

“Where is your lord, Joachim?”  
 “At the hotel of the Marquis de St. C—, madam; and he desired that your excellency should not await him, as he might not return till a late hour.”

“He shall be obeyed. I will wait for him no longer. Midnight is long passed, and I am wearied of these tedious watchings. Good night, good Alba; I shall require no attendance. Quiet is all I want. Nay, humor me, my kind nurse, in this; my brain will not bear more words.”

“Will you then promise me to go to rest at once, dear lady?”

“Yes, with all speed; and ere you sleep, Alba, say one orison for me; and ask that the repose which I am now about to seek may be sweet, and calm, and dreamless. Nay—nay, not my hand; kiss my cheek, old friend, as you used to do in my happy childhood, before I fell—Good night!”

[To be concluded.]

## Communications.

### APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,  
 Sir,

Before proceeding to consider the argument from Primitive Antiquity in favour of the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, there are several things to which it is necessary that I should invite the attention of your readers. The first is, that High Churchmen in making their Bishops succeed to the Apostles, make them, at the same time, to succeed to Christ Jesus himself. The Bishop of Michigan, to whom I have already referred, explicitly declares—that Christ “imparted” unto the Apostles “the power he had received from his Father,” and that they again imparted “the very same power they had received from Christ” unto others, and that “it cannot for one moment be supposed that the Saviour would transfer so great an office as he himself had received from His Father to feeble and short-sighted men, without giving them instructions as to the manner in which its duties were to be performed, and more especially whether it could be conferred upon others.” In confirmation of the above doctrine, we find him quoting the language of Ignatius, one of the Primitive Fathers, where he says “I exhort you that you study to do all things in a Divine concord; your Bishop presiding in the place of God.” And again: “submitting to him, (the Bishop) or rather not to him, but to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Bishop of us all.” And again: “That which he (the Bishop) approves, is well pleasing to God.” And again: “it is well to know God and the Bishop. He that knows the Bishop is honoured of God.” Now, if Christ, before he left the world, imparted unto the Apostles the power he had received from his Father, and they imparted unto Bishops the very same power. Bishops are to be regarded, not merely as the Ministers of Christ, but rather as his Successors; and in consequence, as entitled to act with the very same authority wherewith he acted during the time of his sojourn upon earth. Your readers will observe that as this authority is supposed to be transferred by personal succession, it cannot be affected by the character of those to whom it is communicated: and therefore, on High Church principles, it will follow that even the most wicked and worthless of mankind might be found holding the same office once held by Christ Jesus, and exercising the same authority which he exercised previously to his ascension into heaven.

It is in perfect consistency with these principles that High Churchmen pronounce all who disavow these sentiments as without the pale of covenanted mercy.—For, if their Bishops hold the office once held by Christ, faith in the Bishops, and union unto him being identical with faith in Christ, and union unto Christ, must be essential to salvation. But farther; if High Churchmen are right in maintaining that Christ hath transferred unto Bishops the very same official authority which he received from his Father, it will follow, that being now destitute of the official authority thus transferred, he is not entitled to exercise it even in calling, and appointing any individual to the ministry, that being now the prerogative of Bishops. Agreeably to these sentiments, therefore, none but those whom the Bishop sends can be acknowledged as ministers of salvation.

Another thing to which it is proper that I should invite attention, is the fact,—that wherever the ancient Fathers use the word Bishops, High Churchmen take it for granted that they employ the term in the same sense in which they are accustomed to employ it, meaning thereby a Diocesan, exercising supreme authority and control over all the ministers of the Diocese in which he is appointed to preside. It is freely acknowledged by all parties, that throughout the whole of the New Testament, the words Bishop and Presbyter [or Elder] are used indiscriminately, being only different names for one and the same office. It is, however, affirmed upon the authority of Theodoret, a Bishop of the fifth century, that after the Apostolic age, the name Bishop was employed to designate those who previously had been called, [and were indeed] Apostles;—notwithstanding the unquestionable testimony of earlier Fathers to the contrary; and even notwithstanding the testimony of Theodoret himself. The words of Theodoret, usually quoted by High Churchmen, are “The same persons were anciently called interchangeably both Bishops and Presbyters, whilst those who are now called Bishops, were [then] called Apostles. But in process of time the name of Apostles was left to such only as were Apostles truly, and then the name Bishop was given to

