

THE THREE SOVEREIGNS.

The following anecdote has often been told by the Emperor Alexander, and is among the traditions of the Russian court: In 1841, during the period that the allies were masters of Paris, the Czar, who resided in the hotel of M. de Talleyrand, was in the daily habit of taking a walk (in strict incognito) every morning in the gardens of the Tuileries, and thence to the Palais Royal. He one day met two other Sovereigns, and the three were returning arm in arm to breakfast in the Rue St. Florentin, when on their way thither, they encountered a provincial, evidently freshly imported to Paris, and who had lost his way. "Gentlemen," said he, "can you tell me which is the Tuileries?" "Yes," replied Alexander, "follow us, we are going that way, and will show you." Thanks on the part of the countrymen led them into conversation. A few minutes sufficed to arrive at the palace; and as here their routes lay in opposite directions, they bade each other reciprocally adieu. "Parbleu!" cried all at once the provincial, "I should be glad to know the names of persons so amiable and complaisant as you are?" "My name?" said the first; "Oh, certainly,—you have, perhaps, heard of me I am the Emperor Alexander!" "A capital joke," exclaimed the Gascon,—"an emperor! and you," addressing the second individual, "who may you be?" "I?" replied he, "why, probably I am not wholly unknown to you, at least by name—I am the King of Prussia!" "Better and better," said the man; "and you what are you, then?" looking at the third person. "I am the Emperor of Austria!" "Perfect, perfect," exclaimed the provincial, laughing with all his might. "But you, monsieur," said the Emperor Alexander, "surely you will also let us know whom we have the honor to speak to?" "To be sure," replied the man, quitting them with a strut, "I am the Great Mogul!"

From Mr. Bancroft's Lecture, delivered at the Tabernacle, New York, before the Mercantile Library Association.
THE EXPRESSION OF THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE.

But why speak of the Artist, the Poet; the Philosopher, or the Hero? No man lives for himself alone, and no man lives of himself alone. We all are brothers—all are bondsmen for one another. Humanity is a complex whole from which no individual can separate himself. The Heroes of the time are the representatives of the race in the mighty Congress of Humanity; but we all are free of the city—shareholders of its wealth—partners of its brotherhood. We stand between two eternities—heirs of all ages, bound to the future:—there is not one on whom the spirit of the past does not rest—not one with whom the spirit of the age refuses to hold converse. By it are we cheered, instructed, warned. From it we derive strength. If animated by it, we look forward with hope; if quickened by our relation to it, our life shall stand firm as the Alps or flow with the strength of self-moving waters.

If greatness springs not from individual power but from associated mind, if Heroes, Philanthropists, and Poets are creatures of the invisible Spirit of the Age, we may inquire into the reality of that Spirit and seek to know it in its own sphere of existence. If individual man, in his relation to it, is but as the rose to the Sun, reflecting its light but not creating it; we should expect to see it moving with power over the Earth and manifesting itself at the same time in different places remote from each other. And it is so.—How often do men contend for the honor of inventions—and countries too, Germany and England, Leibnitz and Newton, each claims the honor of having invented the differential calculus. But the truth is, the discovery was made by neither. The Spirit of the Age whispered it in an under tone in the twilight of the Eighteenth Century; and Newton and Leibnitz alone, bending their ear, caught its accents, and both at once gave it utterance among men. At Paris they are building an observatory—and the Bourbons invite Philosophers to tempt electricity from the clouds. At about the same time, in the fields of America, a runaway Printer's apprentice grown to manhood, went forth with no companion as he supposed but his son; but the invisible Spirit of the age went forth to the fields and his guide, and fastened for him the heptagon string—and waited his kite among the thunder clouds, and as he bent down reverentially to touch his knuckle to the key, the Spirit of the Age proclaimed to the world that Franklin had drawn lightning from the clouds! How often have historians endeavor to decide between rivals—as who first suggested a Congress of American Colonies, or who first proposed the declaration of Independence! It is as though the trees of the forest should dispute which first quickened its buds into life and put forth its glossy leaves, when the seasons and the Sun and the earth, as it moved in its heavenly path have renewed the freshness of them all.

