



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 4VWE M

Harvard Depository  
Brittle Book

*CHRIST THE TRUE ALTAR*

*BY THE LATE*

LORD BISHOP OF CARLISLE



572

יהוה

INSTITVTIO THEOLOGICA  
ANDOVER FVNDATA MDCCCVII.

ΑΚΡΟΓΩΝΙΑ



ΛΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ





**CHRIST THE TRUE ALTAR.**



# CHRIST THE TRUE ALTAR,

*AND OTHER SERMONS,*

WITH THE CHARGE

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY  
NOT SACERDOTAL BUT EVANGELISTIC.

BY THE LATE

SAMUEL WALDEGRAVE, D.D.,

*Lord Bishop of Carlisle.*

With Introduction

BY THE

REV. JOHN CHARLES RYLE, M.A.,

*Vicar of Stradbroke, and Hon. Canon of Norwich.*

LONDON :

WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY,

HOLLES STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE ;

AND AVE MARIA LANE, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1875.



Recd April 17, 1877.

25712

## *Introduction.*



THE volume now in the reader's hands requires very little prefatory explanation. It contains nine Sermons preached at various times by the Hon. and Rt. Rev. SAMUEL WALDEGRAVE, late Bishop of Carlisle, and a Charge delivered to the clergy and churchwardens of his diocese at his last ordinary visitation in the year 1867.

Single sermons and Charges, in a bustling, hurrying age like the present, have a very ephemeral existence. They are too often thrown aside, and buried under a heap of pamphlets, after a brief and hasty perusal. It has been justly thought that these scattered remains of the late Bishop are worthy of a better fate, and deserve to

be collected in a more permanent form. They are therefore gathered together in this volume, and republished without note or comment. I have gladly consented to write a few lines by way of introduction.

The contents of the volume need no recommendation of mine. They are the work of a "man of God," of rare gifts and graces, who was loved and honoured by all who really knew him in his short life, and deeply lamented at his death, which took place in 1869. Of him it may be truly said that he died "*suo magis quam suorum tempore,*" and that those who knew him best loved him most. They are the work of one who had a right, by virtue of his office, to speak out on the theological topics of the day, and whose standing at Oxford as a double-first classman, in 1839, entitles him to a patient hearing even from those who disagree with him.

Above all, they are the work of a Bishop who never flinched from maintaining in their full integrity the Protestant and Evangelical principles on which the Church of England was established at the Reformation. Of SAMUEL WALDEGRAVE,

at any rate, it never could be said that the mitre proved an extinguisher to his antecedents, or that his usefulness and faithfulness were checked by his promotion.

I trust the volume may receive the attention it deserves. It contains plain speech about subjects of great and grave importance, subjects which are still much discussed in the present day. Here, I am bold to say, the reader will find Scriptural truth about Christ, the Church, the ministry, and the Sacraments, in its real proportion, no part unduly magnified and no part unduly diminished. Well would it have been for the Church of England if all the chief pastors during the last three centuries had handled controversial subjects as wisely, and declared "all the counsel of God" as faithfully, as SAMUEL WALDEGRAVE!

That God may bless this volume, and grant it a wide circulation, is my earnest prayer.

J. C. RYLE,

*Vicar of Stradbroke and Hon. Canon of Norwich.*

APRIL 26TH, 1875.



## CONTENTS.



INTRODUCTION.

CHRIST HIS OWN ALTAR.

THE RENT VEIL.

THE BREAD OF LIFE, OR EATING CHRIST'S FLESH.

THE PRIMACY OF PETER.

THE CIVIL RULER GOD'S MINISTER.

THE DUTY OF PROPHECYING.

THE APOSTOLIC COMMISSION.

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

MINISTERING KINGS.

THE CHARGE.



*CHRIST HIS OWN ALTAR;*

*or,*

*The Supper no Sacrifice.*





## *Christ His Own Altar.*

---

*"We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle."*—Hebrews xiii. 10.

THERE is no law of Scriptural interpretation more reasonable—there is none more frequently broken—than that which bids us *prophesy*; *i.e.*, preach or interpret, according to the proportion, the analogy, of the faith.

It is most reasonable—if we may without irreverence so speak of an injunction laid upon us by the Lord the Spirit. For surely it is but wise that, in interpreting any given verse or passage of Holy Writ, we should prefer that rendering, which brings it into harmony with the clear and the uniform teaching of the rest of the sacred volume, concerning the question at issue.

And yet how very often is this law neglected and broken! The affections are engaged on behalf of some religious fancy, some heretical tenet—a text, it may be but one word only of a text, seems

to support that tenet, to favour that fancy—it is at once eagerly embraced and exultingly paraded as proof conclusive of the opinion which it is desired to establish. And yet all other Scriptures are against that opinion: and its partizan should at once have suspected and rejected an exposition which involves in its consequences so unhallowed a result as the making of God's Word contradictory to itself.

Thus, to cite an example, the Socinian meets with that perhaps somewhat startling text, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God." He hails it with delight as the testimony of Jesus, to the fatal heresy which holds him enchained. "See," he eagerly cries, "the Son of Mary distinctly repudiates that ascription of divine attributes which you claim on his behalf." But is this, we at once reply, prophesying according to the proportion, the analogy, of the faith? Most assuredly not. A great number of passages, directly and by implication, proclaim Jesus to be God of God, very God of very God; accordingly another than the *primâ facie* rendering of the verse must be sought, one which shall not bring it into conflict with that fundamental truth of the Holy Gospel.

The exegetical history of the text which I have selected for this afternoon's meditation supplies a further illustration of the frequent neglect of this inspired canon of Scriptural exposition.

A man has become entangled in the meshes of Sacerdotalism. He loves to think of Christ's ministers as expiating priests, of the Holy Supper as a propitiatory sacrifice, and of the *Lord's Table as an altar of divine service*. Is Scriptural proof demanded for so designating that instrument of Christian worship? "We have an altar"—it is quickly and confidently rejoined—"whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle."

But surely this is not to prophesy according to the proportion of the faith! The universal teaching of the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, declares that at the death of Jesus all human priest-hoods of expiation, all atoning sacrifices for sin, all altars of propitiation, for ever disappeared, as the type before the antitype, as the shadow before the substance. Another interpretation therefore of my text must be sought—one which shall be consistent with the emphatic instruction thus communicated.

What that interpretation is, it is my desire to show you to-day.

Before, however, that I enter upon the direct consideration of this verse, I would clear the way by recalling to your minds what are the special functions of an altar? and what is signified by eating of the altar?

The functions of an altar were to sanctify the gift, and to endure the flame. To sanctify the gift—the lamb, the ram, the bullock, might be without blemish, and without spot; it might be physically perfect, yet offered any where else than at Jehovah's altar it was an abomination to the Lord: brought to that altar, and offered there, its value for typical expiation was admitted and acknowledged. It was an odour of a sweet smell, acceptable to the Lord. Need I adduce proof? "Ye fools and blind," saith Jesus to the Scribes and Pharisees, "whether is greater, the gift, "or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?" (Matt. xxiii. 19.) "Seven days," saith God to His servant Moses, "thou shalt make an atonement for the altar, and "sanctify it; and it shall be an altar most holy: what-soever toucheth the altar shall be holy." (Exodus xxix. 37.) To endure the flame was the other and the obvious function of the altar. Therefore did stone or metal sustain the wood upon which the victim was to be placed. Thus did Elijah, on Mount

Carmel, take "twelve stones, according to the number of the tribes of the sons of Jacob." (1 Kings xviii. 31.) Thus, when that notable instrument of service was to be constructed, the altar of burnt sacrifice, full directions were given that its wooden framework should indeed be overlaid with brass, but that that portion upon which the fuel was to be ordered, and the flame enkindled, was to be a network of brass alone. (Exodus xxvii. 1—5.) These then were the functions of the altar,—to sanctify the gift—to endure the flame.

But what is signified by the phrase, "eating of the altar"? Let us, brethren, follow the victim in thought—the lamb or the bullock—as it is led to the altar. Brought near to that holy, that sanctifying, structure, the hand of the offerer is placed upon its head. To that head is transferred the sin for which the worshipper seeks atonement. The victim is slain, his blood is sprinkled upon the altar; his carcase is prepared; a large, the largest, portion of it is laid in order upon the wood; the fuel is kindled; the smoke ascends on high; and, in the language of that beautiful passage which describes the sacrifice of Noah on emerging from the ark, Jehovah smells "a savour of rest." "Noah," we read,

“buildded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And the Lord smelled a sweet savour”—“a savour of rest,” as it is in the margin and the Hebrew,—“and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake, though<sup>a</sup> the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth.” (Gen. viii. 20, 21.)

But to proceed; I said that a portion of the sacrifice was not consumed upon the altar. Why so? It was reserved as the sustenance, the life, of Aaron and his sons who ministered at that altar. “The priests, the Levites, and all the tribe of Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel: they shall eat the offerings of the Lord made by fire, and his inheritance. Therefore shall they have no inheritance among their brethren: the Lord is their inheritance, as He hath said unto them. And this shall be the priest’s due from the people, from them that offer a sacrifice, whether it be ox or sheep; and they shall give unto the priest the shoulder, and the two cheeks, and the maw.” (Deut. xviii. 1, 2, 3.) Hence that well known passage, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, in

<sup>a</sup> “Though,” Marginal reading.

which the Apostle Paul is establishing the right of the Christian minister to temporal maintenance, in virtue of his spiritual service;—"do ye not know," he writes, "that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?" (1 Cor. ix. 13.)

These preliminary remarks will serve to picture to you the position in which (in imagination) the Apostle stood when he penned the words of my text. He fancied himself once more present in the courts of the temple at Jerusalem. Surrounded by the disciples of Jesus, he stands near the great brazen altar. The victim has been slain, atonement has been made, the priests and their families draw near to take their portion. "We," he cries aloud to the Christian, the believing, spectators, "we, who have believed in Christ, have our sacrifice, and our altar; and we share that sacrifice and partake of that altar; and to us it communicates, in us it sustains, no temporal, no dying life, it is the bread of immortality, he that eateth of it shall live for ever:—but, mark me well," he adds, "they have no right to eat thereof who serve the tabernacle;" in other words, "law and Gospel are incompatible, they that look to Moses' law for salva-



“tion shut themselves hopelessly out from Christ’s “Gospel.”

But what is the altar of which the Apostle thus makes his boast? Beloved brethren, without hesitation I reply that it is not the Table of the Lord, but the Lord Himself!—considered as having, once, in the fulness of time, given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God.

It is not the Table of the Lord; and that for the following reasons:—

First, because such an interpretation introduces a term into the nomenclature of Holy Scripture which occurs no where else. No where in the book of God is that instrument of holy service called an altar! As in our Book of Common Prayer, so also in the Word of God Himself, the only name by which it is known is “the table of the Lord”—“the Lord’s “table.” “Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord’s “table,” saith St. Paul, “and of the table of devils.” (1 Cor. x. 21.)

But, alone and by itself, this argument is not conclusive, for it might possibly have pleased the Holy Ghost to introduce here a new and unwonted designation of the Lord’s table. I therefore beg you to notice a second reason why it cannot be so.

It is this—That such an interpretation makes this tenth verse of the thirteenth chapter of the Hebrews contradictory to the universal teaching of the whole preceding twelve chapters of the Epistle.

For remember, I pray you, that “altar,” “priest,” and “sacrifice” are correlative terms. If that sacred table is an altar, then is the holy feast which is spread upon it a sacrifice, then is he who ministers there a priest. And if it be so in this sanctuary, so is it in every Christian sanctuary throughout our land; yea, throughout the world. Yes, and more than this, every holy table, every Lord’s supper, every ministering pastor has been from the beginning, and every such will be to the end of the dispensation, altar, sacrifice, priest. Thus have we again a countless succession of priests which cannot continue by reason of death, and innumerable sacrifices which can never take away sin. And yet the whole object of this Epistle has been to show that the Christian economy excels, yea, and has for ever superseded, the Levitical dispensation, in these very respects that, unlike the latter, it has but one Priest—Jesus the Son of God who continueth ever—and one Sacrifice, the prepared body which has for ever put away sin to be remembered no more. Make that table an altar, and

you degrade Christianity from its high dignity, and bring its disciples back to the weak and beggarly elements of a virtual Judaism! In other words, let the altar here named be the table of the Lord, and you make this one verse to undo the entire teaching of the whole preceding portions of this inspired Epistle.

But there is yet a third reason why this cannot be! It is this—That such an interpretation presents an altar by no means adequate to the discharge (in reference to the offering up of the body of Jesus Christ) of an altar's functions.

For what is the gift offered, according to the Papal hypothesis, upon the Lord's Table? It is nothing less than the immaculate body of the incarnate Word,—“this is my body.” Now construct that table, if you will, of the most costly materials, frame it and fashion it with all the symmetry and all the ornament which wealth and art and taste can lavish upon it, tell me can it add the very least to the value of the victim which is present there? No, never can such a table sanctify such a gift!

And this consideration, I may in passing observe, excludes an alternative exposition of this text to which I have not, as yet, referred. It is sometimes

said that the altar of my text is Calvary's Cross. But this cannot be. That cross—that accursed tree—neither sanctified the gift, nor endured the flame. It could not possibly do either. It could not enhance the gift, for such contact with it involved a curse. And then how could it endure, or help to endure, those flames of Divine wrath which burnt so fiercely against sin, as they enveloped the sinner's Substitute? No! Calvary's cross was, it may be, the instrument of death,—the knife to slay the Divine Isaac,—but we must seek elsewhere the altar which shall stamp the offering of the Lamb of God with a priceless value, and possess a sustaining power adequate to the burden laid upon it. And where shall such an ALTAR be found save in Him who is God of God, very God of very God?

Yes truly there must be, and there is, a correspondence of dignity between our Priest, our Sacrifice, our Altar. Our Priest is Jesus Christ the Lord,—our Sacrifice is Jesus Christ the Lord,—our Altar must also be Jesus Christ the Lord. Christ is all! Hence, when the Apostle says, in my text, "We have an altar," we are constrained to declare that he is speaking of no present and oft-repeated sacramental ordinance; but of the past and final Sacrifice

of the death of Christ,—of the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all, *εφ'απαξ*, once and done with. (Heb. x. 10.)

But who may eat of this Altar? That is, who may lawfully expect to find thereon life eternal?

The Apostle, beloved, gives a *negative* and a *positive* reply.

*Negatively*, he says, they have no right to eat thereof who serve the tabernacle. That is to say, they who, actually or virtually, return to Judaism, with its succession of priests, altars, and sacrifices, shut themselves out from all the benefits of Christ's passion.

"Christ," we read elsewhere, "is become of no effect unto you; whosoever of you are justified by "the law, ye are fallen from grace" (Gal. v. 4); that is, not ye are fallen from any inward, saving work wrought in your hearts by Divine grace; but ye are fallen from your adherence to that Gospel, of which the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, the marrow and the fatness, is salvation by grace,—the two, law and Gospel, works and faith, are absolutely incompatible.

*Positively*, the Apostle says, "We" have an altar.

And who are the "we"? They are, my brethren,

Christ's priests, even every man, every woman, yes, and every child, who believing on His name, running with patience the race set before them, looking unto Jesus, come forth to Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. These are, I say, every one of them, priests of the Gospel dispensation. "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father; to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." (Rev. i. 5, 6.) "Ye are..... an holy priesthood," saith Peter to all the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, who had been born again by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever, who, as strangers and pilgrims, abstained from fleshly lusts, —whether husbands or wives, masters or servants, elders or disciples of younger years,—“ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood.” (I Peter ii. 6, 9.) These, brethren, have a right to eat of our altar, and eating they shall live for ever. “This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever” (John vi. 58); for I need not pause to prove to you,

under the blaze of Reformation light, that it is not of His Supper that the Lord speaks in this sixth of John, but of that spiritual participation in His finished work, and all its blessed effects, which is the privilege of every one that believeth on His name!<sup>b</sup>

And now, brethren, in brief conclusion.

