

nace crossed the frigate's bows to get to her station, and was fired over, and hitched the rudder on a rope leading from the frigate to the buoy of her anchor. The boat swung towards the frigate, when Capt. Hamilton gave the word to lay in the oars and board: the boat was under the starboard cathead and forechains laying head and stern to the frigate. Capt. Hamilton would have been the first on board, but his foot slipped on some mud on the fluke of an anchor; he held on by the foremost lanyard of the foreshrouds and recovered his footing, though with difficulty, and his pistol went off in the struggle. The crew of the *Hermoine* were at their quarters on the main deck firing at some object which their fears had magnified as two frigates going to attack them. The party under orders of the surgeon, forgetting that the quarter deck was to be rendezvous, followed a body of Spaniards who were contending with the gunners party on the gangway, and thus the quarter deck was unoccupied; excepting by Capt. Hamilton, who was attacked by four Spaniards and knocked down with the butt end of a musket, and lay senseless on the combings of the after hatchway. Several of the men of the *Surprise* came to the rescue of their captain, who soon recovering, was fully engaged in preventing the Spaniards from regaining their footing on the quarter deck by the after-hatchway. At this critical moment the marine officer, De la Tour du Pin, with the marines from the black cutter boarded over the larboard gangway, and gave a favourable turn to the then not over promising affair. The marines fired down the after hatchway, and then with bayonets fixed rushed down on the main deck. Sixty Spaniards retreated to the cabin and surrendered; they secured, and the doors closed the fighting still continued on the main deck and under the fore-castle. The carpenter had cut the stern cable, and the ship was canting head to the wind, owing to the bower cable not being first cut by the launch, which boat had been idling with the gun boats and was not as she ought have been. That, however, being done, the fore top sail was loosed, the boats took the frigate in tow, and in a minute the *Hermoine* was standing out of the harbour, steered by the gunner and two men, badly wounded. The batteries now opened on the frigate, and galled her severely. The Spaniards were overheard by a Portuguese, the coxwain of the gig, preparing to blow up the frigate. A few muskets shot fired down the hatchway quieted these desperadoes. One hour after Capt. Hamilton and the crew of the pinace boarded, all fighting ceased. The towing boats dropped alongside, and their crews for the first time put their feet on board the prize. Thus a frigate fully armed and manned, the crew at their quarters standing at their guns, was captured BY THREE SMALL BOATS, the first successful footing being gained by sixteen men.

Communications.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

Sir,—Having shewn that the primitive Fathers, down to the beginning of the third century, are decidedly opposed to the claims of High Churchmen, I shall, for the sake of brevity, direct the attention of your readers to a very few quotations only, from those of a later period; and then proceed to enquire whether High Churchmen are enabled to trace their boasted Succession up to St. Peter or St. Paul. Origen, a Presbyter of Alexandria, was born about the year 185, and died in 254. He spoke explicitly of Presbyters as sitting in council presiding over the Church, one of them commonly styled the Bishop, sitting amongst them on a higher chair, and acknowledged as the chief or presiding Presbyter; while the Deacons stood in attendance upon them. Accordingly in his seventh Homily on Jeremiah we find him thus addressing his hearers:—"We of the clerical order preside over you;"—meaning the Presbyters as a matter of course, himself being only a Presbyter: while in his sixth Homily upon Ezekiel, he employs the following language—"Of what advantage will it be to me to sit in a higher chair, unless my works are answerable to my dignity?" while in another place he says, that he who has the qualifications described in Titus 1st, 6th, &c., "though men should not call him a Bishop, yet will he be a Bishop before God."

Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, suffered there as a martyr for the truth A. D. 258. A passage from his writings, wherein he reproves his Presbyters for restoring, without his concurrence, to the communion of the Church, such as had fallen away during the time of persecution, is often triumphantly quoted by High Churchmen. They take no notice, however, of the fact, that Cyprian expressly declared, that from the beginning of his ministry he had done nothing, and could do nothing, without the consent of his Presbyters and Deacons. "From the beginning of my ministry," says he, "I resolved to do nothing of myself; but only with your counsel, and the concurrence of the people." And again, in speaking of a certain matter he says—"I myself dare not prejudice it, nor dare I alone determine a matter which belongs to us in common." When Cyprian was absent from the people of his charge, on account of the persecution to which he was exposed, we find him thus writing unto his Presbyters—"Since the state of the place will not allow that I should be present, I entreat, that for the sake of your faith and religion, you perform your own duties and mine, that nothing may be wanting, either as to discipline, or diligence." And again—"I exhort that you would discharge my duty, act in my stead, and perform all those things which

the service of the Church requires." Had Cyprian, however, been of a higher order than his Presbyters, he could not have entrusted them with the performance of his duties. We even find him, in writing unto Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, styling the clergy "Compresbyters of Cornelius;" and, in another place, "the most illustrious clergy, presiding with the Bishop over the church." Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, died in A. D. 269. He was contemporary with Cyprian. Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, tells us he was very famous. He presided at the council of Antioch. A letter of his in Cyprian's works contains the following declaration:—"All power and grace are settled in the church in which Presbyters preside, who possess the power of baptizing, and of laying on of hands, (confirmation) and of ordination."

