that the courts of law in deciding upon the act of Assembly of 1834 exceeded their jurisdiction; that they have no power to determine whether matters brought before them involved the scope of civil jurisdiction, or the rights of the church; that the matters involve spiritual considerations; that neither sentences of courts, nor decrees of the House of Lords, nor even acts of Parliament, shall be effectual, if they interfere with the rights and privileges of the church, of which interference and of which spiritual considerations the church itself is to be the exclusive judge.

The charge of encroachment preferred by ecclesiastical bodies against civil tribunals is not new in the history of this country. When spiritual and civil powers co-exist, but are vested in separate authorities, the imperfection of all human institutions renders it difficult to ascertain or to define the precise limits of the two jurisdictions.

The history of other times and of other churches presents to us numerous instances in which those intrusted with spiritual power have sought to extend their privileges, and have advanced claims totally incompatible with civil government. They have been disposed in times past to take it for granted, as a point incontestable, that their cause is the cause of God; that in resisting the civil authorities they are suffering for conscience sake; and not only that in all causes spiritual they are the sole judges, but that they alone are competent to determine what is spiritual and what is civil.

Pretensions such as these have heretofore been successfully resisted by the sovereigns and people of this realm; nor could they be conceded without the surrender of civil liberty, and without the sacrifice of personal rights. It is difficult to see in the course of the same community the harmonious operation of independent civil and spiritual jurisdictions. Disputed cases will arise on the confines of their respective powers; and collision can only be avoided by moderation on both sides, and by mutual forbearance.

Whether a particular matter in dispute is so entirely spiritual as to fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the church courts, or whether it involves so much of civil right as to bring it to a certain extent, within the jurisdiction of the civil courts, may often be a difficult question; but it is a question of law, and questions of law are decided in the courts of law, and questions of jurisdiction are also decided there,—subjected to an appeal to the House of Lords, which includes within itself the highest judicial authorities, and which is able to command the opinions of those who are trusted with the power of deciding on the civil rights, the liberties, and the lives of their fellow-subjects.

Disputed questions of jurisdiction must be determined, and Her Majesty's Government cannot advise any departure from fundamental principles—any devolution to the General Assembly of an independent irresponsible authority competent to decide without appeal what are the boundaries of civil and spiritual jurisdiction; and, therefore, what are the limits of its own power.

But it is contended that the independence of the Church of Scotland has been secured by various statutes; and, consequently, that its proceedings, whether legislative or judicial, are beyond the cognizance of the courts of law. It is in vain to insist, expressly affirmed that the General Assembly, by its resolutions, can give to a matter purely civil an ecclesiastical character; but it is asserted that a fundamental law of the church may be established by the resolutions of the Assembly; and that this being done, the Assembly thence acquires a power to make any and every law necessary for carrying into effect the principle which they may thus have established.

I will not pursue this point further—the danger is obvious. This train of reasoning leads directly to despotic power. But the Veto Act was passed on this illegal assumption, and the attempt on the part of the church to sustain this encroachment on civil rights by subsequent resolutions is the main cause of the present difficulties in which the church is involved.

The Veto Act was upheld after its illegality had been ascertained by deliberate judgments of the Court of Session and of the House of Lords; nay, more, it is not yet abandoned—it is upheld, in defiance of law and of the supreme civil authority.