First. They were not trifling points for which Cranmer, and Ridley, and Latimer yielded their bodies to be burned. Far from it! Their own salvation, the salvation of their flocks was at stake. Their eyes had been opened; they had discovered that they had been serving the tabernacle; they had learnt that thus, even while fancying themselves partakers of Christ in the Sacrament, so called, "of the altar," they had been effectually shutting themselves out from Him. Escaped from that snare themselves, they had proclaimed deliverance to others. And when, with the accession of Mary, the days of error returned, and the Mass was again set up in the churches, they were (even though one faltered for a little) willing rather to die than to

<sup>b</sup> See the Author's Sermon, in this Series, on John vi. 49—59. "The Bread of Life: or, Eating Christ's Flesh, and Drinking Christ's Blood."

part with Christ,—rather to endure the flames which might indeed consume their bodies, but after that could do no more, than to plunge into the peril of an eternal loss.

And so, secondly, they are not truths of little moment for which we contend when we protest against the Ritualism of the present hour.

Far from it! It is obvious to the senses that the central point of all that service is the Holy Table, exalted to the dignity of an Altar of Sacrifice. The elements constitute (by a process which it is not easy to distinguish from Transubstantiation) the Victim: the minister is the *priest* (not presbyter “writ short,” but *ιερευς*): and the Table is the altar. Nor, as you must be well aware, can it be truly said that our observations and conclusions do an injustice to these innovators. Themselves proclaim that it is a propitiatory Sacrifice that they from time to time *re-present* to Jehovah.

And what is the result, if we have rightly understood our text? They exclude themselves from Christ. They return to the service of the tabernacle, and, so returning, they abandon the Lord Jesus Christ. So that even while His name is on their lips, while even *a* love of His ordinances is in



their hearts, they are, indeed and in truth, far off from Him.

If then, beloved brethren, you prize your own souls, if you love the souls of the children God hath given you, if you care for the souls of the dependents for whom you are indeed responsible, take heed and beware of the bewitchments of Sacerdotalism. The "bewitchments," I say,—for indeed there is fascination in this system, both for ministers and people. "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?" Remember that the enchantress fascinates but to destroy. "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul, say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." (Gal. v. 1, 2.)

---

*London: William Hunt and Company.*

*THE RENT VEIL :*

*or, the*

*Levitical Ritual no Warranty for Symbolic  
Display in Christian Worship.*



## *The Rent Veil.*

---

*“Jesus, when He had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom.”—Matthew xxvii. 50, 51.*

SUCH was the miracle, pregnant with instruction, by which Jehovah himself first proclaimed the final, the total abolition of the Mosaic Ritual.

True that this elaborate system of “worldly service” was, in its minutest observance, of divine authority. True that for fifteen centuries the prosperity of the chosen nation had seemed to wax and wane in proportion to the strictness or laxity with which its enactments were obeyed. True that the Canon of Old Testament Scripture had, in its closing utterances, given those enactments a renewed sanction. “Remember ye,” these are the words of Malachi, “Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments.” (Malachi iv. 4.)

But all was now to "decay," "wax old," and "vanish away." The law of commandments contained in ordinances was to be "taken out of the way," "abolished." The middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile was to be broken down. For the day had dawned, and the shadows had fled away. Therefore did the God of Israel, striking as it were at the very heart of the ceremonial which Himself had promulgated, with His own hand rend the veil of the temple from the top even to the bottom.

And yet have there never been wanting, from that day to the present hour, men who would impose upon the Christian Church a yoke of service scarcely less complicated, scarcely less oppressive, than that which has been thus destroyed.

Nor have the arguments with which they have pleaded their cause been devoid of an attractive, a fascinating, plausibility. "The glory," it is alleged, "of the Levitical worship consisted in the richness of its display, and the variety of its symbolism: surely," it is urged, "the Christian Liturgy should, instead of falling short in either respect, rather excel in like distinction of sensuous ministrations embodying spiritual significance."

In dealing with allegations so specious, an appeal

to the Scriptural facts of the case is our best safeguard, our most conclusive reply. Give me, brethren, your candid, your patient, your prayerful, attention, as I conduct that appeal in your hearing to-day.

And, *first*, I would have you note, that they are certainly in error who imagine that the Levitical Ritual was, by divine appointment, so ordered as to act upon the natural senses of the congregation by an imposing display.

We do not deny that form, and colour, and scent, and sound, were present in the Mosaic worship by God's appointment. Nor can it be questioned that art also was impressed into the same sacred service—the art of the apothecary, compounding the sweet incense with which the High Priest entered into the Holy of Holies,—and the art of the cunning workman weaving the garments of glory and of beauty with which that High Priest was, on all other occasions, clad. But we can hardly admit that “display” was the object with which these appliances were called into requisition, when we consider that they were all confined to the precincts of a single temple, and that, even there, the most gorgeous furniture and the most awful rites were entirely concealed from all but priestly eyes.

I say that every thing of comeliness and of skill

was shut up within the limits of one solitary sanctuary. And such was in very deed the truth. He that, in thinking of the Church of those days, imagines to himself troops of priests clad in vestments of gold and blue, and purple and scarlet,—he that pictures to himself frequent altars smoking with burnt offerings and fragrant with incense,—indulges in a day dream which had no counterpart in the dispensation of old. There was but one city, Jerusalem, where Jehovah set His name ; there was but one temple, that on Mount Moriah, in which sacrifice was offered, and sweet perfume was shed abroad ; there was but one minister, the High Priest, who was robed in vestments radiant with colour and gold and precious stones.

And then even within these narrow limits—for narrow indeed they were, the Temple proper was, after all, an edifice of but humble dimensions—how small comparatively was the number of the children of Jacob who had personal acquaintance with the exquisite adornments and the mysterious celebrations of the House of the Lord ! Beyond the outer court, with its brazen altar and brazen laver, the general congregation of Israel saw literally nothing. To the priests alone, the sons of Aaron, was it given to enter into the holy place. They and only they

might look upon the golden candlestick with its sevenfold lamps ; they and only they might behold the golden table with its twelve loaves of shewbread ; and to them alone was it permitted to inhale the sweet perfume of the burning incense morning by morning and evening by evening :—you will recall, as I speak, that passage in the story of Zacharias, the father of the Baptist, “the whole multitude of “the people were praying without at the time of “incense.” And even these were for ever excluded from the inner chamber of all, the Holy of Holies. No eye of mortal man, save that of the High Priest, ever lighted upon the Ark of the Covenant, the Mercy Seat, the Cherubim of Glory, and the Shekinah. Certainly display was not the object kept in view in the ordering of the Jewish Ritual. In other words, the advocates of a sensuous service,—a service which shall attract rather by the eye, than by the ear,—rather by addressing the natural senses, than by appealing to the spiritual understanding ; will, I think, be constrained, on an impartial examination of the Levitical enactments, to confess that the inspired ceremonial of Horeb fails to supply them with the sanction of a divine precedent.

But, to proceed, I am, in the *second* place, free to confess that it *was* avowedly the divine pur-



pose, in ordering the Levitical Ritual, to instruct the Church of Israel, concerning Him that was for to come, by an elaborate typology. In every holy place, in every consecrated person, in every sacred function Moses spake of Christ.

Yes, truly sacrifices and ablutions—varied and multiplied to an extent which led even an Apostle to assert that they imposed “a yoke which neither “we nor our fathers were able to bear,”—all united in proclaiming the necessity of vicarious satisfaction for sin by the atoning blood of Christ, the necessity of personal sanctification from sin by the quickening might of the Holy Ghost. And for us who have been brought into “the clear light and true know-ledge” of the Gospel, there can, I conceive be no exegetical pursuit more interesting, no Scriptural study more profitable, than to follow out, with cautious and reverent step, such Evangelical lessons as we are encouraged by the Epistle to the Hebrews to learn from the Levitical code.

But, my brethen, it is a very different thing, a thing the lawfulness of which is more than doubtful, for any to introduce into Christian worship a symbolism similar to that of the Jewish Ritual.

For note, I pray you, in the *third* place, that the symbolism which did, as we have seen, characterize

the Mosaic dispensation was emphatically a badge of its inferiority to the Christian œconomy.

Yes, verily if that which is carnal is inferior to that which is spiritual ; if that which fails to meet the crying necessities of the sinner is inferior to that which satisfies his utmost need ; if that which is but for a season is inferior to that which is destined to remain ; if shadow fall short of substance ; if bondage be less honourable than liberty ; pupilage than full-age ; then truly is Mosaic Type indelibly branded as inferior to Christian Anti-type. For indeed the symbolism of old was carnal ;—carnal were the victims, carnal were the cleansings, carnal was the priestly qualification. And the symbolism of old was ineffectual for imparting peace to the conscience-stricken worshipper ; “for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats can take away sin.” And the symbolism of old was temporal ; it was “imposed till the time of reformation ;” it was “a figure for the time then present ;” it was “our schoolmaster unto Christ.” In short it was shadow, not substance ; bondage, not freedom ; childhood, not maturity. Truly grievous then is the degradation which he would inflict upon the Church of Christ, who returning to the weak and beggarly elements of the law, would clothe her in the vestments of symbolism.

Yes, a degradation I say such course would be ; for consider I pray you, and this is the *fourth* point to which I desire to call your attention, that to every sanctuary in which is proclaimed the finished work of Christ, in language clear, and full, and certain, belongs, on that very account, a greater glory than any that can be conferred by the most exquisite workmanship, even when wrought under the guidance of a Divine inspiration.

Do you ask for proof? "The glory of this latter house shall be greater than the glory of the former house," was the word with which the Prophet consoled the ancient men who wept at the seemingly humiliating contrast between the temple of Zorobabel and the temple of Solomon. But how so? In all distinction of rite and ceremony, and proportion and adornment, the latter fell infinitely short of the former house. It was "as nothing" in comparison of it. But to the latter house He was to come suddenly who was the Anti-type of all,—the Anti-type of Aaron,—the Anti-type of the scape goat,—the Anti-type of the pascal lamb. In its courts were, for the first time, those glad tidings to be heard which, fulfilling, exhausting all the teaching of the year of jubilee, proclaimed liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.

Thus was the second temple filled with a greater glory than the first, and thus is every sanctuary where, under the Gospel œconomy, Christ is preached, more glorious on that very account than the temple of Solomon with its cedar-wood from Lebanon and its gold from Ophir. And as the stars pale and disappear before that greater light which rules the day, so did all the glories of the Levitical firmament pale and disappear when, with its surpassing glory, the Sun of Righteousness rose upon the world with healing in his wings.

But more than this: the question is not simply one of less glory or more, it is one of incompatibility.

For indeed, and this is the *fifth* important truth to which I would invite your attention, the two, Law and Gospel, Symbolism and Christ, are not only of unequal dignity, they are also of incompatible nature—they cannot co-exist, the one is destructive of the other.

The very idea of symbolism involves the teaching of doctrine. And what was the doctrine taught by Jewish types? It was shortly this, that for the remission of sins shedding of blood was needful, but that no blood had yet been shed which was equal to the emergency. According to the Levitical Ritual sin is not put away, for there is a

remembrance of sin again every year. Now what is the doctrine taught by Christ's Gospel? It is summed up in this,—that for the remission of sins shedding of blood is indeed needful, but that blood has been found, and blood has been shed, which has fully accomplished the task. According to the Gospel of Christ sin has been once and for ever so put away that it should be remembered no more. In other words,—the law of rites and ceremonies, symbolism, declares, even while foreshadowing them, that all the good things of which it supplies countless emblems are yet *for to come*; the Gospel makes known that they are already in their abundant fulness, in their complete formality, *present* amongst men. Hence the two are, as I have stated, absolutely irreconcilable the one with the other; they cannot co-exist, the law decays, waxes old, and vanishes away for ever before the Gospel.

And this, as I would have you in the *sixth* and last place observe, was the great lesson to be learnt from that notable phenomenon which my text records.

“The veil of the temple was rent in twain from “the top to the bottom.” That veil, my brethren, had been originally suspended by command of Jehovah Himself. It separated between the holy

place and the holy of holies. It concealed entirely from all human view the Ark, the Mercy Seat, the Cherubim, the Shekinah. Once, and only once, each year did mortal man pass beyond that barrier. On the great day of atonement the High Priest of Israel, divested of his gorgeous attire and clad in garments of purest white, entered, with blood of sacrifice and odour of incense, within that awful inclosure. But he did not continue there; and, for twelve months, was the way into the typical heavens fast shut up. Of all this the meaning is thus summed up by the Apostle. "The Holy Ghost, "this signifying that the way into the holiest of all "was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." The remaining veil was, in fact, the very epitome of all Ritual teaching, the very heart of all symbolic doctrine; it taught the need of atonement, it taught that atonement had not yet been made.

But now the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world is come. An offering full and sufficient has been made. Sin has for ever been put away,—the way to the throne of grace is open. The voice is heard from the inner sanctuary, "Come "unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, "and I will give you rest." "Ho, every one that

“thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money, come ye, buy and eat: yea come buy wine and milk without money and without price.” The greater glory has come. Free, open access to God exists. Free, open access to God must be proclaimed, and the first announcement shall be given by the Lord Jehovah Himself. His hand hung the veil; His hand shall tear it asunder. “The veil of the temple was rent from the top even to the bottom.”

Thus did Jewish symbol come to its appointed end. True, that infatuated people clung still to it tenaciously. But, as has been very well said, “The temple was now become a common place, distinguished by its splendour, but no longer by its sanctity: the priesthood was abolished; the sacrifices were at an end. The fabric of the house might stand, the sons of Levi might yet linger around it, and the victims might still bleed upon its altar. But with this difference in the sight of heaven,—that whereas the living body had presented the most beautiful form, and breathed the most fragrant incense, in its unceasing service of sacrifice and praise it was now a dead and loathsome carcase, polluting and defiled. And the words of the prophet were fulfilled in the courts of God’s own house,

“He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog’s neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine’s blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol.”<sup>a</sup> And soon, the measure of national iniquity being full, was the voice heard, as the great brazen gates of the temple opened of their own accord, as of a multitude departing with the words “*μεταβαινωμεν εντευθεν.*” Then was the awful transaction completed of which the rending veil was but the initial act, by which the whole Mosaic œconomy was suppressed, overwhelmed, annihilated, in the conflagration and ruins of a temple of which literally not one stone was left upon another.

Such is the award of Holy Scripture in the matter which, at the commencement of this discourse, we referred to its supreme arbitration. We inquired of that inspired volume whether the acknowledged existence, by divine authority, of the Jewish Ritual in days of yore, justifies the introduction, at the present hour, into the Service of the Christian Church of an æsthetic symbolism? The oracles of God have enunciated by way of reply the following

<sup>a</sup> “The Churchmanship of the New Testament.” By J. B. Marsden, M.A. Second Edition. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co., 1867.



infallible propositions : (i.) that the worship of Israel was not, in the purpose of Jehovah, intended for display : (ii.) that that worship was truly, in that same purpose, symbolic : but (iii.), that that very symbolism was a badge of the inferiority of the dispensation of which it was characteristic to (iv.), that œconomy to which belongs the greater glory of an unveiled, unfigurative exhibition of Christ. Nay more (v.), Symbolism and the Gospel are mutually destructive, and therefore (in the sixth and last place) did the Lord Himself, when He introduced the latter into the world, annul the former ; abolishing it not only virtually but actually, by deeds of fearful significance, involving its sudden, complete, and final abrogation.

And now, my brethren, two words in conclusion.