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, flourished about A. D. 375. In his works, there is a commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, commonly supposed to have been written by Hilary, a Deacon of Rome. In his Comment on the 4th chapter of Ephesians, he informs us,—that after Churches were planted in all places, and officers ordained matters were settled otherwise than at the beginning. . . . Therefore, the writings of the Apostles, do not, in all things, agree with the order that is now in the Church; because they were written at its very commencement. For Timothy, who was created by him (Paul) a Presbyter, he calls a Bishop, because the chief Presbyters were called Bishops; so that when one withdrew, he that followed next in order succeeded to his office. Moreover, in Egypt Presbyters ordain if a Bishop is not present. But because the Presbyters next in order began to be found unworthy to hold the chief place, the custom was changed, by the council appointing that not order, but merit, should constitute a Bishop, and that he should be appointed by the judgment of many Presbyters, lest one unworthy should rashly usurp, and become a scandal to many."

In his Comment on 1st Timothy, and third chapter, he says,—"After a Bishop follows the order of a Deacon,—and wherefore, unless the order of a Bishop and Presbyter is one? For each is a priest. But the Bishop is first; so that although every Bishop is a Presbyter, every Presbyter is not a Bishop. For he is a Bishop who is first among Presbyters. (Hic enim Episcopus est qui inter Presbyteros primus est)"

To the testimony of Jerome I have already referred. In his Commentary upon Titus, first chapter, he says,—"a Bishop and Presbyter are the same;" and confirms his assertion by the scriptural arguments commonly adduced by Presbyterians, even at the present day. Besides, in his celebrated Epistle to Evagrius, he states that the Presbyters of Alexandria, chose and made their own Bishops, from the days of Mark, till those of Heraclius and Dionysius;—namely, for 250 years. Chrysostom too, Bishop of Constantinople, in his comment on the third chapter of 1st Timothy, observes,—"that between the Bishop and Presbyter there is little or no difference; and what the Apostle has ascribed to the Bishop, the same also is proper to the Presbyter, since to the Presbyter also the care of the Church is committed;" while even Theodoret admits—"The Apostles call a Presbyter a Bishop, as we showed when we expounded the epistle to the Philippians; which may be also learned from this place; for, after the precepts proper to Bishops, he describes the things that agree to Deacons. But, as I said, of old they called the same men both Bishops and Presbyters. It were easy to multiply similar quotations from the Fathers. Those already adduced, will, I trust, be considered quite sufficient to shew whether, as has been boldly affirmed, they are all in favour of High Church principles. I shall therefore conclude this part of the subject with quotations from two very learned and eminent divines of the Church of England. Stillfleet, Bishop of Worcester, says—"I believe upon the strictest enquiry, Medina's judgment will prove true, that Hieron, Austin, Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact, were all of Aeriuss's judgment, as to the identity of both name and order of Bishops and Presbyters in the Primitive Church." And Whitby in his Annotations on the first verse, of the first chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians, affirms that "the Greek and Latin Fathers do with one consent declare that the Apostle here calls their Presbyters their Bishops. So Chrysostom, Theodoret, Occumenius, and Theophylact among the Greeks, and among the Latins St. Jerome, Pseud-Ambrosius, Pelagius, and Primasius; and that not only for the after mentioned reason, that there could be but one Bishop, properly so called, in one city; but for another alleged by them all that then the names were common to both orders, the Bishops being called Presbyters, and the Presbyters Bishops. And this saith Theodoret, is manifest in this place, because he adds here Deacons to Bishops, making no mention of their Presbyters."