those who before were called Apostles.” Now, whatever be the meaning of the above words, two things are plainly asserted: 1st, that the name Bishop was given to those that were called Apostles; and 2nd, that those that were called Apostles [and to whom the name Bishop was given] were not Apostles truly. Thus, in the very passage so confidently quoted, we are told, that those in the first instance called Apostles, and afterwards styled Bishops, were Apostles only in name,—were not Apostles at all. Another very natural error into which High Churchmen fall, is the belief, that whenever the Ancients speak of Diocesan Bishops, they speak of them as such by Divine Right; and, should we dispute this position, they call upon us to account for their existence, on any other ground than that of their being appointed by Divine Authority. In answer to their challenge, we refer to the writings of Jerome, a very celebrated and learned divine, who flourished during the fourth century, and of whom Bishop Hurd says that he was “the ablest of the Fathers, and the most esteemed;—while even Bingham acknowledges—” St. Jerome will be allowed to speak the sense of the Ancients.” Now, Jerome in his commentary upon Titus 1, 5, plainly asserts “a Presbyter is the same as a Bishop. And before there were, by the instigation of the Devil, parties in religion, and it was said among the people, I am of Paul, I of Apollon, and I of Cephas, Churches were governed by the Common Council of the Presbyters. But afterwards, when every one began to account those whom he baptised, his own, and not Christ’s, it was decreed, throughout the whole world, that one chosen from among the Presbyters, should be set over the rest, to whom should belong the whole care of the Church, that the seeds of schism might be taken away.” After establishing the position, that Bishops and Presbyters are identical, by a variety of Scripture testimony, he proceeds—“We have declared these things, to shew that among the ancients Presbyters and Bishops were the same. But that, by little and little, the roots of dissensions might be plucked up, the whole care was devolved upon one. As the Presbyters know, therefore, that as they are subjected by the custom of the Church, to him who is set over them; so, let the Bishops know that they are greater than Presbyters, more by custom, than by any appointment of the Lord; and that they should govern the Church in common, &c.”

The grounds on which High Churchmen pretend to pay such deference to the Primitive Fathers are—that, as they saw and conversed with the Apostles, and were completely instructed by them in all things pertaining to the constitution and government of the Church; so, their writings may be regarded as having all the weight of Apostolic, if not of Divine, authority. What the Apostles spoke by the spirit of immediate inspiration, is surely to be counted of higher authority than what they are merely supposed to have spoken to the Fathers. Besides, the private sentiments of the Apostles, as well as the writings of the ancients, are to be tried by the law and by the testimony; and, in so far only as they accord therewith, either rejected or received. And therefore, while we proceed to enquire into the opinions of the Fathers on the subject under discussion, it is rather to ascertain whether, [as High Churchmen aver] the Fathers are universally in their favour, than to learn from them what is explicitly revealed in the Oracles of Truth. The earliest and most excellent of the Christian Fathers is known by the name of Clement of Rome; and the only work of his extant, is an epistle to the Corinthians, supposed to have been written towards the latter part of the first century. Clement is believed to have been Bishop of Rome, and is placed by High Churchmen as a link in that chain through which they trace their succession up to St. Peter or St. Paul. In placing him there, however, they very wisely conceal from the public the difference of opinion amongst learned men, as to the place which he occupied, and the person to whom he succeeded. Even Archbishop Wake, no mean authority, when speaking of the disagreement, on this subject, betwixt the celebrated Bishop Pearson, and the very learned Henry Dodwell, both most strenuous advocates of Episcopacy, says—“if any could have settled this matter beyond dispute, it had without question been done by those of our own nation, who, as they have the latest searched with all possible diligence into it, so, never were there any better qualified for the determination of it. But, as their mutual disagreement, after all their endeavours to fix this point, shews that one of them must have been mistaken, so, I doubt not, but it will sufficiently satisfy all such as shall consider the high character they have so justly obtained, both by their learning and judgment in this kind of disquisitions, that they are points not to be determined, and that he who shall do the best upon them, may only be said to have made a good guess in a subject too hard for any at this distance to decide.” Now, although Clement was the companion of St. Paul, and therefore had an opportunity of being acquainted with his views on the subject of Church Government; High Churchmen, although they admit him as a link in the chain of their boasted personal Succession, do not always appeal to him as being in favour of their claims;—a pretty sure evidence that he is not on their side. The epistle in question was written to confirm the faith of the Corinthians in the doctrine of a future resurrection; but principally to allay a sedition that had broke out amongst the people against the Presbyters or Elders of that Church. With a view to effect this important object, he thus reminds them of what they once were, “for ye did all things without respect of persons, and walked according to the laws of God; being subject to those who had the rule over you, and giving the honour that was fitting to such as were Presbyters among you.” In the 47th Sec. he declares “it is a shame, my beloved, yea, a