In the first place, learn why, in his Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul so strenuously objected to the imposition of circumcision upon the Gentile converts. It was not, as has been recently alleged, that he selected this rite as the one Jewish institution which, leaving all or nearly all the rest untouched, unchallenged, he would see abolished. But it was that he regarded this observance, as implying and *embodying the entire Mosaic Ritual* ; nay more, that he regarded continued adherence to that ritual as contradictory to the Gospel and incompatible with sal-

vation. Did I say that St. Paul viewed circumcision as implying, embodying the whole Mosaic ritual? Let his own voice be heard in confirmation of my testimony; "I testify to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." (Gal. v. 3.) Was it added that continued adhesion to that Ritual was, in his estimation, contradictory to the Gospel, and fatal to salvation? Let the Apostle himself bear witness to my veracity: "I Paul say unto you that if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing...Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace." (Gal. v. 2, 4)

In the second place, and finally, learn why we, treading in the steps of the Apostle of the Gentiles, repudiate the imposition upon ourselves and our people of a Ritual equal in burden and similar in character to the Jewish ceremonial. It is not, as is too often slanderously reported, that we under estimate the value of comeliness and order in the services of the Sanctuary. God forbid! We are not content that the Ark of God should dwell in curtains, while we ourselves dwell in cedar. But it is because, for the honour of our Lord and for the safety of the souls for whom He poured out His soul unto death, we are constrained to protest against a

system which degrades, emasculates, abolishes, annuls His Gospel. That symbolism which really had inspiration for its warrant, has been done away with by the fiat of our God. Shall any venture, by inventions of merely human fancy and art, to reinstate the principle in the visible Church? No! even if their teaching could by any possibility be doctrinally true, to submit to such ceremonial would be an act of spiritual degradation, a descending from a greater to a lesser glory, an abandoning the clear brightness of noon-day sun for the uncertain guidance of a twilight in which it is neither day nor night. But their teaching is *not* doctrinally sound! *Their symbolism actually neutralizes the teaching of the Gospel.* By the multiplication of renewed expiatory oblations, it practically declares the One Sacrifice to have been ineffectual. By the interposition of a human priesthood between the sinner and his God, it virtually proclaims that the way of direct access to the mercy-seat is closed anew. Can we accept symbolism like this? God forbid. To do so is treason to the Gospel. The veil has been *rent*; we will not suffer it to be suspended afresh. A new and living way has been *opened*; we will not suffer it to be closed again before our eyes. The great High Priest, overflowing with sympathy, stands

ready to receive all who by a direct, a simple faith, would come unto God by Him. We will not consent that earthly mediators should hinder our path and obstruct our access. No! we will come boldly to the throne of grace, and having received life, pardon, peace, through Jesus the Son of God, we will stand fast in the liberty wherewith He hath made us free, and we will not be entangled again in the yoke of bondage.



*THE BREAD OF LIFE ;*

*or,*

*Eating Christ's Flesh, and Drinking His  
Blood.*



## *Eating Christ's Flesh, and Drinking His Blood.*

---

- "I am that bread of life.*
- "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead.*
- "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.*
- "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.*
- "The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?*
- "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.*
- "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.*
- "For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.*



*"He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.*

*"As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.*

*"This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."*—  
John vi. 48—59.

THE various interpretations of this highly important passage are all ultimately reducible to one of two principal expositions. These expositions may be characterized, for the sake of brevity, as the Romish and literal, the Protestant and spiritual.

The Romish exposition is literal. It is based upon the double hypothesis that our Lord is here speaking, by way of anticipation, of the Eucharistic Feast; and that in that feast the bread and the wine are transubstantiated—*tota substantia panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini nostri,—tota substantia vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus.*<sup>a</sup>

The Protestant rendering of the passage is spiritual. It maintains that our Lord speaks generally of that participation in His finished work, and all its attendant blessings, which belongs to every true believer.

<sup>a</sup> Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent.

And it asserts that the special form which His parabolic instruction upon this subject here takes is due, not to a desire to inculcate anything concerning that Holy Supper which had yet to be instituted, but simply to the fact that the miracle of the five loaves and the two fishes, having but recently been performed, was fresh in the minds of His hearers, and afforded a timely, as well as an apt, vehicle of instruction.

These expositions, my brethren, are conflicting ; they are incompatible. Let us examine them, each in its turn, in the light of Holy Scripture ; and may God the Holy Ghost give us grace manfully and persistently to choose the good, and to refuse the evil.

We take, **FIRST**, the literal, the Romish interpretation of my text. It is briefly this—that the bread and the wine in the Supper of the Lord become, in and by the act of consecration, “really and substantially the body and blood, together with the “soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and “therefore the whole of Christ.”<sup>b</sup> Consequently the communicant does, in the act of carnal participation in the consecrated elements, eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood. It is of

<sup>b</sup> Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent.

this, they would have us believe, that the Lord treats in the discourse before us to-day.

Now is this interpretation Scripturally tenable?

Without hesitation I reply in the negative.

I might well remark on the total omission of the element of *wine* throughout our Lord's discourse. Surely had He meant the Jews, had He meant us, to learn lessons concerning the Eucharist, speaking as He did before its actual institution, He would not have failed to name both parts of its outward and visible sign.

But I leave this, and I allege the following reasons:—

1. This interpretation makes the teaching of our Lord in this passage incongruous in its style with all His similar public instructions. "I am the light of the world"—"I am the door"—"I am the true vine." In every one of these examples we have the teaching of symbol and of figure. Surely it needs conclusive proof before we can admit that He speaks literally when He says, "I am the bread of life!"

2. This interpretation makes the teaching of our Lord in this passage contradictory in its statements to the recorded facts and doctrines of the rest of Holy Writ.

Let me illustrate my meaning.

Read, and as you read them ponder well, verses 51 and 54:—"I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. Whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Then answer this question—Shall Judas Iscariot live for ever? Had Judas Iscariot eternal life? Will Judas Iscariot be raised up in blessedness at the last day? And yet so it must be if these verses are to be understood of the Supper of the Lord. For Judas did assuredly partake of that holy feast.

But again read, and as you read ponder well, verse 53:—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." Then answer this question—Shall it be found, after all, that the dying malefactor never entered Paradise? that his portion is to be for ever in the lake of fire? And yet so it must be if these verses are to be understood of the Supper of the Lord. For it is certain that he who said, "Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom," never ate that bread, never drank that wine.

But yet once more, read and ponder verse 56:—"He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood,

“dwelleth in Me, and I in him.” Now compare with it John xv. 5 :—“He that abideth in Me, and I in “him, the same bringeth forth much fruit.” And then, without going back to days of old, say, does every one even of the comparatively few who kneel at those rails bear much fruit?

Or, place the same words side by side with 1 John ii. 28 :—“And now, little children, abide in Him; that, “when He shall appear, we may have confidence, “and not be ashamed before Him at His coming.” And then say, shall no one even of those few be ashamed before Him at His appearing? And yet so it must be, if the Lord speaks in my text of a carnal manducation of the elements in the Eucharist.

I might now go on to verse 57,—“As the living “Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me,”—and I might ask, does every one who eats that bread, and drinks that wine, verify that word? Jesus did indeed live, by, for, *dei, per, propter* the Father—does every communicant live, by, for, *dei, per, propter* the Son?

But I forbear; for I know full well the rejoinder with which the enemy is ready to lull the rising suspicion,—“Is there not a lie in my right hand?” It is suggested that all these blessings actually do belong to the participant at the time of his commu-

nicating—but that in many, nay perhaps in most cases, they are lost by his own subsequent unworthiness.

Brethren, I will not tarry to point out that no such qualification is to be found throughout the whole passage, and that therefore we have no right to import it into our Lord's teaching, in order to save a theory of our own from shipwreck.

But I will remark, that hereby is revealed yet another fatal objection to the literal interpretation of the passage before us. It is this,—

3. This interpretation makes the teaching of our Lord, in some parts of this passage, contradictory to His teaching in other parts of it.

For mark well verses 49, 50, and again verse 58 :—  
 “Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and  
 “are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from  
 “heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.”  
 “This is that bread which came down from heaven :  
 “not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead :  
 “he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.”  
 In their plain, literal, and grammatical sense, these words declare, that herein consists the excellence of the bread given by the Father, that, in every single instance, it confers upon the participant a life un-failing and indestructible. And yet, if the Romish

interpretation of the closely adjoining verses which we have been hitherto pondering be true, many, very many, of those who partake of the bread of heaven shall, without doubt, finally perish.

But I trust that I have said enough to convince you, if conviction were needed, that the literal, the Romish interpretation of the passage before us, is wholly untenable. It makes Him who spake as never man spake, in the style of His teaching, incongruous,—in the matter of His teaching, contradictory to Scripture, contradictory to Himself.

It is a relief, a joy, a great relief, a great joy, to turn—

SECONDLY, to the Protestant, the spiritual interpretation of the passage. It is briefly this,—that the Supper of the Lord is not the subject of any part of this important discourse; that the Lord Jesus, when He makes mention of “giving His flesh for the life of the world,” denotes, by this similitude, that complete and final atonement for sin which He was shortly to accomplish “in His own body on the “tree”;—that, when He speaks of a man eating His flesh, and drinking His blood, He signifies, under that figure the exercise of that living faith, by which alone, and by which infallibly, the penitent sinner appropriates all the enduring benefits, present and to

come, of that finished work. In other words, be the means of grace what they may by which faith is quickened and invigorated, the subject of justification by faith, with all its attendant blessings, is that upon which the Master here instructs His disciples.

Let us try this interpretation by the tests under which the alternative exposition has so signally given way.

I. Does this interpretation make the teaching of our Lord in this passage incongruous in its style with His similar instructions in other portions of the Word? By no means. The very reverse is the case. Sitting on the well of Sychar, He said to the woman who came thither to draw,—“If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give Me to drink: thou wouldest have asked of Him, and He would have given thee living water.” (John iv. 10.) It was of a spiritual water, a spiritual drinking, that He spake. It is but consistent that when He says to the Jews who sought Him (in v. 26 of the chapter now before us), Because they did eat of the loaves and were filled,—“Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give you” (v. 27), He should speak of a spiritual bread, and a spiritual eating.



2. But again, does this interpretation make the teaching of our Lord in this passage contradictory in its statements to the recorded facts and doctrines of the rest of Holy Writ? By no means. The very reverse is the case.

Read again verses 51 and 54:—"I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." "Whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Understand them figuratively, spiritually; is it not most true, most completely in accord with the universal teaching of Holy Writ, that every one, without one single exception, who spiritually eats the flesh of Christ, and drinks His blood—that is, believeth on Him—shall live for ever? hath eternal life? shall rise again to bliss and glory? "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." (John v. 24.)

Take verse 53 figuratively, spiritually. "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." Is it not most true, most completely in accord with the uni-

versal teaching of Holy Writ, that no one who does not spiritually eat His flesh, and drink His blood—that is, no one who does not believe on Him—can or shall live for ever? “He that believeth and is “baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not “shall be damned.” (Mark xvi. 16.) “He that hath “the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son “of God hath not life.” (1 John v. 12.)

Yet, once again, take verse 56 figuratively, spiritually; “He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My “blood, dwelleth in Me and I in Him;” and you are reminded of the certain, the infallible, the testing truth:—“I am the vine, ye are the branches: he “that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringeth “forth much fruit.” (John xv. 5.) “The Scripture “saith, whosoever believeth on Him shall not be “ashamed.” (Rom. x. 11.)

But I pass on, and I remark—

3. That this figurative, this spiritual interpretation, gives a grand consistency and cogency to the teaching of the whole passage. The literal, the carnal Israel, eating of a literal and a carnal manna, died, —“Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, “and are dead.” The figurative, the spiritual Israel, eat of a figurative, a spiritual bread from heaven, and they live for ever:—“This is the bread that

“cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and *not* die. Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but My Father giveth you “the *true* bread from heaven.” (Ver. 32.)

But why say more? If any doubt yet lingers in any mind as to the question *which* is right—the Romish and literal, or the Protestant and figurative interpretation of this passage, surely the declaration of the Lord Himself should be final upon the point:—“It is the Spirit that quickeneth; *the flesh profiteth nothing* (even if you could and did eat My very flesh, and drink My very blood, it would do you “no good): the words that I speak unto you they “are spirit, and they are life.” (Ver. 63.)

And now two concluding words by way of practical exhortation.

I have, my brethren, spoken of that interpretation of this passage which I would deprecate, as Romish. But I must caution you against a perilous misapprehension. This teaching is no longer confined to the assemblies of avowed Papists. False brethren have crept in unawares, to spy out the liberty which we have in Christ. A dogma, for the denial of which Cranmer, and Ridley, and Latimer were burned, is now—by manuals of devotion, by discourses from the pulpit, but, above all, by the elaborate symbo-

lism of a gorgeous ritual, taught amongst ourselves. And then there are explanations and refinements, under which—drawing distinctions where there is no difference—these novel teachers hide from themselves and from others the too certain fact, that they are sliding back into the old Apostacy. But, brethren, call it what they will, it is the very essence of Popery. Call it Anglicanism!—it is Romanism in its core. It is an error at the very foundation—fatal, soul-destroying; for it leads those ensnared by it from seeking Christ in His own appointed way, where He can be found, to seeking Him in a way of man's devising, where He cannot be found,—from seeking Him by the exercise of a spiritual faith, to seeking Him by the operation of a carnal contact. Beware then, I entreat you, of the first beginnings of evil. Shun all sympathy with—have no dalliance with—the ritualism of the day. "*Principiis obsta.*" Once permit the table of the Lord to become an altar: once permit the notion of a corporal presence to creep in, and great, very great is the danger of that word being literally fulfilled in you which we read in Psalm lxix. 22:—"Let their table become "a snare before them: and that which should have "been for their welfare let it become a trap." Mark well the words—"that which should have been for

“their welfare,” for indeed I trust that no one who hears me to-day will for one moment imagine that I would depreciate the blessed, the Scriptural Supper of the Lord. For indeed that Supper is for the welfare of every one who, with broken and contrite spirit, feeds upon Christ in his heart, by faith with thanksgiving.

But then there is another danger. The armour of righteousness is needed on the right hand, as well as on the left. I trust that I have shown that the Protestant interpretation of the passage before us is the right,—the Scriptural interpretation. It is by a simple faith that the hungry, the thirsty, the mourning sinner, becomes partaker of the finished work of Christ, and of all the matchless blessings which flow therefrom. But let it ever be remembered, that while the carnal contact, which brings us not to Christ, is within the power of nature, the spiritual faith which really apprehends Him is only of the operation of grace. Whilst, therefore, with the utmost eagerness I would re-echo, to every weary and heavy-laden one, my Master's words, “Come unto Me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest,”—while I would, from the chapter before us, rehearse that other most comfortable saying, “All that the Father giveth

“Me shall come to Me, and him that cometh to Me  
“I will in nowise cast out;” I must not shrink from  
warning the sensual, the worldly, the thoughtless,  
the procrastinator, against the notion that it will be  
as easy a matter to flee to Jesus in the hour of  
extremity, as it may be to betake oneself to the  
ministrations of the priest. The priest may draw  
near, he may exhort, he may impart the memorials  
of Christ’s dying love; we may listen, we may eat,  
we may drink; all this is within his power and  
ours, but more neither he nor we can do. “No  
“man,” it is written in verse 44—and if these words  
alone existed to determine the question they would  
be conclusive for the spiritual rendering of the pas-  
sage—“No man can come to Me except the Father  
“which hath sent Me draw him.” Faith is the gift  
of the Holy Ghost, of Him who is Jehovah, the  
Giver of Life, *Dominus et Vivificans*. And is it  
likely that the Father will, by Him, draw those, in  
the hour of sickness and death, who have wilfully  
and deliberately set Him at nought in the hour of  
life and health? Is it not written, “Because I have  
“called, and ye refused; I stretched out My hand,  
“and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought  
“all My counsel, and would none of My reproof: I  
“also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock

“when your fear cometh; when your fear cometh  
“as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a  
“whirlwind; when distress and anguish cometh  
“upon you. Then shall they call upon Me, but I  
“will not answer; they shall seek Me early, but  
“they shall not find Me.” (See Prov. i. 24—28.)

O then be up and doing at once: for except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you; and ye cannot, ye will not, eat that flesh, and drink that blood, except Himself make you hunger and thirst, and then Himself impart. Plead then with Him who has said, “If ye being evil know how to give good gifts  
“unto your children, how much more shall your  
“heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that  
“ask Him.” Tell Him that though you have been baptized, you need something more; that you need that Spirit’s teaching which shall make you feel what a sinner you are, what a Saviour He is; and bringing you to Him, shall teach you by a living faith,—in the ordinances of His house, in the devotions of the closet, in the daily lifelong walk of faith, to say,—“His flesh is meat indeed, His  
“blood is drink indeed.”

---

*London: William Hunt and Company.*

*THE PRIMACY OF PÊTER;*

*or,*

*The Church and her Rock, The Kingdom  
and its Keys.*





## *The Primacy of Peter.*

---

*“And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona : for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.*

*“And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church ; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*

*“And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”—  
Matt. xvi. 17—19.*

UPON these words the Bishop of Rome grounds his claim to the unquestioning allegiance of universal Christendom. “Sitting in that chair in which Peter “the prince of the Apostles, sat to the close of life” —I am translating into English the words of the Catechism of Trent—“the Catholic Church recog-

“nizes, in the person of the supreme Pontiff, the most exalted degree of dignity, and the full amplitude of jurisdiction ; a dignity and a jurisdiction not based on synodal, or other human constitutions, but emanating from no less an authority than God himself. As the successor of St. Peter, and the true and legitimate Vicar of Jesus Christ, he therefore presides over the universal Church, the father and governor of all the faithful.”