Still more do we notice the influence of this Spirit on masses of men and on nations, so that their actions and works appear to spring from a higher life behind the life of the individual agents and works appear to spring from a higher life behind the life of the individual agents and workers. All antiquity is full of illustrations. Look at the middle Age, when Christianity invaded the forests of the North and subdued the barbarous nations. At her bidding savage hands prepared their offerings and builded temples to the God they were taught to worship. Then rose the towers of Pisa, and Milan, of Strasbourg and Vienna, of York and Salisbury. In the hearts of these men moved the Spirit of the age and builded these creations through them.

The same result might be traced in reference to the American Revolution. It was the work not of one man, but the child of the Age. Parliament was claiming all power over the people of the Colonies, and where should America find relief? The Spirit of the Age pointed out to them the way, and helped them to resist the despotism of Great Britain. I took counsel with the religious Spirit of the previous Century, both immortal, and learned how it might elevate the popular power and yet preserve order. It even entered the closets of the metaphysician in the mists of Scotland, and compelled him to seek the truth in the oracles of common sense. It sought out the moralist, and enjoined upon him to believe virtue a reality. It entered into Political Economy, and Adam Smith, the very year of Independence, made a protest against the restrictive commercial system of the past. It mingled, as a companion, with the nobility of the continent of Europe; and when to Lafayette, the volunteer, the American Commissioners made answer, "we are too poor to give you passage," it whispered by his lips—"then I'll build a vessel for myself." It prompted Chatham to defend Reform in Parliament, and kept watch over the true hero of Bunker Hill—the brave Prescott, upon the heights of Charlestown. It entered the forests of Geneva, and Emanuel Kant, the greatest reasoner of his century, asserted for Society its right to Progress—and called upon men to advance from a state of imperfection to one higher and better. It inspired Schiller and breathed through him lines of such deep and thrilling power as have since reached all through the race. And where you would expect it least, Music grew to new perfection as Beethoven, shut out from the enjoyment of his own compositions, sought to embody in sound his conceptions of love for universal man.

But those Spirits of the Age—are they immortal? Do they live for ever, or are they the children of Time, and doomed to die as centuries roll on? The Spirit of an age is for the time the living essence of Humanity and cannot be annihilated. It is a unity, and does not exist in fragments. Leaving no gaps it embraces the whole being of the race. Individuals may forget—but humanity has a consciousness that treasures up all that passeth in the world—suffers no idea to be lost, nor one great prophesy to go unfulfilled.—There is a false spirit that perishes—it strikes no deep root—it kindles no genuine warmth, but its fires are as crackling brambles. But Humanity moves onward surrounded by the spirits of the Ages as the Sun is encircled by the Hours.

ORIGINAL.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

SIR,—Episcopalians invariably contend that in the Church of God, there are three distinct orders of Clergy, namely: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and that, while it belongs exclusively to the first, to ordain other Ministers, and rule over both Pastors and People; the second have authority to preach the Gospel, and administer the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; while the last are permitted only to Preach, and administer the Sacrament of Baptism—High Churchmen, (as they are called) maintain, that these three Orders are of Divine institution. In the New Testament they read of Apostles, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons; and admitting, as they do, that in the Scriptural sense of the terms Bishop, and Presbyter, or Elder, are only different names for one and the same order, namely, that of those commonly styled Priests, they affirm that the Title *Apostle*, is the appropriate designation of such as are now called Bishops. They tell us, moreover, that it is in 'voluntary humility' they have rejected the above Title, and having left to those who in Scripture are called Bishops, or Presbyters, indiscriminately, that of Presbyters only have assumed the other designation, that of Bishops, to themselves. Accordingly, instead of regarding their Bishops as the rightful successors of those who in Scripture are so called, they consider them the legitimate successors of the Apostles; at the same time that they maintain, that without such a succession, there is no Church, no Altar, no Sacrament, and no Salvation. The term *Apostle*, in its literal acceptation, signifies a *Messenger*; and while, in Scripture, it is frequently employed to designate any Minister of the Gospel, or any other Messenger, is applied to those, who by way of eminence, are styled the Apostles of our Lord, and distinguished by their prerogatives and powers, from all other Ministers whatever. It is to the latter that High Churchmen suppose their Bishops to succeed.