We come now to enquire, whether High Churchmen can trace their spiritual genealogy in the line of direct personal succession up to the Apostles. This much at least, they boldly pretend they are able to do; and beginning with St. Peter, or St. Paul, they name Linus, Anacletus, &c., as all forming links in that chain which hath come down unbroken and perfect even to the present time. High Churchmen, in general, trace their succession through the See of Rome, of which it is alleged, St. Peter was the first Bishop.—Indeed! they have no other. No man can prove however that Peter ever was at Rome. Dr. Cave affirms that "it never can be made good that St. Peter was, in a proper sense, Bishop of Rome." while Archbishop Cranmer asserts that "it is not even certain that Peter ever was at Rome." But, supposing this were taken for granted, the primitive Fathers and learned men are completely at variance as to his successor. "Come we to

Rome," says Stillfleet, "here the succession is as muddy as the Tyber itself; for here Tertullian, Rufinus and several others, place Clement next to Peter;—Irenaeus and Eusebius set Anacletus before him—Epiphanius and Optatus both Anacletus and Cletus,—Augustine and Damasus, with others, make Anacletus, and Cletus, and Linus, all to precede him. What way shall we find to extricate ourselves out of this labyrinth?" Here we find Fathers, even during the second century, completely divided in opinion as to who was Peter's successor. But, on the same subject, we find High Churchmen themselves equally divided. Bishop Pearson and Henry Doddwell, both strenuous advocates of Episcopacy, after all their learning, and research, could never agree as to this matter, as Archbishop Wake had testified; and hence that learned prelate concludes that it is a point "not to be determined." "O! but" says the Bishop of Michigan to his very sapient admirers, "this succession you will find brought down to the Council of Nice, in the year 325, by Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History. No link is broken in the chain which connects the Bishops with the Apostles, and of course with Christ." In reading these assertions of the "good and highly gifted Bishop of Michigan," as the "Toronto Church," Newspaper, styles him, one would think that Eusebius had spoken on the subject of the successions with as much confidence as himself; and yet Eusebius tells us—that in tracing the succession he had "to tread a solitary and untrodden way, and could no where so much as find the bare steps of any man who had passed the same path before; excepting only some shews and tokens divers here and there had left, holding forth torches, as it were, afar off, and lifting up their voices from on high." In speaking of Peter, and Paul, and the Churches which they founded he confesses:—"Now, of how many, and what sincere followers of them have been approved as sufficient to take the charge of those Churches by them founded, it is not easy to say, except such and so many as may be collected from the words of St. Paul." Bishop Pearson positively affirms that the supposition that Eusebius had catalogues of the Bishops of Rome "is the most vain conjecture." He also proves that "Linus died before Peter, and therefore could not succeed him," and that "Cletus, and Anacletus, were only different names for one and the same person;"—while Prideaux, a very learned Churchman, avows that on this subject "no certainty is to be had." Indeed, if we only reflect how the primitive Christians were exposed to the assaults of the Heathen persecutors, their records wrested from them, and destroyed; and themselves driven from one nation and kingdom to another, we shall not be surprised that catalogues of their Bishops have not been preserved. There is one circumstance to which reference hath already been made, and to which I would again call the attention of your readers,—namely; that according to Irenaeus, several of the early Bishops of Rome were nothing more than Presbyters. Their names, as I stated in my last communication, are Anicetus, and Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus, and Xystus. They must all be expunged from the catalogues of High Churchmen:—and yet, by expunging them, we destroy no less than five links, out of the very first twelve, in that boasted chain whereby they are "connected with the Apostles, and with Christ." It is well known that High Churchmen are obliged to trace their succession thro' the Popes of Rome, down to the era of the Reformation. Here also the greatest uncertainty prevails, as their own historians freely acknowledge. Platina, a learned Italian, who wrote a History of the Popes from St. Peter down to Sixtus IV., informs us that his authorities, on many occasions, were full of confusion, and complains, says Prideaux, that they who were appointed "as protonotaries, to register the passages in the Church, were in their time become so illiterate that some of them could scarce write their own names in Latin." Five Chroniclers (says Powell, after citing the above passage) on whose faithfulness and accuracy to place the existence of our Christianity!! Prideaux, in another place observes that Onuphrius, who continued the "Lives of the Popes" begun by Platina, and others, "complain much of the neglect of registering, and the confusion of their Popes lives; notwithstanding their succession is made such a convincing argument." The manner, too, in which the Popes were often elected cannot otherwise than raise in the mind of the serious enquirer the strongest doubts on this question. According to the testimony of Cardinal Baronius, librarian of the Vatican, and author of "Ecclesiastical Annals," from the beginning of the Christian era, down to A. D. 1198, "the most powerful and base harlots ruled at Rome, at whose pleasure Dioceses were changed, Bishops appointed, and what is wicked and horrible to tell, FALSE POPES their paramours were intruded into the Chair of Peter, who being enrolled in the catalogues of the Popes of Rome, serve no other purpose than to mark time. For who could affirm that those thrust in by strumpets of this kind without Law were legitimate Roman Pontiffs? No where is there any mention of the Clergy choosing or afterwards consenting. All the Canons were put to silence, the decrees of Pontiffs strangled, ancient traditions proscribed and the old customs, and sacred rites, and antique usages in choosing the chief Pontiff thoroughly extinguished." Here we have the Apostolical Succession descending through the Roman harlots, who must be put as links in that chain through which High Church Priests derive their Spiritual descent. Baronius was a Cardinal of the Church of Rome, and had thirty votes for the Popedom after the death of Clement the VIII. He owed his advancement to his literary abilities. His testimony must therefore be regarded as unexceptionable:—indeed it only accords with that of all historians who have written on the subject. But again, it is freely