In reply, it might well be observed that, even were it certain that a primacy was conferred upon Simon Bar-Jona in the words of our text, it would still remain to be proved, before we can safely addict ourselves to “the Roman obedience,”—first, that the authority so vested in Peter was to be transmitted to his official successors ; and secondly, that the Popes of Rome are his legitimate episcopal representatives. For the former of these assumptions Scripture gives not even the semblance of a warranty. Not one word, not one single word, is written in any of its pages, of any descent of the dignity of Peter, be that dignity what it may, to those who should subsequently be holders of his See. The latter of these assumptions is, to say the least, a subject of serious historic controversy.

Certainly no traces exist in Scripture of any connection between Peter and Rome. He was, we are told, the Apostle not of the uncircumcision but of the circumcision. Many as are the persons saluted by Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, the name of Peter is not found amongst them. The only locality associated with him beyond the confines of Syria, is by himself called Babylon. An interpretation which should identify that Babylon with Rome, would indeed be perilous to all Rome's fondest and most cherished pretensions.

But did our blessed Lord, in the words of my text, confer any supremacy at all upon His servant Peter?

Without hesitation I answer,—or rather I would humbly but confidently say Scripture answers—in the negative.

Did time permit, we might note the subsequent and repeated contentions as to priority of rank, which arose amongst the disciples. Again: Your attention might be called to the memorable petition of the mother of Zebedee's children. Or, once more, you might be reminded how, in after days at Antioch, Paul resisted Peter to the face. And it might well be asked,—“Is it possible, with all these

“facts before us, to believe that Supremacy had “already been conferred upon Peter, in the presence of the whole Apostolic college, by the Great “Head of the Church?” Above all, we might call your attention to the profound, the ominous, silence of all the New Testament writers, including Peter himself, upon the matter of his alleged primacy. Other fundamental doctrines present themselves at every turn, in many and various garbs; this occurs no where else. And yet, if true, it yields to none, yea rather it takes precedence of all, in vital importance.

But we may well be content with the examination of the passage itself. For it will be found to contain within it every thing necessary for the refutation of the Papal pretensions.

My text obviously resolves itself into three parts. The *first*,—“Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will “I build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not “prevail against it.” The *second*,—“And I will give “unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.” The *third*,—“And whatsoever thou shalt bind on “earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever “thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in “heaven.”

Now, of these three groups of propositions, there can be no question that the last is, *prima facie*, the strongest ascription of spiritual power to the Apostle Peter. It is indeed probable, that had it not been for these its closing and culminating utterances, the whole passage would never have attracted so much attention as has always been given to it in controversy.

But, before you concede the point, turn to Matt. xviii. 15—18:—"Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a Publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Here a promise, identical in its wording with that which in my text is addressed individually to Peter, is spoken, without limitation, to all and every of the disciples of the Lord.

A similar remark may be made, in passing, respecting what is generally, and that not without reason, assumed to be a parallel passage in the Gospel of St. John, chapter xx, verses 22, 23:—"And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." Here a power which is, in my text, apparently deposited with Peter only, is found to be the common prerogative of the whole Apostolic brotherhood.

Without at present entering upon the exposition of either of these sayings of the Lord Jesus, mark the logical issue of the mere similarity, or identity, of their utterances with that portion of my text which is immediately under consideration. It is this: The last words, the most literal words, the strongest words of the whole passage before us, are found, on inquiry, to predicate nothing of Peter which is not elsewhere predicated, if not of all his fellow believers, at least of all his fellow Apostles. Take them alone, without claiming for them any reflex influence upon the rendering of the sentences which are bound up with them in so intimate a connection and by so close a sequence, and they at

least must be withdrawn from the array of Scripture proofs of the Petrine Supremacy. Give them that ruling power of interpretation over the entire context which so naturally belongs to them, and the whole passage, from beginning to end, must disappear from the pro-Papal phalanx.\*

I am the more careful to make this remark, that you may clearly see that, if the consideration of the words to which I am alluding is now relegated to a future occasion, it is not because I have any fear whatsoever of dealing with them. For, in very truth, they are most emphatically Protestant against the usurpation of the Bishop of Rome.

To-day we turn to the two earlier divisions of our text. They are these: The first,—“Thou art Peter, “and upon this rock I will build my Church, and “the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” The second,—“I will give unto thee the keys of the “kingdom of heaven.”

There are two terms here, the Scriptural significance of which it is needful to bear in careful remembrance:—“Church,” “Kingdom of heaven.”

*What doth the Lord mean by, “My Church”?*

\* See Note on page 21, and the Author’s Sermon on the Apostolic Commission.



Whenever in Holy Scripture, the word "Church" is used (as it is used in the passage before us) absolutely, and without qualification, it signifies,—not any one visible corporation, how august soever that body may be, but that spiritual society, indefinable by man but well known to God, of which our Communion Office makes mention, when it speaks of "the mystical body of God's dear Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people." This it is which is called (in Hebrews xii.) "the general assembly and Church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven." This it is of which it is written (in Eph. v.), "Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing." This it is which is (in Eph. i.) declared to be His body, "the fulness of Him, who filleth all in all." This is the Church which He "nourisheth and cherisheth." "That Church of Christ," saith good old Richard Hooker,\* "which we properly term His body mystical, can be but one; neither can that one be sensibly discerned

\* Eccl. Polity, Book III. ; in initio.

“by any man, inasmuch as parts thereof are some  
“in heaven already with Christ, and the rest that  
“are on earth (albeit their natural persons be visible),  
“we do not discern under this property whereby  
“they are truly and infallibly of that body. Only  
“our minds by intellectual conceit are able to  
“apprehend that such a real body there is,—a body  
“collective, because it containeth a huge multitude;  
“a body mystical, because the mystery of their  
“conjunction is removed altogether from sense.  
“Whatsoever we read in Scripture concerning the  
“endless love and the saving mercy which God  
“showeth towards His Church, the only proper  
“subject thereof is this Church. Concerning this  
“flock, it is that our Lord and Saviour hath pro-  
“mised,—‘I give unto them eternal life, and they  
“‘shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck  
“‘them out of My hands.’ They who are of this  
“society have such marks and notes of distinction  
“from all others, as are not object unto our sense;  
“only unto God who seeth their hearts, and under-  
“standeth all their secret cogitations, unto Him they  
“are clear and manifest. All men knew Nathanael  
“to be an Israelite; but our Saviour, piercing deeper,  
“giveth further testimony of him than men could

“have done with such certainty as He did:—‘Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile.’”

*But what doth the Lord mean by “the kingdom of heaven”?* In the Gospel of St. Matthew the term “kingdom of heaven,” corresponding to the term “kingdom of God” in the other Gospels, is used most frequently to signify that mixed society of Christians in name and Christians indeed, which is, in the language of divines and of Hooker amongst the number, so frequently named,—“The visible Church.” Need I remind you, by way of proof, of the parable of the tares and the wheat? of the parable of the net which being cast into the sea gathered of every kind? of the parable of the wise virgins and the foolish? In every one of these cases our blessed Lord opens His lips with the words,—“The kingdom of heaven is likened unto.” The kingdom of heaven is, in short, the whole body of them who by baptism “profess and call themselves Christians.”

Now, if these statements as to the meaning of the terms “Church” on the one hand and “kingdom of heaven” on the other be Scriptural and true, it is at once evident that the two portions of our text which we reserve for consideration to-day are distinct, not

only in predicate, but also in subject. When Christ speaks of "My Church," He speaks of one thing; when He speaks of "the kingdom of heaven," He makes mention of another.

Yes, truly, when He saith,—“Upon this Rock will I build My Church,” He speaketh, whatever that Rock may be, of that work which is so beautifully set forth in the 2nd chapter of Ephesians, verses 19—22:—“Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the Chief Corner Stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.” Here, as I would have you in passing remark, the same thing is said of all the Apostles and Prophets which the Romanists allege to be said of Peter exclusively. And thus, in truth, is this portion also of our text removed from the pro-Papal phalanx.

But, to return,—This is the work which Peter himself pours in his First Epistle, chapter ii., verses 4 and 5:—“To whom coming, as unto a liv-

“ing stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.” This is the work of which (when the topmost stone shall have been put to it, with shoutings of “Grace, grace unto it,” when all the scaffolding of temporal, civil and ecclesiastical appliances shall have been for ever swept away) the full proportions, the perfect symmetry shall be seen, as the New Jerusalem cometh down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

And what foundation shall be adequate to sustain for ever so mighty, so glorious a superstructure? Shall Peter supply this need? Peter!—ignorant, timid, unbelieving, dying Peter? Peter, who straight-way so offends, that he is by the Lord Himself denounced as an adversary,—speaking under the promptings of that great adversary, the Devil? No surely, none save the Rock Christ, the Rock of Ages! Jehovah Jesus, and He alone, is equal to support the colossal edifice.

And this, Peter and his brother Apostles would well understand. For they would recal the fact, that the word “rock” occurs in the Old Testament record

some one hundred and fifty times. Of these in one half, as nearly as may be, the word is used in a literal, in the other half in a symbolical, sense. In no case is the word metaphorically applied, save to a Divine Being, or to one who assumes to be Divine. "The Lord," saith David, "is my Rock and my Fortress." "He is the Rock: His work is perfect." "Their rock is not as our Rock." "Trust ye in the Lord for ever; for in the Lord Jehovah IS THE ROCK OF AGES."\* These and many similar quotations would readily occur to their minds. Accordingly they would understand their Lord to say,—“Thou art Peter,” a stone—*πετρος*—“but I am “a Rock,”—*πετρα*—“and upon Myself, as a sure Foundation, will I build My Church.”

“And the gates of hell,” the Lord further declares, “shall not prevail against it.” Doth “hell,” “hades,” signify the mansions of the dead? Doth the pronoun “it” stand for the Rock? Then is it as though the Master would say,—“Do not be dismayed. Do “not for one moment think that My promise has “failed and come to an end if you see Me die. I “shall die; I shall pass into the unseen dwellings of

\* Isaiah xxvi. 4. Margin.

“the departed. My foes shall seem to have triumphed over Me. But tarry a while. Three days shall not have passed away before I shall rise again, and that shout of triumph shall echo throughout the Church militant and triumphant: “The stone which the builders rejected is become “the Head Stone of the corner. This is the Lord’s “doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.”

Or, must “hell,” “hades,” be taken to symbolize the powers of darkness in general? and must the word “it” be regarded as representing the Church? Then is the most comfortable assurance given in this portion of my text that how many, how great soever, may be the vicissitudes through which that Church shall pass in her conflict with the world, the flesh, and the devil, she shall still survive and shall finally emerge from the strife more than conqueror through Him that loved her. “Because I live, ye shall live also.”

The first division, therefore, of our text affords no support to the doctrine of Peter’s supremacy. But what of the second? It certainly is addressed to the Apostle individually. “I will give unto thee,” saith the Lord, “the keys of the kingdom of heaven.” Does not this confer supremacy? By no

means. For remember what is meant by the kingdom of heaven, and consider what is the use of a key.

The kingdom of heaven is the visible Church,—the whole company of those who, being baptized, have professed and called themselves Christians. A key is that which opens the door of entrance. And by whom was “the door of faith opened” (Acts xiv. 27)—by that “key of knowledge” (Luke xi. 52), the living Word of God,—in the first instance to the Jew and in the second to the Gentile? Was it not by the Apostle Peter? He it was who preached to the assembled Jews and proselytes on the Day of Pentecost, when as many as three thousand at once of the seed of Abraham, entered by the door into the visible Church,—the kingdom of heaven. He it was who preached to the Gentile Cornelius and his assembled household, when, for the first time, men uncircumcised, strangers to the covenants of promise and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, entered by the door into the visible Church,—the kingdom of heaven. But did the promise given in my text, that this should be the case, invest the Apostle with any supremacy? Assuredly not. It simply conferred a privilege, which from its very



nature was exhausted in its exercise, and could not by any possibility be delegated to his successors.

I have now, beloved brethren, laid before you what I verily believe to be the Scriptural interpretation of these memorable words of our blessed Lord. He had put to His Apostles the searching question,—“But whom say ye that I am?” True to that impetuosity of zeal which was the distinguishing feature of his character, Peter had hastened to reply,—“Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living “God.” The Lord Jesus, after reminding him whence, and whence alone, that blessed conviction had been derived, makes use of Peter’s name, according to a frequent practice of prophetic speech, as a point of departure in the enunciation of a most precious truth: “Thou art Peter, a stone; “and upon this Rock, Myself, I will build up My “mystical temple, the Church. And be not dis-  
“mayed, though Satan may seem at times to  
“triumph; he shall not prevail: the Rock and the  
“spiritual house built thereon shall stand for ever.” He then recurs to Peter, and bestows upon him a privilege, which was indeed most honourable, but which once exercised, could neither be repeated nor transmitted,—the privilege of being the first

herald of the Gospel to the Jew, the first herald of the Gospel to the Gentile, after that memorable day when ascending up on high He led captivity captive, and received gifts for men.

And now two short words in conclusion !

In the first place, think not, my brethren, that we do amiss in bringing subjects like these before you. The Scriptures are wrested by the enemy to the destruction of souls. How can that danger best be obviated? Not by shunning the passages which he most adroitly and most frequently employs,—not by postponing their examination till the affections have already been won, and the judgment has already been enthralled,—but by expounding to you beforehand, while yet you are free to choose the good and refuse the evil, their true and intended force and significance. I speak from personal experience when I say, that many a heart-rending perversion to Popery would never, humanly speaking, have occurred had parents and teachers been as careful to inform and instruct the mind, as they were eager to influence and stimulate the affections, of their scholars and their children.

Secondly, and lastly, you have all, beloved brethren, been admitted into the kingdom of heaven, the

visible Church. The doors opened on the day of Pentecost, and in the chamber of Cornelius, have never since been closed. Great, unspeakably great, are your consequent privileges. But privileges unaccompanied by grace are but aggravations of woe. The Servant that knew his Lord's will and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes. Rest not then, I earnestly pray, until you know, to your endless comfort, that Jesus hath Himself built you up upon the Rock. For blessed indeed is every mother's son who is in such a case! The enemy may, the enemy will, come in like a flood. Ancient land-marks may, ancient land-marks shall, be swept away. The scaffolding which, while it serves to raise, still obscures the Church of the living God, may, nay it shall, totter and fall, but—

Glorious things of thee are spoken,  
Zion, city of our God :  
He whose word can ne'er be broken,  
Formed thee for His own abode.  
On the Rock of Ages founded,  
What can shake thy sure repose?  
With salvation's wall surrounded,  
Thou mayest smile at all thy foes !

---

## NOTE.

For John xx. 21—23, as bearing upon Auricular Confession and Priestly Absolution, see the Author's Sermon on "The Apostolic Commission."

With regard to Matthew xviii. 15—18, in its relation to the same subject, the following facts, patent on the very surface of the passage, seem to prove conclusively that here, at least, is no authority for the Sacrament of Penance :—

i. The instructions here given have reference to one class alone of transgressions,—namely that of the trespasses of brethren against each other.

The Law of Penance embraces all sins of every kind, with all their circumstances.

ii. The rule here given is one of exceptional and unfrequent application.

The Law of Penance is one binding upon all persons, during the whole course of their lives.

iii. The power of binding and loosing herein recognized, is not to be called into exercise, until three other alternatives have been previously tried without success,—viz., (*a*) private remonstrance; (*b*) expostulation in the presence of "one or two more;" (*c*) solemn exhortation on the part of the whole "Church" in its collective capacity.

The Sacrament of Penance is the primary, and the indispensable, resource of every man who falls into sin after Baptism.

iv. The power of binding and loosing is, according to St. Matthew's Gospel, vested not in any one individual, whether Minister or otherwise, but in the whole Church, comprising clergy and laity alike, in its collective and corporate capacity.

The power of binding and loosing is, according to Rome, lodged exclusively in the hands of the Priest, or his Superior, acting singly in his judicial capacity.