They imagine, that when Christ Jesus, after his resurrection from the dead, gave his Apostles the grand Commission, to go and 'disciple all nations,' and promised to be with them always, even unto 'the end of the world,' he engaged, merely to be present with themselves, and with *Diocesan Bishops* alone, as their exclusive successors; and hence they denounce all who will not, without the shadow of proof, either from Scripture or reason, but even in opposition to both, acquiesce in their exclusive and intolerant pretensions. Such being the scheme of High Churchmen, it will necessarily follow, that if our Lord did not in the Commission to which we have referred, confer distinct and peculiar powers and privileges on Diocesan Bishops; that if they are not Apostles, in the highest sense of the term, or at least, by direct, unbroken, and personal descent, their legitimate successors, they are, upon their own principles, enemies of God, and children of perdition; and while they continue in this state, whatever be their piety, or purity, not only destitute of salvation, but utterly incapable of obtaining it. It hath very properly been remarked, that none of the peculiar prerogatives of the Apostles, could, during their lives, at least, be possessed by any other Minister of Christ. These prerogatives could not be peculiar to them, and at the same time, common unto them, along with others; and therefore, when High Churchmen endeavor, as they frequently do, to confound their opponents by telling them of the Episcopacy of Timothy, and Titus, they, in so many words, oppose and overturn their own favourite system. For Timothy, and Titus, were not Apostles, in the highest sense of the term, and therefore could not be Bishops—the one of Ephesus, and the other of Crete, as High Churchmen have often inconsistently maintained. Presbyterians, without exception, affirm, that when the Apostles died, they left no successors in that peculiar and pre-eminent office which they held during their lives. In the words of the learned Dr. Barrow, an eminent Divine of the Church of England, they contend that 'the Apostolical office, as such, was personal and temporary; and therefore, according to its nature and design, not successive, nor communicable to others, in perpetual descent from them. It was as such in all respects extraordinary, conferred in a special manner, designed for special purposes, discharged by special aids, endowed with special privileges, and was needful for the propagation of Christianity, and founding of Churches. To that office it was requisite that the person should have an immediate designation and commission from God; that he should be endowed with miraculous gifts and grace; that he should be able, according to his discretion, to impart spiritual gifts; and that he should govern in an absolute manner, as being guided by infallible assistance, to which he might appeal. Now such an office, consisting of so many extraordinary privileges, and miraculous powers which were requisite for the foundation of the Church, was not designed to continue by derivation, for it contained in it divers things, which apparently not communicated, and which no man without gross imposture and hypocrisy, could challenge to himself.'

May I not then reasonably ask, to which of these Apostolic prerogatives and powers modern Bishops lay claim, and in consequence of their possessing which High Church Priests conduct themselves so contemptuously towards the Ministers of all other Christian Denominations? Have they seen Christ, after his resurrection from the dead?—Acts 1, 21—22 and 1 Cor. 9, 1. Have they received an immediate call, not of man, but of Jesus Christ; (Gal. 1, 1) and been ordained to their high functions, *without imposition of hands*, and without previously being invested with any inferior or preparatory office? Have they been taught, not by man, but by the immediate revelation of Christ Jesus himself; (Gal. 1, 12) and have they, in consequence, become infallible teachers unto others? (Gal. 1, 8 & 12) Have they received an universal commission, both to teach and to rule? [Matt. 28, 19, & 11, Cor. 13, 10] and if so, how do they discharge it in confining, each, his attention, and his care, to one Diocese only! Do they not only possess the power of *working miracles, themselves*, but of communicating miraculous powers unto others? (Acts 19, 6) Can they discern spirits, and inflict remarkable judgments on all opposers of the truth? (Acts 5, 1—13) And if they cannot lay claim to any, or all of these peculiar powers and privileges—on what foundation is it that they rest their lofty pretensions? It is very remarkable that any individual should be found bold enough to maintain that *Ordination and authoritative rule* are higher and more important functions than those of *Preaching, and administering the Sacraments*, especially as the last commission, given by Christ to his Apostles,—a commission too, which invariably hath been regarded as embracing the ministerial succession; and in which, surely, their highest, and most important duties are contained, should include only the latter; without a single reference to the former, (Matt. 28, 19, 20). It is not less remarkable, that High Churchmen should aver, that while the Apostles lived, the power of ordination was confined exclusively to them, and at their death conveyed to their successors, when the Word of God testifies so very plainly to the contrary. Timothy, Titus, and Barnabas, were all appointed to ordain, and they, unquestionably, were not Apostles;