very great shame, and unworthy of your Christian profession, to hear that the most firm and ancient Church of the Corinthians should, by one or two persons, be led into a sedition against its Presbyters; and in the 54, and 57 Sections, he exhorts them “only let the flock of Christ be in peace with the Elders [Presbyters], that are yet over it;” and, “do ye, therefore, who laid the first foundation of this sedition, submit yourselves unto your Presbyters;” and thereby very clearly shews that in the Church of Corinth Presbyters were set over the flock. In order the more effectually to induce the Corinthians to submit themselves to their Presbyters, he endeavours to convince them that they had been regularly called to their office, and were invested with Episcopal authority. “The Apostles of our Lord,” says he “preaching through countries and cities, appointed the first fruits of their conversions to be Bishops and Deacons over such as should afterwards believe, having first proved them by the Spirit. Nor was this any new thing, seeing that long before it was written concerning Bishops and Deacons.” “For thus saith the Scripture in a certain place I will appoint their Bishops in righteousness, and their Deacons in faith.” In the 44 Section, Clement testified to the Corinthians that their contentions were foreseen and provided against “Our Apostles knew by our Lord that contentions should arise on account of Episcopacy, and therefore, having a perfect fore-knowledge of this, they appointed the aforesaid persons, [Bishops and Deacons] and then gave directions that when they should die, other chosen and approved men should succeed to their ministry. Wherefore, we cannot think that those may be justly thrown out of their ministry who were either appointed by them, or afterwards chosen by other eminent men, with the consent of the whole Church; and who with all lowliness and innocency ministered to the flock of Christ, in peace, and without self-interest, and were for a long time commended by all. Blessed are those Presbyters who, having finished their Episcopacy before these times [of sedition] have obtained a fruitful and perfect dissolution; for they have no fear lest any one should turn them out of the place which is now appointed for them.” No language could more clearly testify that in the Church of Corinth there were only two orders of ministers—namely, Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons. Bishops and Deacons, then, were the only ministers set over the Corinthian Church. Corinth too was one city, and there were several “Bishops” there. These Bishops therefore could not be Diocesans;—for, according to High Churchmen, there cannot be more than one Bishop, in one city, or Diocese, at the same time. Bishop Stillfleet when speaking of this subject, remarks—“Had Episcopacy been instituted on the occasion of the schism at Corinth, certainly of all places we should the soonest have heard of a Bishop at Corinth, for the remedying of it; and yet almost of all places those heralds that derive succession of Bishops from the Apostles’ times are the most plunged whom to fix on at Corinth. And they that can find any one single Bishop at Corinth at the time when Clement wrote his Epistle to them, must have better eyes and judgment than the deservedly admired Grotius, Milner, the well known ecclesiastical historian, and a Vicar in the Church of England, speaks to the same purpose when he says—“At first indeed, and for some time, Church Governments were only of two ranks, Presbyters and Deacons. At least, this appears to have been the case in particular instances, and at Philippi, and at Ephesus, and the term Bishop was confounded with that of Presbyter. The Church of Corinth continued long in this state, as far as one may judge from Clement’s epistle.” And more explicit still is Faber, a justly admired writer on Prophecy, and a Clergyman of the English Church, who thus comments on Clement’s testimony: “Here we may observe, no more than two orders are specified; the word Bishops being plainly used as equipollent to the word Presbyters; and all possibility of misapprehension is avoided by the circumstance of Clement’s affirmation, that the appointment of these two orders was foretold in a prophecy, which announced the appointment of exactly two descriptions of Spiritual officers.”