---

*London :*  
*William Hunt and Company.*

**THE  
CIVIL RULER GOD'S MINISTER;**

*or,*

*Church Establishments based on New  
Testament Principles.*



## *The Civil Ruler God's Minister.*

---

*"For he is the minister of God to thee for good."—*  
Rom. xiii. 4.

THE New Testament *seems, at first sight, to be* silent as to the duty which, in a commonwealth of professing Christians, the State owes to the Church.

And the reasons for this silence are obvious.

In the first place, "all the direct instruction "which is given in the Apostolic writings, is adapted "to the position of the Church at the time, and has "reference to it."<sup>a</sup> Now no secular commonwealth of professing Christians did, when these documents were penned, exist. The civil government, whether of Jewry or of the Gentile nations, was, on principle and of necessity, opposed to the faith of the crucified Nazarene. Consequently, positive enactments for the guidance of the temporal ruler would have

<sup>a</sup> Bishop O'Brien, Charge to the Clergy of the united Diocese of Ossory and Ferns. 1854. p. 167.



been at once superfluous and injurious: superfluous, as under present circumstances impracticable, injurious, as aggravating the already too bitter antagonism.

In the second place, it was not the purpose of God that under the new covenant any one outward regimen should, as under the ancient œconomy, have supreme and exclusive precedence. The fundamental principle upon which, if I understand his argument aright, Richard Hooker constructed his great work on the Ecclesiastical Polity, is indisputably sound and good. It is not that Episcopacy, of which he was the champion, is of Divine right; while Presbyterianism, of which his opponent was the advocate, is sacrilegious; but that the Inspired Word hath left the question open, in order that, as years passed on, and the Gospel brought various nations, under differing circumstances, beneath its sway, "the Church and its members might devise "rules for themselves, by inference and analogy "from the general principles already laid down."<sup>b</sup>

"From the general principles," I say, "already "laid down;" for, after all, the silence of the New

<sup>b</sup> O'Brien, p. 167, 168.

Testament upon the matter in question is only *seeming*: for it does, in truth, enunciate principles abundantly sufficient to "enable States, as they "become Christianized, to determine what course "they ought to pursue with reference to this important object:" and those principles, I am bold to affirm, must, when fairly carried out, inevitably result in the accomplishment of that prophecy appertaining to Gospel days to which, from this pulpit, I directed your attention some weeks ago: "The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, "and their kings shall minister unto thee." (Isaiah lx. 10.)

Of the enunciation of such a principle, my text, and indeed the whole context from which it is taken, presents a notable example. It addressed the disciples of Christ in their civil capacity. So addressing them, it declares of the ruling power, be that power what it may, that it is "the minister of "God to thee for good:" in other words, the civil power has a twofold relation,—a relation toward God and a relation toward man. The relation toward God is expressed thus: "He is the minister "of God." The relation toward man is thus exhibited: "He is the minister of God *to thee* for good."

Here, in germ, in embryo, in principle, waiting only for its full manifestation for the day when the Gospel should have vanquished the nations, is all that we contend for when we affirm that the State is bound alike by its filial relation toward God, and by its paternal relation toward man, to regulate, to endow, and to sustain the Church.

Give me, beloved, your candid and your patient audience. The subject is not one which I should willingly or often choose ; but these are days in which it is especially needful that you should be able, with meekness and fear, to give a reason of the hope that is in you as members of the Established Church of England : and such a reason you will not be able to give if we, your teachers, your instructors, your guides, shrink from making very plain to you the solid Scriptural basis on which we claim to stand in our relations with the civil government of the realm.

Notice, then, my brethren, in the FIRST place, that the civil power is the minister, the servant, the *διακονος*, of God.

It is unnecessary to enquire from what proximate and immediate source that power may spring, nor is it needful to examine the special and rational shape it may assume when called into existence: *there it*

is, exercising the functions of civil government. The Scriptures command us to regard it as the servant, the minister, of God; ultimately deriving its authority from, and owing a responsibility to, Him. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." (Rom. xiii. 1, 2.)

Now mark well the issue to which this principle leads. The Gospel works its way in society. The little leaven once hidden in the three measures of meal has now leavened the whole lump. Disciples who, as subjects of the State, were divinely instructed to regard their rulers as the ministers or servants of God, become rulers themselves. Are they to ignore, to abandon, to repudiate, the principle inculcated under different circumstances? Surely not. If, within the limits imposed by the necessities of the case, Paul could speak of a system of which the heathen Nero was the head, as providentially, though unconsciously, deriving its authority from the King of nations, shall the professedly Christian Constantine refuse to recognize his own relation to the Most High God as His servant? Surely not.

And if he would recognize it, what must he do? He must avowedly, officially, as a civil ruler, render homage to the Sovereign Ruler of heaven and earth. "It may be left" (I am quoting the words of one of the ablest of living Irish prelates, Bishop O'Brien, of Ossory) "to every well ordered mind to answer the question, whether it is fitting or safe that the depositary of such authority should wield it without acknowledging that it is held from God and under Him and for Him; and in every exercise of it, asking for His guidance and blessing? This is a question which seems to admit of but one answer. It cannot but be felt; and in point of fact, until something is done to unsettle the spontaneous conclusion to which common sense and common feeling conduct all unsophisticated minds, is always felt, that a position of acknowledged dependence is the only one suited to such a delegate power; that a power so raised up by God, and armed by Him, charged by Him with such interests and such duties, and commissioned by Him in so important a sense to represent Himself in the world, is bound to confess Him and to worship Him."° To cite the words of inspiration: "A

°O'Brien, p. 79, 80.

“son honoureth his father, and a servant his master :  
“if then I be a father, where is mine honour? and  
“if I be a master, where is my fear?” (Mal. i. 6.)

And here we have at once the principle of the national profession of a pure Christianity. I say of the national profession of a pure “Christianity;” for the Christian who has become a statesman may not leave his Bible behind him: and the pages of that Book are plain as to the nature of the worship which alone is acceptable to Jehovah. “This is my “beloved Son, hear Him.” “I am the Way, the “Truth, and the Life: no man” (whether he be citizen, prince, or people) “cometh unto the Father “but by Me.”

Time will not permit me to trace this principle to all its legitimate applications. Suffice it to say, passing over the original establishment of Christianity in our island, that it abundantly justifies that great Ecclesiastical Revolution which was consummated at the blessed Reformation. The State found itself pledged to a national profession of Christianity, but the purity of that profession had been corrupted in the lapse of ages. The State, as the minister of God, convinced that its homage had ceased to be such as He could accept, purged out the leaven of

superstition and error, and returned, in its national worship, to "the simplicity that is in Christ." And has not the Lord hitherto honoured the nation that thus under the guidance of its rulers honoured Him? Surely Britain is a joy and a praise set on high among the inhabitants of the earth. On the other hand, can we look for a continuance of His favour, if, even in part, we withdraw the national homage, which, by the establishment of a Scriptural Christianity, we render to Jehovah? "Them that honour Me, I will honour" (this we have found true: have we now to learn the truth of the reverse?); "and those that despise Me shall be lightly "esteemed." And can any despising of Him be more flagrant, more displeasing, than after centuries of national recognition to withdraw the public acknowledgment by which a nation declares of its civil governor that "He is the minister of God"?

But it is time that we notice, in the SECOND place, that the civil power is the servant, the minister of God *to thee* for good, *εις το αγαθον*. In other words, the ruler is entrusted by God with his delegated authority for the good of his subjects: it is his mission, his duty, his proper work, to seek their good.

Hence, and no one will venture to dispute my assertion, the functions and offices of Government are, in all secular matters, essentially paternal. The preservation of bodily health, the development of material resources, the security, the prosperity of the people,—these, and a thousand others (all those things in short which political œconomists comprehend in the idea of “the wealth of nations”), are temporal objects which the powers that be are bound, as God’s ministers, to endeavour by all wise and lawful means to compass and achieve.

But, as I said before, mark well the full bearing of this principle. The Gospel works its way in society. The seat of the ruler is occupied by the disciples of that Jesus who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light by His Gospel. He has taught them that man is a being of two parts,—of two worlds: he has a soul as well as a body: there is a life which is to come as well as the life which now is. Shall they ignore, abandon, repudiate these lessons? Impossible, my Brother, if they would be the ministers of God to thee “for good:” for can he be said to seek thy good who cares for thy body, but not for thy soul? who has



regard to thy present life, which is but a span long ; and heeds not thy future life, which can only be measured by eternity itself ?

It would be quite possible, did my time allow me to do so, to prove that the temporal health of a State cannot be compassed by rulers who neglect the eternal weal of their subjects. Here, also, the word is true, both in its positive and its negative aspect : " Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His " righteousness ; and all these things shall be added " unto you." God grant that that word may never be spoken of us ! " Oh that My people had heark- " ened unto Me, and Israel had walked in my ways ! " (Psalm lxxxix. 13.)

I might also remind you, apart from this consideration, that the parental relation in which the State stands to its members, imposes upon it, in an especial degree, and with a peculiar urgency, the care of " those interests which are least likely to be " cared for wisely and well, or cared for at all, by " themselves. Such interests, if any, are their spiritual " interests...for, momentous as they are, there are " none to which the great body of the people are so " prone to give but slight and insufficient attention, " or to neglect altogether. This is quite enough to

“make them proper matter for the care and consideration of the State.”<sup>d</sup>

But I must refrain. It is enough to say that the civil “Ruler,” *who* would indeed adequately discharge his duty, and meet his responsibility as the minister of God to thee for good, must provide thee, for thyself and for thy children, and for thy children’s children, with pastors after God’s heart, who shall feed thee, and them that come after thee, with knowledge and understanding. I enter not into the question whether these pastors shall be ranged in triple or single rank; whether they shall be bishops, priests, and deacons, or presbyters only. But I do say that, under some form of permanent national provision, the civil ruler owes it to God no less than to thee, to provide that every sheep may have its fold, and every fold its shepherd, who shall be ready to lead the flock into the green pastures, and to make them lie down by the still waters of Gospel truth.

Hence our rulers did rightly when in England, Scotland, and Ireland they established Churches of the Reformation. Surely it has, so far as those Churches have had fair opportunity of acting up to

<sup>d</sup> O’Brien, p. 89.

their principles, been well with our people for three centuries of time. It has been as though that prayer had been answered: "Rid me, and deliver me from the hand of strange children, whose mouth speaketh vanity, and their right hand is a right hand of falsehood: that our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth; that our daughters may be as corner stones, polished after the similitude of a palace: that our garners may be full, affording all manner of store: that our sheep may bring forth thousands and ten thousands in our streets: that our oxen may be strong to labour; that there be no breaking in, nor going out; that there be no complaining in our streets. Happy is that people, that is in such a case; yea, happy is that people, whose God is the Lord." (Psalm cxliv. 11—15.)

But if our rulers did rightly when they established the Churches of the Reformation, surely they shall not do rightly should the day ever come when they shall withdraw from that noble army of evangelists, the clergy of the Irish Protestant Communion, that sanction and support which have been hitherto accorded to them, and shall thus, so far as in them lies, by the discouragement of truth, and by giving free

course to error, abandon all claim to be "the minister of God" to Ireland for her highest good. "For pass over the isles of Chittim, and see; and send unto Kedar, and consider diligently, and see if there be such a thing. Hath a nation changed their gods, which are yet no gods? but My people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit. Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid, be ye very desolate, saith the Lord. For My people have committed two evils; they have forsaken Me the Fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." (Jer. ii. 10—13.)

And now to conclude. I have shown sufficiently, I trust, that the New Testament Scriptures, if only in the passage from which my text is taken (and you know well that that passage does not stand alone), exhibit, maintain, sanctify the principle, under the Gospel œconomy, of such a National Establishment of Christianity, as is the intended burden of the prophetic declaration, "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers."

And now permit me to leave with you certain corollaries which flow from all that has been said.

They shall be briefly spoken, but I trust that by the Lord's people they will be carefully pondered.

First: do not let those who desire to love and serve the Lord listen for a moment to teachers who would have them stand aloof from all concerns of earthly State. On the principles inculcated by some mistaken brethren, it would be impossible for a State to have a single real Christian in any one of its departments. What then becomes of my text? "He is the minister of God to thee for good." Are there then places in God's service of which it is essential that they be filled by ungodly men?

Secondly: do not listen to the plea that is frequently urged from another quarter, namely,—that the consistency of a ruler is adequately maintained if he is individually a Christian, but officially a Gallio, caring for none of these things. Such a plea would never for one moment be tolerated in the dealings of man with man. Who acquits the servant from blame, however chaste, sober, or honest he may be, who deliberately neglects, nay rather who positively hinders, the work he was appointed to execute, to further, to encourage, to protect? Give an account of thy stewardship, for thou mayest be no longer steward; I appointed thee over my house

to give each member of my family his portion of meat in due season; and instead of bread thou hast given them a stone. And think you that God will do otherwise with His servants? with rulers whom He appointed over His heritage to be ministers to them for good?

Thirdly: be thankful for the relations in which in this happy land the Church stands to the State. There are those (another class of persons *is* now passing before my eye) who chafe and fret, as some do not scruple to speak, beneath the "yoke and "fetters" of civil control. When we see the lengths to which, even under the present conditions of their position, some will dare to go, in undoing the work of the Reformation, we cannot, beloved, be too grateful for the check which the laws of our land impose upon their designs.

Nor can we too earnestly pray that our God may, in His own way, and by the means He counts best, so frustrate their enterprise that this Church and nation may still wholly retain, and abundantly enjoy, from generation to generation, without curtailment and without alloy, all the good, all the spiritual good, which at the blessed Reformation she received by the ministration of her kings.

## PRAYER FOR THE ACCESSION.

“BLESSED Lord, who hast called Christian Princes  
“to the defence of Thy Faith, and hast made it  
“their duty to promote the spiritual welfare, to-  
“gether with the temporal interest of their people ;  
“we acknowledge with humble and thankful hearts  
“Thy great goodness to us, in setting Thy servant  
“our most gracious Queen over this Church and  
“Nation ; give her, we beseech Thee, all those  
“heavenly graces that are requisite for so high a  
“trust ; let the work of thee her God prosper in  
“her hands ; let her eyes behold the success of her  
“designs for the service of Thy true Religion es-  
“tablished amongst us ; and make her a blessed  
“instrument of protecting and advancing Thy  
“Truth, wherever it is persecuted and oppressed ;  
“let hypocrisy and profaneness, superstition and  
“idolatry, fly before her face ; let not heresies and  
“false doctrines disturb the peace of the Church,  
“nor schisms and causeless divisions weaken it ;  
“but grant us to be of one heart and one mind in  
“serving Thee our God, and obeying her according  
“to Thy will : And that these blessings may be

“continued to after-ages, let there never be one  
“wanting in her house to succeed her in the govern-  
“ment of this United Kingdom, that our posterity  
“may see her children’s children, and peace upon  
“Israel. So we that are Thy people, and sheep of  
“Thy pasture, shall give Thee thanks for ever, and  
“will always be showing forth Thy praise from  
“generation to generation. Amen.”





*THE DUTY OF PROPHECYING*

*according to*

*The Proportion of Faith.*



# *The Duty of Prophesying*

*According to the*

## *Proportion of Faith.*

---

*“Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith.”—*  
Romans xii. 6.

WHEN our Reformers protested, in the twentieth Article, that the Church may not “so expound one “place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another,” they did but re-affirm a law of Biblical interpretation which flows, naturally and necessarily, from the plenary inspiration of the sacred volume.

For once admit that God Himself is, from Genesis to Revelation, the Author of that Holy Book, and you cannot but concede that there must be—as diligent and prayerful study proves that indeed

there is — continuity and oneness of instruction throughout its pages.

Hence arises an obligation, from which we cannot lawfully excuse ourselves, ever to seek that exposition of any given passage proposed for our consideration which shall preserve that continuity and oneness inviolate. In other words, the Church, whether collectively or individually, must take “good heed ever to prophesy according to the proportion “of faith : *κατα την αναλογιαν της πιστεως.*”

For this, it would seem, is the principle enunciated in my text. “Whether prophecy, let us prophesy “according to the proportion of faith.” “Prophecy,” we take to indicate that speaking “for exhortation “and edification and comfort,” which is the special duty of the Christian Pastor. “Faith,” or “the faith,” we hold to mean that sacred deposit, the truth as it is in Jesus, the faith once delivered to the saints. “Prophesying according to the “proportion of faith,” we therefore conclude to signify the so unfolding the Written Word as always to preserve inviolate the unity, the harmony, the consistency, the oneness of its teaching.