while Paul and Barnabas, were ordained by certain Prophets and Teachers of Antioch, (Acts 13, 3) and Timothy himself, by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, (1st Tim. 4, 14). It is true that High Churchmen, with their usual consistency, have suggested, that they by whom Timothy was ordained, may have been a 'Company of Apostles,' and Timothy's ordination, after all, 'Apostolic Ordination.' It is equally true, however, that the hands of the Presbytery were the *instrumental cause* of Timothy's ordination; or, in other words, that it was in the character of Presbyter alone, that they conferred upon him those gifts which he received, and those functions with which he was invested, when they laid their hands upon him.

Intending to resume the subject in a future communication,

I remain, yours, &c.

JAMES HANNAY.

Richbcto, January 18, 1843.

COMMUNICATIONS

RELATIVE TO THE LATE ELECTION.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

Presuming that the following Statistics in reference to our Legislative Assembly, may be found interesting by some of your readers, I offer them for insertion in your useful Journal.

The late House of Assembly consisted of 33 Members,—the present House of 34. The increase in the representation of Restigouche, occasioning the additional one. In the recent General Election, 3 Counties returned their Members without opening a Poll, and 9 Counties, and one (the) City were contested—resulting in the return of 20 old, and 14 new Members.

Of the 14 new Members, 3 were returned without opposition, and 11 after a contest—4 had been Candidates on former occasions, 1 had served a Session, and one sat in the late House for a few days, but was ejected through some illegality in his return. 9 are natives of the Province, 3 of Ireland, 1 of Scotland, and 1 of the Island of Jersey.

Of the 13 Members displaced by the late dissolution, 8 were favourable to Government Measures, and 5 opposed. Of the 8 Government men, 6 lost their election after a contest, and 2 did not offer. Of the 5 oppositionists 4 declined offering, and one lost on a contest.

Of the three members of the Executive Council belonging to the late House, who supported the Government, two were rejected by their constituents, at the late Election, and the third was the LOWEST RETURNED MEMBER on the poll book of his County.

The national origin of the members of the present House stand thus—Natives of the Province 21—of Scotland 6—of Ireland 4—of Nova Scotia 1—of Jersey 1—of the United States 1.

Presuming on the fairest grounds of offering an opinion on the strength of parties, we should say, there will be found opposed to the measures of the present administration 19—doubtful 5—and favourable to every thing, the Executive demand 10. This will not perhaps apply to the Initiation Bill, a slight modification in which will ensure its passage.

Your obedient Servant,

H. H.

January 29, 1843.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

Sir, In resuming the subject of the late Election, on the present occasion, I shall guard against giving myself or your readers so much trouble as I did last week, by giving them a few pages in advance, and shall, from time to time, through the week, add, as I may be enabled to spare time, until I shall have filled up each space as you may feel disposed to devote to me.

In my last I brought your readers to the close of the Poll at Negouac, on the second day,—and having left the Sheriff, Poll-Clerks, Candidates, and their friends there, to regale themselves, after their days labor, while they are finding their way home and making preparations to proceed to Bay du Vin, being 20 miles below Chatham, on the South side of the river, on the next day but one, (one day's intermission being allowed by the law,) I shall visit Chatham, on the evening of the day on which the Poll opened, or for sake of brevity it may be as well to call it the first day. For my own part, as much, very much, has been said and written upon this part of the subject, I deem it necessary to state, that notwithstanding my having left Newcastle at the close of the Poll on that day, in company with the People of Chatham, and of the sections of the County below Chatham, yet from the circumstance of one of the traces of the Horse which I drove, having 'given way' as I was coming up the hill at Coulson's Slip, (being about half a mile above the centre of the Town, and which accident, in the absence of any cordage, took me some time to repair) I did not reach Chatham, I should suppose, for upwards of a quarter of an hour after Mr Williston, and those already enumerated.

On reaching home, I drove immediately into my own yard, and from thence walked into a room in my house, where I met with a few female friends who had come to spend the evening. These friends, Sir, are amongst your readers, and will recollect what passed