Had the Church in Clement’s time universally acknowledged, and believed that three distinct orders of clergy had been appointed, that Father never could have asserted such a form of polity to be foretold in a prophecy which announced the appointment of no more than two sorts of officers, described as being overseers and ministers.” So much for the testimony of the earliest of the Christian Fathers in favour of the claims of High Churchmen.

Before concluding, allow me to observe, that it is not a little remarkable that High Churchmen should ever have consented to promote Clement a decided Presbyterian to the See of Rome, or to derive from him their Spiritual descent. It is no less remarkable that Clement, after writing the Epistle referred to, should have aspired to such signal honour as that of being their Spiritual progenitor.

I am, &c.

JAMES HANNAY.

Richibucto, April 7, 1843.

### LINES ON HEARING A CHILD LAUGH IN ITS SLEEP.

Dear little dreamer! what avail’th  
 All the ills of life to thee?  
 Altho’ thy little besom heaveth,  
 ’Tis not with grief or misery.

Unconscious of the dark—dark night,  
 Like some angel-spirit—free—  
 Thou hast soar’d where all is bright,  
 Where’s no grief or misery.

But, dear child, the hours are flying—  
 Tho’ unheeded now by thee;

And, again, thou wilt be crying—  
 Childish grief and misery.

And, dear child, the hours are flying,  
 (May they be well-spent by thee),  
 That will bring the hour of dying,  
 The hour of joy or misery.

Newcastle, April 3, 1843.

## Editor’s Department.

MIRAMICHI:  
 SATURDAY EVENING, APRIL 15, 1843.

*Proceedings of the Legislature.*—  
 The Journals of the Assembly, in our possession are to the 6th of the month. The committee of supply, so says the St. John Courier, closed its labours on the 4th inst., after having passed grants for upwards of £70,000, with a very uncertain prospect of the revenue reaching within 10 or £15,000 of that amount. A number of Bye Road grants passed by the House have been rejected by the Council, as well as £100 to Mr Ward, and £75 to Mr Sancton, for Reporting the Debates.

The Bankruptcy Law has undergone a revision. It allows a man owing £200 to become a Bankrupt, and permits the granting of a certificate by the Commissioner, instead of four fifths of the creditors, as by the late Law. The Clerk of the Pleas of the Supreme Court, it appears is to be placed on a salary of 900*l.* a year. He was formerly paid by fees.

The inhabitants of St. John are highly indignant at the Revenue Bill, which, abounds in absurdities, and its provisions are calculated to bear very heavily on our infant manufactures. There is some talk of petitioning His Excellency to call an extra Session, to revise this ill-conceived law. We will refer to the subject in a future number.

*Prorogation of the Legislature.*—  
 The business of our Legislature was brought to an end on Tuesday last. The following is the Speech of His Excellency on closing the session.

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Legislative Council;  
 Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly;

The business of the Session having been brought to a termination, I am enabled to release you from your further attendance.

Although several important matters which have engaged your attention have necessarily been postponed, some measures of considerable interest to the Province, have, by your joint exertions, been accomplished.

At the opening of the Session I recommended to your special attention the state of the Public Credit, and it will afford me much satisfaction if the measures which you have taken to facilitate its revival, should prove effectual to that end.

The alterations you have made in the Law relating to Insolvency, will facilitate the re-administration of them, and operate favourably upon commercial credit.

You have been judiciously guided by the principles of the English Statutes in amending the Criminal Law, and also in the amendments made in the Election Laws, which will have a material effect in protecting the rights of freeholders, and in promoting the public peace at Elections.

The revival, for a short period, of the Act for supporting Parish Schools, will afford time for devising a comprehensive plan for improving these important institutions,—in the efficiency of which the interests of the rising generation are so deeply concerned.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly;

I thank you for the Supplies you have granted for the public service, and for the means you have provided in aid of the ordinary Revenue to meet the liabilities of the Province,—in the due application of which, I feel every assurance that the Government will be entitled to confidence.

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Legislative Council,  
 Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly,

The situation of the Province, after the severe trial to which it has been exposed during the last two years, and which I regret to think are not yet surmounted, will continue to require the fostering care and attention of the Government. Looking to the calamities which have fallen on other countries, we have abundant cause for thankfulness; and I rely on receiving that support from you, in your relations, which will enable me to give effect to