But, my brethren, whether this be the burthen of

this special text or no, there can be no question as to the truth, the permanency, the supremacy of the principle, the law, of which I am now speaking. And yet I will venture to say that no law affecting our dealings with Holy Writ is more frequently broken on every hand than this. And its breach is not only to the dishonour of God, but also to the peril of souls. For error in doctrine, or viciousness of life will be retained, even with a tenfold tenacity, if he whose affections are already implicated in its maintenance, can persuade himself that his conduct or opinion has some, even the least, Scriptural warranty. And to compass such self-deceit will not be hard, if, in the treatment of the fragments of God's Word which seem to supply that warranty, the principle in question be, either in ignorance or of purpose, set aside.

It will not therefore be amiss if this afternoon—in the spirit of Christian love and ministerial faithfulness—I enforce this rule of sacred exegesis, by the citation of examples of its practical importance.

I take my **FIRST** illustration from the **SOCINIAN Controversy**.

In the nineteenth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel we find these words, at verses 16, 17: "Why callest thou Me good? There is none good but one, that is God." The denier of the Eternal Divinity of the Son of God is apt to cite these words as proof decisive of the truth of his deadly heresy. And their *prima facie* rendering would seem to favour his argument. Jesus Himself appears to repudiate the ascription of Divine attributes. But many, very many, passages teach a different lesson. "Te Deum laudamus"—"We praise Thee as God"—is the universal testimony of the Scriptures concerning Jesus of Nazareth. What shall he, who would prophesy according to the proportion of faith, do with this isolated utterance? He shall, at once, reject as an impossibility that superficial interpretation of the passage now under review, over which the Socinian stumbles. And he shall, humbly and prayerfully, inquire whether there be not some simple explanation, which shall leave inviolate the verity which every one who feels his need of a Divine Saviour holds so dear. Nor will he inquire in vain. For he will soon discover in the Master's question an indirect guidance to a more distinct

and decided recognition of His Godhead, as the only adequate ground upon which could be based that testing command which was forthwith to be imposed, "Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor." (Matt. xx. 21.) "Non hic asseritur Deitatis essentia, sed ad fidem doctrinæ habendam deducitur juvenis. Iamquidem aliquo obidiendi affectu imbutus erat: sed eum vult Christus altius concendere, ut *Deum* loquentem audiat." (Calvin in Matt. xix. 17.)

But I pass on to a SECOND illustration.

In the second chapter of St. James' Epistle we find it thus written, at the twenty-fourth verse: "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

Now these words do beyond all doubt appear—and their context seems to confirm the impression—to militate against the teaching of St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans. Let me cite a single verse. It shall be taken from the third chapter. "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." (Rom. iii. 28.)

What shall that pastor and teacher do, who would expound St. James aright? Shall he boldly and



ostentatiously exhibit him as the rival, the opponent of St. Paul? Or, acting with equal hardihood and more subtilty, shall he so bring the statements of St. James to bear upon those of St. Paul, as to qualify and temper them down, until they altogether cease to yield that overflowing abundance of consolation which they are so well calculated, so manifestly intended, to convey to the man of broken and contrite spirit? Surely neither course can lawfully be taken by him who would prophesy according to the proportion of faith. It is not for a moment to be thought that the Holy Ghost, speaking by St. James, can have intended, either overtly or by implication, to contradict Himself as speaking by St. Paul. For let this for a moment be supposed to be the case, and His utterances here are found to be at variance, not with His instructions by St. Paul only, but also with those given through St. Peter, and St. John also, yea and with the words of Immanuel Himself. For hath He not said: "Verily, "verily, I say unto you, He that heareth My word, "and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; "but is passed from death unto life." (John v. 24.)

Nay more: the very Prophets themselves of the Old Testament Church, from Moses downwards, must be set aside. For is it not Moses who teaches us that "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed "to him for righteousness"? "for righteousness"—*εἰς δικαιοσύνην*—unto the attainment of an interest in Christ's righteousness. And doth not the Prophet Habakkuk thus speak (chap. ii. 4): "Behold, his soul "which is lifted up is not upright in him: but the "just shall live by his faith"?

Now look carefully at the context in St. James' second chapter, and you will find the key to the whole passage in the fourteenth verse: "What doth "it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath "faith, and have not works? can faith save him?"—*ἡ πίστις*—"that faith," or, in other words, "the faith alleged."

It is as though the Spirit would say to the inconsistent professors whom He is so evidently addressing,— "The Gospel truly ascribes saving "efficacy to faith. But look to it that your faith "is actual faith, and not the mere profession of it. "See to it that it is that faith, the reality, the life, "the love, of which is exhibited in abundant fruits

“of righteousness. Thus was it with Abraham :  
“he was justified before God by faith, without the  
“works of the law, on that memorable night when  
“Jehovah said to him, as He bid him contemplate  
“the starry firmament, ‘So shall thy seed be.’ But  
“he was also justified before men by works, when  
“many years afterwards the offering up of his well-  
“beloved son, proved the reality, the vitality, of that  
“faith by which exclusively he had so long before  
“been finally, completely, and for ever justified.”

Thus far, my brethren, the illustrations I have adduced have been drawn entirely from the Gospels and Epistles. The language employed was, in each case, and in both the contrasted passages, simple, definite, clear, devoid of all figure and metaphor. Now if, even in such instances, we were right in abandoning the obvious, the *prima facie*, interpretation of isolated portions of the written Word, in order to bring our exposition of them into concord with the analogy, the proportion of the faith, as generally set forth in Holy Scripture; how much more shall we be constrained so to do where these portions of God’s Word—the utterances of which seem, on first being heard, discordant from its teach-

ing elsewhere—are of that poetical and figurative character which distinguishes the prophetic portions of the Sacred Volume ?

To such an instance, drawn from the pages of Isaiah, I would, in the third place, direct your attention.

In the sixtieth chapter of this Prophet we find these words, at verse 7: “All the flocks of Kedar “shall be gathered together unto thee, the rams of “Nebaioth shall minister unto thee: they shall come “up with acceptance on Mine altar, and I will glorify “the house of My glory.”

Now as Isaiah is undoubtedly speaking of times posterior to the first Advent of the Messiah, it has, from this and similar passages, been argued that the Church on earth shall yet see the temple at Jerusalem rebuilt, the altar replaced in its courts, and the flames of animal sacrifice going up on high, while the sons of Aaron minister again to the restored tribes of Israel.

But, my brethren, this is not to prophesy according to the analogy of the faith. Surely the Epistle to the Hebrews instructs us otherwise. And surely the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Colos-

sians, combine with it, in proclaiming that the law of commandments contained in ordinances is taken away, cancelled, abolished; that the middle wall of partition is broken down, destroyed; that in the Church of God there is not now, nor ever will be more, either circumcision or uncircumcision, Jew or Gentile, Male or Female, Barbarian, Scythian, Bond or Free, for all are one in Christ Jesus. No! The interpretation to which I refer should at once be set aside. God cannot contradict Himself. He cannot by the pen of Isaiah predict the restoration of bloody sacrifices under the Gospel œconomy, while He by the pen of St. Paul declares them to be forever abolished. The sixtieth of Isaiah must be otherwise interpreted. It is, as the table of contexts prefixed to it accurately tells, a description of "the glory of the Church in the abundant access of the Gentiles,"—an abundant access which is set forth in rich and various imagery drawn from the storehouse of Jewish history, Jewish topography, and Jewish ritual. Hence, to return to the verse specially cited, he expounds it aright, he submits to that rule of interpretation which I am commending to your dutiful obedience to-day, who bids his

hearers recognize in the rams of Nebaioth coming up with acceptance on Jehovah's altar, not the oblation of animal sacrifice in future days in the courts of a restored earthly temple at Jerusalem, but the presentation now of the sacrifice of broken and contrite hearts from amongst the Gentiles in the courts of that spiritual house, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, which is ever growing unto an holy temple in the Lord.

One illustration more, a FOURTH, before I close.

Turn to the Revelation, and read verse 3 of chapter viii., and verse 4 of chapter xi. "And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne." "These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth."

The introduction into our sanctuaries of a symbolism which centres round the Lord's Table as an "altar," the Lord's Supper as an "expiatory oblation," the Lord's Ministers as "sacrificing priests"—the exhibition of gorgeous dresses, of fragrant

incense, of lights burning at noon-day,—all these innovations find, we are assured, a Scriptural warrant in “the Church of the Apocalypse.” And the verses which I have read are, with others, cited in proof. They picture forth, we are told, the actual ritual of the Temple of God in heaven. “I saw no temple therein,” saith St. John: but let that pass. That ritual, it is further alleged, is evidently a restoration—and *that* subsequently to the incarnation—of the Levitical ceremonial. It is well therefore, so the argument runs, that we should restore and reproduce it upon earth also.

But is this to prophesy according to the proportion of faith? Most certainly not. For the Epistles already cited, and more particularly that to the Hebrews, distinctly affirm that the one Great High Priest who has passed into the heavens, has by the one full, perfect, and sufficient oblation of Himself, for ever put away sin. They further unequivocally declare that while the whole family of God is exalted to the dignity of a royal priesthood, ever to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ, the ministers of the Gospel sanctuary are not, and never can be, expiating

atoning sacrificers. The interpretation, then, of the Apocalyptic visions to which I am alluding is, as expounding one passage of Scripture so as to be contrary to another, entirely inadmissible.

What, then, is the key to the class of passages in question? Simply this. The imagery of the Apocalypse is derived from the Levitical ritual, just as much as is the imagery of Isaiah, or of Zechariah. And as we are constrained by the law of interpretation now under consideration to understand the figurative language of the prophetic seers of the Old Testament Church in a spiritual sense, so are we by the same law compelled to interpret the symbolic visions of the great Theologos of the New Testament dispensation, in a similar manner. The golden altar, and the golden candlesticks of "John the Divine," are as purely allegorical as are the golden candlesticks of Zechariah, or the altar upon which the rams of Nebaioth are to be consumed according to Isaiah. And they do most truly, though doubtless in very many cases most unconsciously, run a risk of wresting the Scriptures to their own destruction, who, adhering to the letter, and overlooking the spirit of its visions, thus make



the Apocalypse,—a Divine book especially raised on high to be a beacon-light against Rome,—a very *ignis fatuus* to allure them onward until, becoming partakers of her sins, they receive of her plagues.

I have now, beloved brethren, illustrated, so far as time permitted, the very important principle which is, if I understand it aright, enunciated in my text, and which is incontestibly involved in the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the written Word. That principle is simply this: that when two portions of God's Book seem to be at issue one with the other—the one enunciating that which is agreeable to the general teaching of the Scriptures in their remaining portions; the other seeming to propound that which is abhorrent thereto,—it is the duty of God's ministers and people to reject, as untenable, the *primâ facie* rendering of the latter, and to seek for an exposition of it which shall harmonize with the obvious and Divinely accredited interpretation of the former.

And now, before we part, two words of affectionate admonition concerning the application of this principle. Pray, my beloved brethren, that God the

Holy Ghost may graciously bestow upon you, in all your dealings with His perfect law, singleness of eye, and humbleness of mind.

Yes! plead for singleness of eye. For without it you must and you will miscarry in all your Biblical inquiries. Unless you draw nigh to that Holy Book with a firm, unflinching resolve to believe whatever it bids you believe, to do whatever it bids you do, you will assuredly fail in attaining to the discovery of the Divine Will. For that discovery must be made to you by the Lord the Spirit. And He will most assuredly be grieved, quenched, if in your bosom He detect the secret determination that some opinion shall still be cherished, some practice shall still be allowed, even though it be proved that His Scriptures forbid. And if He be grieved, quenched, shall you not grope in darkness even at noon-day? "The light of the body is the eye: "therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body "also is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, "thy body also is full of darkness. Take heed "therefore that the light which is in thee be not "darkness. If thy whole body therefore be full "of light, having no part dark, the whole shall

“be full of light, as when the bright shining of  
“a candle doth give thee light.” (Luke xi. 34,  
35, 36.)

And then plead for humility of mind. “Whom  
“shall He teach knowledge? and whom shall He  
“make to understand doctrine? them that are  
“weaned from the milk, and drawn from the  
“breasts.” (Isaiah xxviii. 9.) Because a problem  
is not soluble by you, it does not therefore follow  
that it is not soluble at all. Many a young dis-  
ciple has made fearful shipwreck for lack of that  
“humbleness of mind” which, when it encountered  
what appeared a formidable difficulty, would have  
reasoned thus with itself: “I cannot controvert  
“this specious argument, it is true. But though I  
“cannot detect and expose the fallacy, I am sure  
“that there is a fallacy somewhere. I will not  
“therefore parley with the foe: but, fleeing from  
“him, I will patiently wait until it shall please the  
“Lord to reveal even this unto me.” Shall faith  
and love like this be confounded? Oh, no. “With  
“the lowly is wisdom.” “The meek will He  
guide in judgment, the meek will He teach His  
way.”

## COLLECT FOR ST. MARK'S DAY.

O ALMIGHTY God, who hast instructed Thy Holy Church with the heavenly doctrine of Thy Evangelist St. Mark ; Give us grace, that, being not like children carried away with every blast of vain doctrine, we may be established in the truth of Thy Holy Gospel ; through Jesus Christ our Lord. AMEN.



*THE APOSTOLIC COMMISSION ;*

*or,*

*Auricular Confession and Priestly  
Absolution.*



## *The Apostolic Commission.*

---

*"Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you :  
as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.*

*"And when he had said this, he breathed on them,  
and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost :*

*"Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto  
them ; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are  
retained."—John xx. 21—23.*

IN the matter of forgiveness of sin, the Church of Rome draws a line of demarcation, wide and deep, between guilt contracted before, and guilt contracted after the reception of baptism. The former, she alleges, is purged in and through the waters of the font. There the sinner receives the absolution and remission of all previous sins, original and actual. They shall be remembered no more. But for the latter—for post-baptismal transgression,—a distinct and a different provision is required. It is made in the "Sacrament of Penance." Let the offender,



with contrition of heart, pour the confession of all his iniquities, with all their circumstances, into the ear of the priest, and let him render the satisfaction prescribed; then shall he receive, at his lips, the pardon of his sins, in pregnant words like these,—  
“*Ego te absolvo.*”

The mere statement of this doctrine will bring to your memories many words of painful present controversy within the pale of our national Church. Confession—auricular confession,—not that general and open confession in which we have taken part twice this very day,—not that special and private opening of grief to some discreet and learned minister of God’s Word, by him who, being guilty of grievous crime, and unable to quiet his own conscience, requireth further counsel and comfort,—no, nor that exceptional confession of the sick or dying penitent, whose conscience is troubled with some weighty matter, and who truly repents and believes in Jesus; but, that minute, that prolonged, that exhaustive confession of every thought, every word, every deed of ill, which needs to be drawn forth by questionings, detailed and often necessarily polluting, from the inmost recesses of memory and conscience,—is now inculcated, “urged,” “pressed”

upon all "who have souls to be saved," whether very children, young men and maidens, or Christians of maturer age.

Nor is the point at issue one of merely speculative interest. It is absolutely vital. For, if this dogma concerning post-baptismal sin and the method of its cleansing, be Scriptural and true, then have we not a moment to lose. For which of us is there who has not been guilty of sin,—yes, of "mortal sin," as the doctors of Rome are wont to call it,—many, many times since the day when, in unconscious infancy, we were washed with water in "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" and thus—cruel mockery, as it would seem—taken out of the Gospel pale of simple Divine grace, and committed to the tender mercies of fallible, puny, power-seeking, power-loving man? Which of us is there who should not at once betake himself to this *δευτερος πλους*,—this *secunda tabula post naufragium*, this second, and only remaining resort of Sacramental Penance?

Thank God, brethren, we are not reduced to this sad predicament. The whole scheme is a "fond thing, vainly invented," and hath no warranty of Holy Scripture.