owned by Popish historians themselves, that there were many schisms in the Popedom. Onuphrius admits that before the end of the 14th century there were not less than twenty, some of which lasted from twenty to thirty years. Moreover, it is well known that during that period there were, on several occasions, two, three, and even four rival Popes reigning at the same time. In the 11th century for instance, Benedict, Sylvanus, and Gregory, were all rival Pontiffs, opposing and excommunicating one another. In 1046, the Emperor Henry, in the Council of Sutri, had them all deposed, and Clement the second raised to that dignity. In the 14th century, we find Urban VI., and Clement the VII. rival Pontiffs. France, Spain, Scotland, Sicily, and Cyprus acknowledging the latter, and all the rest of Europe the former, as the true Vicar of Christ. At their death, Boniface IX. succeeded the former, and Benedict XIII., the latter. The former dying was succeeded by Innocent VII., who reigned only two years, and was succeeded by Gregory XII. At a Council held at Pisa, in 1409, the rival Pontiffs were both declared guilty of "heresy, perjury, and contumacy, and separated ipso facto from the communion of the Church. One of these,—viz. Gregory XII, in the Council of Constance, A. D. 1415, had all his acts and proceedings annulled, and all his ordinations rendered void; and yet, it was he that ordained, in 1414, and after he was declared excommunicated, Henry Chicheley, Archbishop of Canterbury, and consequently, all the ordinations by the said Archbishop and his successors down to the present time must be null and void. And yet, notwithstanding all that hath been mentioned, and it is not a title of what might be adduced, High Churchmen "can trace up through a perfect and unbroken chain their lineal descent from the Apostles." Verily, bigotry itself might blush when making such an assertion! In my next communication, which shall conclude the present correspondence, I shall call the attention of your readers to the sentiments of eminent Reformers and divines of the Church of England, on the subject under consideration.

I am, &c.,
JAMES HANNAY.

Richibucto, May 4, 1843.

Mr. Editor,
I beg through the medium of your paper to call the attention of our Commissioners to the bad state of the Causeway on the road ascending the saw-dust hill. Perhaps one of the citizens would take a look at it whilst taking his usual pleasure drives.

X. Y. Z.

Chatham, May 12.

Mr. Editor,
There are a few persons in this community who grumble at every thing, and at every body—in this our Commissioners of Highways act of their part. They would study the comfort of the inhabitants of the town, by tending a little more to the wretched condition of our roads, which are in a deplorable state. What fair promises we sometimes make in the simplicity of our hearts.

AN ENQUIRER.

Chatham, May 13.

Colonial News.

Newfoundland:

Halifax Morning Post, May 5.
THE SEAL FISHERY.—This important branch of Colonial Industry has been carried on with much spirit in the present spring, and a larger number of vessels have been fitted out than for a long time previous. One of the St. John's papers chronicles the names of vessels and owners. The number of vessels is 102.
Private advices received from St. John's state the following interesting particulars.—Newfoundland was surrounded on the 5th ult. by immense fields of ice, which completely cut off all access to the Eastern Coast, for a fortnight previous. Within the last two days of that period, four vessels, (Sealers), from the port of St. John's, from the press-ure of icebergs coming in contact. The loss on two of them will be heavy as they had cargo of icebergs coming in contact. A large number of vessels had arrived from Sealing voyages, and appearances were very flattering; but the great prevalence of N. E. winds kept the vessels off the coast, and expectations were less sanguine than at first it seemed reasonable to entertain. The fishery, it was thought would be an average one, but underwriters would suffer more than for some years past.

Nova-Scotia.

Halifax Novascotian, May 8.
DISTRESSING CASUALTY.—The Picton Presbyterian Banner says—"As Mr. Alexander Dick, of the Albion Mines, was returning home from New Glasgow, on horseback, on Monday night, he was thrown from his horse, and so severely injured that after lingering in a state of unconsciousness, he died on Wednesday night. The deceased was 42 years of age, and has left a widow and large family to lament their irreparable loss."

LARGE HOG.—A hog was lately killed by Mr. Increase Ward, of the Bedford Inn, weighing 742 lb, and measured from the snout to the hock, eight feet, six inches—neck to tail, five feet six inches, and in girth 8 feet nine inches. On the back of the shoulders the depth of lean and fat was eight inches.