For where, in the first place, does the Bible draw any such distinction between *pre* and *post*-Baptismal sin, as that to which I have referred? Nowhere! By faith we live at the first: by faith we continue to live to the very end. The fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, is a fountain for *all* sin and *all* uncleanness. And where, in the second place, does the Bible confer upon any human being whatever, born in this 19th century of the Christian era, the Divine prerogative of the forgiveness of sin? I know what will be the ready, the confident reply of the Fathers of Trent. "Turn," they say, "to the twentieth chapter of St. John, and read the twenty-second and twenty-third verses." "There," they add, "is our authority for auricular confession and priestly absolution."

We have need to pause, beloved brethren, before we concede the point.

For let us, for one moment, suppose that the Apostles were, by these words, invested with authority to receive confession and to grant absolution, where is the evidence and proof that that privilege and function was to be transmitted by them from generation to generation? The Gospel was to be preached, the two Sacraments were to be admin-

istered, when the Apostles had long ceased to tread this earth, even to the end of time. Accordingly you have but to turn to the passages in which the Apostolic commission—so far as these are concerned—is given, and you will find words inserted which leave no doubt whatever that that commission was to be prolonged till the Lord came again, by a succession of ministrations in His kingdom. In the text under review this afternoon, such note of continuance is wholly and entirely wanting. Nor is there in the Acts of the Apostles, or in any one of the Epistles, the least trace whatever of teaching which shall supply the deficiency.

But was the passage under consideration meant by the Lord to bear the superstructure built upon it, even in respect of the very Apostles themselves? Were even they instructed to receive private confession, and to confer priestly absolution? I trow not. For these words of the Lord Jesus had, as I will now endeavour to prove from Holy Writ, a very different intention and meaning from that which the mediæval and the Romish Church has attached to them.

Let us take the verses in the order in which they stand. "As my Father hath sent Me, even so send

I you." Here is, I conceive, the key to the whole passage. A commission is here given by Christ to His Apostles similar to one given by His Father to Him. Ascertain the nature of the latter, and you learn at once the nature of the former.

In order to do this, remember that a threefold office was vested in the Messiah,—He was the Priest, He was the King, He was the Prophet of His Church. Could it be the priestly commission which was here bestowed upon the Apostles? Assuredly not. As sacrificing, expiating Priest, the office of Jesus Christ the Son of God was incommunicable. As Priest to offer thanksgiving of lip and life to God, His functions are shared with Him by every one of His redeemed. Could it be the kingly commission which was here placed in the hands of the Twelve? Again, I say, that in essential Kingship over His Church, Jesus is the one sole Ruler and Lord. This honour also is incommunicable. In respect of a derivative Kingship, His royalty is shared by all His people; it is not peculiar to His Apostles. There remains the *Prophetic Commission*,—and *this* it was which was here delegated solely, exclusively, and exhaustively to the Apostles.

For consider well the nature of the prophetic com-

mission received by Christ from His Father. It was a Commission of Revelation corresponding to the commission given to Moses. You will at once remember the early prophecy of the Lawgiver, and the later prediction of the Seer. The one describes the person, the other exhibits the message of the coming Messiah. The Lawgiver thus speaks (Deuteronomy, 18th chap. and 15th verse)—in words which the Holy Ghost Himself has, by the mouth of St. Peter, taught us to understand of the Lord Jesus Christ—"The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto Him shall ye hearken." The Seer thus writes (Isa. lxi. 1—3), in syllables which Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth declared to be predictive of Himself: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for

the spirit of heaviness, that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord that He might be glorified."

And thus, accordingly, in the fulness of time, was Christ sent of God. He was prepared by everlasting fellowship with Jehovah the Father, and sent down to earth, even as Moses for forty days saw God face to face, and then came down from the mount. "He was sanctified and sent into the world." He was gifted with miraculous powers for the purpose of attesting his mission, even as Moses was empowered to work mighty signs and wonders as evidence that "I AM" had sent Him. In the 36th verse of the fifth chapter of St. John we read—"But I have greater witness than that of John, for the works which the Father hath given Me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of Me that the Father hath sent Me."

And His errand was to bring a doctrine. "For as the law was given by Moses, so did grace and truth come by Jesus Christ." In the seventh chapter of the same Gospel we read, ver. 16, 17,—“Jesus answered them and said, My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent Me. If any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God,

or whether I speak of Myself." And how thoroughly did His doctrine from first to last answer to the prophetic description of Isaiah! It was throughout the doctrine of the *forgiveness of sins*. Read again, at the 24th verse of the fifth chapter of St. John, the words of our Saviour Christ—"Verily, verily I say unto you, He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

This then was the nature of Christ's prophetic commission—of that commission which in this Gospel of St. John the Lord Jesus loves to call the "sending" of Him by the Father. It was a mission of Revelation: the subject of the Revelation was the Gospel of Peace: the credentials of the Revelation were mighty deeds wrought in the sight of all the people.

Now, return to my text. "As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." "I commit to you a mission of Revelation: the subject of that revelation shall be the Gospel of Peace: its attestation, greater miracles even than those which I myself have done." This was the Apostolic commission.

And there was need that it should be entrusted



to them. For, I speak it with reverence, the revelation work of the Lord Jesus was still incomplete.

The doctrine was but partially known, it was entirely unwritten. Jesus was going up on high: He could not (such was the good pleasure of our God) consummate His task Himself; He must leave it to be brought to perfection and to be embodied in authentic documents by the Apostles of His choice.

But how shall any men—how shall *such* men—so timid, so ignorant, so wayward, be qualified for the execution of so great a work? Read the two remaining verses of my text:—“And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.” Here is a plenary, here is an infallible inspiration.

Yes! “He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” Here is the bestowal of a plenary inspiration. It is as though the Lord would say,—“Sent of God, I have spoken the words of God, for God gave not the Spirit by measure unto Me.” (John iii. 34) “I now send “you, and I endow you with an ample portion of

“the same high privilege and gift. Let the Spirit of  
“Truth come now and guide you into all the truth:  
“yea, even into the many things of which (before I  
“died and rose again), I said, Ye cannot bear them  
“now. You shall now preach the Gospel with the Holy  
“Ghost sent down from heaven; and *that* not in the  
“words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the  
“Holy Ghost teacheth. And when the time comes  
“for you to put off this tabernacle, you shall leave  
“behind you books which, completing the volume  
“of inspiration, shall stand on a footing of equal  
“authority with the writings of the Holy Prophets  
“which have been since the world began. Thus  
“shall you sit on twelve thrones, judging to the end  
“of time the twelve tribes of Israel. Thus shall you  
“form, by the inspired truth which you deliver, an  
“integral part of that sure foundation of the Apos-  
“tles and Prophets, on which that building rests, of  
“which I, Jesus Christ, am the Chief Corner Stone.”

And He proceeded further to say,—“Let no one  
“fear lest, reposing upon your decree, he shall be  
“confounded. Nor let any one hope, that despis-  
“ing your sentence, he shall escape unpunished; for  
“whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto  
“them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are re-

“tained.” The inspiration conferred was infallible as well as plenary. As though the Lord would say, —“ Does a contrite sinner discern in the glad tidings “of peace which you promulgate,—when living, by “your voice, when gone hence, by your writings,—the “full supply of his utmost need? Does he believe? “He shall not be confounded. You have *loosed* “him upon earth; he shall be *loosed* in heaven. “He shall, at the last great day, stand before My “judgment-seat, and he shall find that his sins, “though they be many, are forgiven him. Whose “soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them. “But does a man of obdurate heart neglect your “message,—does he delay to embrace your Gospel, “—does he cavil at it, reject it, scoff, mock, persecute, “the messengers of God? Or, while saying Lord! “Lord! does he invent substitutes of his own— “counterfeits of the simple Gospel of the grace of “God? Do you, even weeping, tell him that his end “is destruction? that if he will not come to Jesus “in his own appointed way, he cannot have life? “Your word shall take hold of him. You have “*bound* him upon earth, and he shall be *bound* in “heaven. He shall, at the last great day, stand be- “fore My judgment-seat, and he shall find that I have

“set his iniquities before Me, his secret sins in the  
“light of My countenance. I will reprove him and  
“set them in order before his eyes. Whose soever  
“sins ye retain, they are retained.”

Such, beloved brethren, is the Scriptural interpretation of this most important passage of God's Holy Word. In it the great Prophet of the new Covenant, being about to depart to the Father, commits to His Apostles the honourable task of completing the Revelation which He had inaugurated, and qualifies them for the work by conferring upon them a plenary and an infallible inspiration.

Now, if this be so, it follows, as an inevitable conclusion, that there is no ground, in this text at least, for that assumption of priestly power to which I directed your attention at the beginning of this discourse. In its original and absolute sense, this Apostolic Commission can only affect us through the Apostolic Scriptures, and through a ministry exercised in strictest subjection to those Scriptures.

And it is, beloved brethren, obviously in this sense that our Reformers retained these words in the English Ordinal. Surely they seem to have taken special pains to mark the fact that it was only in a derived and secondary sense—a sense involving

entire, unreserved, and implicit submission to the Scriptures—that they set apart men, and devolved on their successors the duty of setting apart men, for the discharge of the office of the ministry of the Word and Sacraments. You have but to turn to the Prayer-book to see that I am right.

Mark well, I entreat you, the questions put and the answers given relative to the Scriptures, before the imposition of hands at the Ordination of Presbyters.

*The Bishop* :—“ Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all Doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? and are you determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?”

*Answer* :—“ I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God’s grace.”

*The Bishop* :—“ Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God’s Word?”

*Answer* :—“ I will, the Lord being my helper.”

*The Bishop* :—“Will you be diligent in Prayers, “and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such “studies as help to the knowledge of the same, lay- “ing aside the study of the world and the flesh?”

*Answer* :—“I will endeavour myself so to do, the “Lord being my helper.”

Immediately after, nay during, the imposition of hands, follow the words “and be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God.” The whole is wound up by that most significant act prescribed in the Rubric : “Then the Bishop shall deliver to every one of them kneeling, the Bible into his hand, saying, take thou authority to preach the Word of God.” “*Cum clavis, qua aditus nobis aperitur ad regnum Dei, sit verbum Evangelii et interpretatio legis et Scripturarum* UBI NON SIT VERBUM, IBI DICIMUS NONESSE CLAVEM.”\*

But I will not pursue this part of the subject further. The explanation I have now given is certainly the only interpretation consistent with the general teaching of the Prayer-book, and especially with that of that one authoritative summary of Church of England doctrine,—the thirty-nine Articles of Religion. It is also most certainly the only interpreta-

\* Bishop Jewel, in the Apology.

tion consistent with the practice of the very men themselves to whom these words were primarily addressed. They went forth in due time to execute their mission. The Acts of the Apostles chronicle their proceedings. The Epistles complete the record. Where do we find auricular confession and priestly absolution? Passing strange indeed it is, if the Romish doctrine be true, that there is not a single hint of their having carried out the Divine command in all the twenty-eight chapters of the Acts, and in all the twenty-two subsequent books of the New Testament volume. Certainly, if it was committed to their custody, they buried this talent of Priestly Absolution most culpably in a napkin. They neither made use of it themselves, nor did they instruct Timothy and Titus to avail themselves of it in their ministry. Truly confession is to be found in their history and Epistles,—yes, and absolution is there also; but confession to God,—absolution from God. “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us: if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” And how, throughout, is this great benefit obtained and received? Simply and solely by faith. “To

Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts x. 43.) Yes, truly, "who-soever,"—even he who falls into sin after he has been bathed in the waters of Baptism. For turn once again to the first chapter of the first Epistle of St. John, an Epistle unquestionably written to baptised children, young men and fathers. Read the seventh verse,—“If we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin.” Look on, once more, to the second chapter, the first and second verses,—“My little children, these things write I unto you that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have”—a priest who shall receive our confession; who shall—after judicially measuring the depth of our contrition, the fulness of our confession, the sufficiency of our satisfaction—give us the benefit of his absolution? No! “We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus the Righteous.”

Beloved brethren, I have, I fear, detained you long, but really not longer than the exigency of the case demands. For indeed the practice of Sacramental Confession and Priestly Absolution which it is pretended to establish by the authority of this



passage of God's Word, is one which it is the duty of every man to repudiate, who has the very least regard for the temporal quietness, or the eternal welfare of those whom God hath gathered round him in all the hallowed associations of home.

Of temporal quietness, I will but say to husbands, fathers, mothers,—resist the very beginning of this evil. Concede to your son, your daughter, the wife of your bosom, permission to confess to the priest of their choice, and you sign the death warrant of all conjugal confidence, all parental authority, all domestic happiness. An usurpation has been established within the precincts of your dwelling, which will not shrink, if occasion shall call for it, from bidding defiance to all, even the most sacred of human commands. It is God, they declare, who speaks through the priest, and God must be obeyed rather than man. I say nothing of the *espionage* established within your walls, which renders the confidence of the nearest of earthly ties a nullity, and entangles you and yours in a network of intrigue, which, so far as the laws of the State will permit, places yourselves, your property, your children, at the mercy of God's vicegerents.

And what compensating gain shall there be? None

whatever. Such concession will prove to be, in the great majority of cases, when the snare is not broken and the soul does not escape in time, the sacrifice of eternal, no less than temporal interests. I know full well that the victims of this system say—for have I not heard it from their lips myself?—that none but he who has tasted that joy can tell how great the peace of him who has made true confession and received full absolution. But oh, brethren, what a peace! A peace which soothes, which delights, which intoxicates, as it is, in life, from time to time renewed: a peace which stills the chamber of sickness, and which smooths the very pillow of death. But beyond it cannot go. The spell of the enchantress is broken as the river of death is crossed! And then what a discovery! That that which man had professed to loose upon earth has not been loosed in heaven! That that sin which man professed to remit, has been by God still retained; and that therefore, notwithstanding the absolution of a human priesthood, their miserable dupe, standing before the great High Priest, is pronounced by Him helplessly, hopelessly, unclean. And mark the consequence. Without the camp of the saints, without the New Jerusalem, in lamentation and mourning

and woe, for ever must his habitation be. From such strong delusion, from such fearful doom, good Lord deliver us.

---

*London : William Hunt and Company.*

*THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH;*

*or, the*

*First Day kept Holy by Divine Command.*



## *The First Day of the Week Kept Holy by Divine Command.*

---

*“ Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.*

*“ And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made ; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made.*

*“ And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it : because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made.”—Genesis ii.*

1, 2, 3.

THE Old Testament Scriptures may be regarded as a rich store-house of enduring principles, many of which are embodied in transitory enactments.

Thus, for example, is the enduring principle of an ordained ministry enshrined in the evanescent priesthood of the house of Aaron.

Thus again is the permanent obligation of a

weekly day of sacred rest established by the original institution, and the observance for full four thousand years of the primæval Sabbath.

Permit me, brethren, to bring this subject before you in detail this afternoon,—invited as I am to deal with it by the Lesson of the day. It may be that God will honour that which shall be spoken to the stablishing, strengthening, settling of minds, which though I know it not are known to Him to be tossed to and fro by the winds and the waves of doubt upon a subject which, in the experience of the Christian, yields to none in practical importance.

I will begin by tracing the principle of a weekly day of sacred rest through the records of the earlier economy. I will then proceed to illustrate the application of that principle to us, the people of God, under the Christian dispensation.

I will begin, I say, by establishing the principle of a week-day rest from the records of the ancient patriarchal Churches.

And *first*, I cite the text which has already twice this afternoon been read in your ears:—“And God “blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because “that in it He had rested from all His work which “God created and made.”

Mark well the Sabbatical principle here enunciated. Mark well also the reason assigned for its embodiment in the seventh day of the week.

Mark well, I say, the Sabbatical principle here enunciated. There was a day to be sanctified to God, in order that it might be blessed to man.

It was to be sanctified,—set apart from the remaining six, as holy to the Lord. Even in Paradise man was not to be idle. He was placed in the midst of the Garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. But on one day labour was to be suspended, and its hours were to be devoted to special and more abundant communion with his Maker.

And this was not the arbitrary decree of a despot, it was the loving counsel of a Father. One day in seven was to be sanctified to God, in order that it might be blessed to man. God blessed the seventh day: He made it a happy day. Though still in full possession of that joy and peace which belonged to a state of innocency, the happiness of man was capable of increase. His cup, as he held fellowship with Jehovah, was every day full; but on this day it was to run over.

But why was the seventh day chosen? Why not the fifth, or the sixth? Read Genesis ii. 3,



again. The greatest of all Jehovah's workings hitherto had been completed on the six earlier days of the seven. He had, then, speaking after the manner of men, rested on the seventh day in the contemplation of the marvellous achievements of Creative wisdom and power. Accordingly, on the seventh day man must rest also in the grateful, the adoring, the free, the unpurchased enjoyment of all the "very good" things which had been made ready to his hand. And thus was it declared, twenty-five centuries after,—“For in six days the Lord made “heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, “and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord “blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.” (Exod. xx. 11.)

For the principle thus established, the enactment thus promulgated was to survive the fall.

For turn, *secondly*, to the Exodus xvi. 22—27. “And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they “gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one “man: and all the rulers of the congregation came “and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is “that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the “rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that “which ye will bake to-day, and see the that ye will

“seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for  
“you to be kept until the morning. And they laid  
“it up till the morning, as Moses bade: and it did  
“not stink, neither was there any worm therein.  
“And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a  
“Sabbath unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it  
“in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on  
“the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there  
“shall be none. And it came to pass, that there  
“went out some of the people on the seventh day  
“for to gather, and they found none.”

You will at once see why I call your attention to this passage. It establishes, beyond the possibility of all reasonable gainsaying, the twofold truth, first, that the Sabbatical rest was, in the Patriarchal as distinguished from the Mosaic Church, a recognized and long established institution; and, secondly, that this was no mere tradition or invention of man's devising, but had all the authority of a divine enactment, even before the promulgation of the Ten Commandments.

And this explains why the word “Remember”—“Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy”—stands foremost in the fourth of those ten words which were given by the ministration of angels, amid

the thunderings and lightnings and voices of the mount of God. The principles enshrined in the 1, 2, 3,—in the 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 Commandments, were not on the day of their proclamation new; even though on that day they for the first time received distinct and authoritative legal enactment. But Jehovah knew full well that while the enemy would not dare, even with all his effrontery, to maintain that these fundamental moral postulates were of Jewish origin and transitory obligation, he would, in his subtilty, endeavour practically to compass their overthrow by impugning the permanent authority of that one command, upon the dutiful observance of which, as all experience proves, hinges the loyal keeping of all the rest. Hence it is that this one is singled out by Jehovah Himself, and by the employment of the word “remember,” proclaimed to be coeval with the human race in its origin, and co-extensive with the human race in its obligation.

But I pass onward to another and a *third* passage in the Old Testament Scriptures:—“Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee. Six days thou shalt labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the

“Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not  
“do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter,  
“nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thine  
“ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy  
“stranger that is within thy gates; that thy man-  
“servant and thy maidservant may rest as well as  
“thou. And remember that thou wast a servant in  
“the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God  
“brought thee out thence through a mighty hand  
“and by a stretched out arm: therefore the Lord thy  
“God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.”  
(Deut. v. 12—15.)

You will observe, what may indeed be noticed as implicitly taught even in the twentieth of Exodus, that the commandment which was originally promulgated in Paradise, and which was subsequently proclaimed anew on Mount Sinai, is here rehearsed with an altered sanction. For a work had now been achieved by Jehovah, august in itself, and ever to be had in remembrance in its historical relation to the literal, and in its typical relation to the spiritual Israel. That work was the redemption of His people out of the land of Egypt and the house of bondage. And henceforth must the Sabbatic rest commemorate that stupendous deliverance wrought for Israel, as

Israel looked on, by the fiat of Jehovah. Yes; and every spiritual worshipper under that economy shall be blessed as he delights himself on each recurring Sabbath, in the free, the unpurchased, the consummated temporal rest achieved by that mighty arm, and sees in it a joyful earnest of redemption yet to be accomplished in Jerusalem.

I might now, if time permitted, cite many, very many, corroborative passages, both from the historical and the prophetic books, which, by expostulation, warning, promise, demonstrate how dear to Jehovah, not only for His own glory, but also for His people's good, were those days which He loved to call, "My Sabbaths." But enough has been adduced to prove that as to its principle, the week-day rest is made for man. It is the heritage of the whole human family. It was necessary for the fulness of man's bliss before the fall. It was much more necessary to his happiness, when owing to the malice of the foe, he had very far departed from original righteousness. It has also been proved, that as to the special application of the Sabbatical principle, that application is susceptible of modification and alteration, as in the lapse of time, works of increasing might and marvel are achieved by Jehovah in the history of His Church.

And this leads me to illustrate, as originally proposed, by a renewed induction of passages, the application of the Sabbatical principle to us the disciples of Jesus, under the Christian dispensation.

And, *first*, I invite you to read Isaiah lvi. 6, 7, 8. "Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve Him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be His servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people. The Lord God which gathereth the outcasts of Israel saith, Yet will I gather others to Him, beside those that are gathered unto Him."

Here is a prophetic picture of a scene under the Gospel economy! The sons of the stranger, the Gentiles of every nation under heaven, are represented by the pencil of an infallible inspiration, as crowding Jehovah's courts, sanctifying Jehovah's Sabbaths, and reaping Jehovah's blessing, in days posterior to that great work of atonement which *ipso facto* abolished the Mosaic law of commandments

contained in mere ceremonial ordinances. And to this agree those memorable words, in which the Lord Jesus, manifestly referring to the time subsequent to the breaking down of the middle wall of partition, thus speaks:—"But pray ye that your flight be not in "the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." (Matt. xxiv. 20.)

Thus we learn that the principle which was essential to man's highest happiness, even in Paradise, still holds its sway in that blessed economy which is ultimately to restore to the people of God greater blessings far than those from which Adam their father by transgression fell.

But was the exhibition, the application, of the principle to remain unchanged? Was the seventh day Sabbath to be kept in the Christian dispensation? No! for a work, infinitely transcending the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, infinitely transcending the marvels of Creation, has now been consummated. *Τετέλεσται*—*Consummatum est*—It is finished. Redemption is complete. And now must the Sabbatic rest be kept on that day of the week when a risen Saviour ceased, once for all, from exploits more stupendous far than those of Creative wisdom and might.

And what is that day? It is not the seventh, but the first, day of the week. For turn, *secondly*, to Acts xx. 7:—"And upon the first day of the week, "when the disciples came together to break bread, "Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the "morrow; and continued his speech until midnight."

Here we see the first day of the week noted as the day habitually set apart, in the primitive, the strictly Apostolic Church, as the day for that distinctive act of Christian Worship, the breaking of bread. And thus is a memorable word of Old Testament Psalmody explained:—"The stone which "the builders refused is become the head stone of "the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the "Lord *hath made*; we will rejoice and be glad in "it." (Psalm cxviii. 22, 23, 24.) "Hath made," hath "advanced" above all other days, hath exalted to honour! And thus is a not less notable word of the New Testament doctrine unfolded:—"There remaineth therefore a rest"—the keeping of a Sabbath, as the margin hath it, *Σαββατισμος*—"to the people of God. For he that is entered into "his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, "as God did from His." (Heb. iv. 9, 10.)



Nor—though the Apostles still frequented the Jewish synagogues and preached the Gospel to congregations in them on the seventh day—can that seventh day any longer claim the allegiance of the baptized. The principle indeed remains unimpaired. One day in seven is still sanctified and blessed. But the day is changed and the sanction is changed. The day is no longer the seventh; it is the first. The sanction is no longer the achievement of Creation, no, nor the emancipation of Israel; it is the rest of Jesus our Lord from the work of Redemption. And now the word runs, with respect to the ancient day of Sabbatic repose:—"Let no man therefore judge you "in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, "or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: "which are a shadow of things to come; but the "body is of Christ." (Col. ii. 16, 17.)

But by what authority, the unbelieving Jew rejoins, doest thou these things? I would reply by citing, in the *Third place*, the very words of the Master Himself:—"For the Son of Man is Lord even "of the Sabbath day." (Matt. xii. 8.) Here, in converse with the cavilling Pharisees, Jesus enunciates, as an *obiter dictum*, a truth which accounts for everything. "I, the Son of Man, am Lord also of the Sab-

“ bath day; I am its founder, I am its owner; I gave  
“ it to man; and, while in love to him, I may not  
“ withdraw the boon and cancel the principle, I may  
“ modify and change its application.” Yes! verily!  
The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath day!  
It was He who, when He had completed the work  
of Creation,—for all things were made by Him, and  
without Him was not anything made which was  
made,—it was He who blessed the seventh day and  
sanctified it, in commemoration of the task which  
He had then achieved. It was He who, when He  
had brought Israel up out of Egypt—for He was  
the angel of Jehovah’s presence who led them by  
day in a pillar of a cloud, and by night in a pillar of  
fire—bade the Church in the wilderness ever remem-  
ber, on the seventh day, the achieved work of their  
redemption from the furnace of iron. With fullest  
right therefore He claimed, as He passed with His  
disciples through the cornfields, to expound His  
own law and to reassert the original truth, “The  
Sabbath was made for man and not man for the  
Sabbath. But, with the inspired pages of the  
New Testament before us, exhibiting the Christian  
Church in the established observance of the first  
day of the week, we may not close our paraphrase

here. No! The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath day. And this His supreme Lordship He shall yet further vindicate when He shall have obtained eternal redemption for His people, and shall have for ever set apart the first, instead of the seventh, day as the Lord's day. "I was in the Spirit,"—saith that disciple who leaned on Jesus' bosom at that first celebration of the Lord's Supper,—“I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day.” (Rev. i. 10.)

Such then, it would seem, is the Sabbatical Principle as recognized in the records of the elder dispensations; such its Christian application as enrolled amongst the laws of the more recent œconomy: the principle,—a rest sacred to the glory of God, and full of every blessing, temporal and eternal, to man: the application,—the selection of the first day as perpetually commemorative of the completion of a work which never has had and never can have its superior, or even its equal, in the whole history of mankind.

And now three short words in conclusion.

*First:* Dismiss, as utterly untenable, the oft repeated, but sadly deceitful, statement, that the keeping of a Sabbath is a Jewish, a Levitical, a

Mosaic institution. Truly it was embodied in the code of the Israelitish Church. But it is as much for all men, at all times, as any one other of those principles which, standing by its side, on the right hand and on the left, are also embodied in the Ten Commandments of God.

*Secondly:* Dismiss, as equally untenable, the phantasy that man, in his present earthly pilgrimage, can ever be elevated above the Sabbatical observance of the Lord's day. As well may you say that he can be elevated above the holy estate of Matrimony. Both these blessed institutions, the Sabbath and Marriage, were ordained of God, as being even then needful for man's holiness and happiness, in the state of man's innocency. And they cannot, now that man has fallen, be ignored, without grievous harm to the offending member, as well as to the body collective of Christ. Yes truly, I speak it with seriousness, just as the theory that celibacy is a higher estate than wedlock, has ever resulted, and always will result, in unbridled licence, so will the theory that every week-day should be a Sabbath, inevitably issue in every Sabbath becoming, to all intents and purposes, a week-day.

*Thirdly,* and lastly: Prize and hallow the Chris-

tian Sabbath: sanctify it to Jehovah and Jehovah will bless it to you. "If thou turn away thy foot  
" from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on  
" my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight,  
" the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt  
" honour Him, not doing thine own ways, nor  
" finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine  
" own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in  
" the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon  
" the high places of the earth, and feed thee with  
" the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth  
" of the Lord hath spoken it." (Isaiah lviii. 13, 14.)

" Almighty and everlasting God, give unto us the  
" increase of faith, hope, and charity; and, that we  
" may obtain that which Thou dost promise, make  
" us to love that which Thou dost command;  
" through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

*MINISTERING KINGS;*

*or,*

*Our Established Church a Favour from God.*



## *Ministering Kings.*

---

*"The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee: for in My wrath I smote thee, but in My favour have I had mercy on thee."*—(Isaiah lx. 10.)

IN the Book of Isaiah a double portrait fills the prophetic canvas. It is that of Christ and His Church.

That the prophet tells of *Christ*, and that with a marvellous fulness of anticipation, no one can reasonably deny. The sixth chapter, with its vision of the Seraphim, proclaiming Him to be the Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of Hosts; the seventh chapter foretelling His miraculous birth of a virgin mother; the ninth heralding forth His titles, as the Wonderful, the Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace; the eleventh expatiating upon His unction with the sevenfold Spirit of God; the fortieth revealing Him as the Good Shepherd who gathers the lambs with His arm and carries them in His bosom; and, above



all, the fifty-third, showing how the foundation of all His work is laid in the atoning efficacy of vicarious sacrifice,—all these, and many more, passages will at once recur to the memory of the serious student of the Divine Volume, and satisfy him that Isaiah did indeed speak of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.

That the prophet tells of the *Church* is equally certain. True it is that the use, the inevitable use, of symbolism drawn from the land, and history, and people, and kingdom, and worship of Palestine, has been misunderstood by many. Warm affections and busy fancies have led them to refer all to the still future of the literal Israel, and to see in the glowing prophecies of the son of Amos the picture of scenes yet to be enacted in the story of the sons of Jacob after the flesh. But if the New Testament is to be the key to the Old (and can it be anything else?), these imaginings must in great measure be abandoned in obedience to the Divine Interpreter, who, using the pen of an Apostle, gives utterance, with reference to some of Isaiah's most notable visions, to words like these: "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold now is the day of salvation" (2 Cor. vi. 2, quoting Isaiah xlix. 8); and again, "Jerusalem which is above is free, which

“is the mother of us all; for it is written, Rejoice, “thou barren that bearest not.” (Gal. iv. 26, 27, quoting Isaiah liv. 1.) Accordingly the disciple of obedient spirit and chastened judgment will thankfully trace through the pages of Isaiah the story of the Church concurrently with that of her Lord. In the thirty-fifth chapter, for example, he will recognize the quickening might of the Spirit; in the fortieth he will view the preaching of the Baptist as a pattern for all the ministers and stewards of God’s Word; in the forty-second, the vocation of the Gentiles; in the fiftieth, the righteousness which is by faith; in the fifty-fifth, the largeness of the Gospel invitation; in the fifty-eighth, the perpetual obligation of a Sabbath; in the sixty-first, the spiritual characteristics of disciples indeed; in the sixty-sixth, the abolition of the Levitical ritual and the substitution of the Gospel worship,—all these notes of the now existing Church and kingdom of Christ will crowd upon his memory as proofs conclusive that Isaiah, in common with his brethren, has “foretold of *these* days.”

The chapter from which my text is taken forms no exception; it belongs not to the still future, but to the actually present dispensation. As such it begins by setting forth the duty of the Church to exhibit

to the world the light she has received in the Gospel: "Arise, shine, for thy light is come." It then predicts, under the appropriate symbols of the camels and dromedaries of Midian and Ephah, the rams of Nebaioth, and the ships of Tarshish, the marvellous access of Gentile converts consequent on the visitation of the Dayspring from on high. It then proceeds to foretell the excellence,—“For brass I will bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver,” and the permanence,—“Thy sun shall no more go down, nor shall thy moon withdraw her shining,”—of so blessed, so glorious a dispensation: a dispensation which shall be succeeded by no further terrestrial œconomy, but shall be merged into an eternity of light and peace and righteousness.

In the progress of this wondrous hymn occur certain notes which have a timely significance in this our day. For they give an inspired, an infallible answer to a question which is now forcing itself upon the attention of Christians with a special urgency. That question is this: “Is it pleasant and acceptable to our God that temporal rulers should,” to adopt the words of Dr. Owen, “take care that the faith which was once delivered to the saints, be protected, preserved, propagated to and among the people over which God hath set them?” That

answer is in the affirmative: "The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee: for in My wrath I smote thee, but in My favour have I had mercy on thee." Give me, brethren, your patient, your candid attention as I unfold these clauses each in its turn.

And first: "*The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls.*"

The original builders of the Christian Church were Jews. St. Paul, St. Peter, St. James, St. John,—all were children of the stock of Abraham. But it was not always to be so. The father of Timothy was a Greek. Titus was a Greek. And so it came to pass, ever more and more, as the Church lengthened her cords and strengthened her stakes. Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin, Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Augustine,—all these master-builders of the walls of the Christian Church, the spiritual Jerusalem, were strangers of the Gentiles. And how many other such "strangers" were there in those early days whose memories have not come to us, but whose names are in the Book of Life, who were fellow labourers, fellow workers with the Apostles and their successors unto the kingdom of heaven. Truly the prophecy of Zechariah has, from the beginning of the Gospel, been in course

of fulfilment: "They that are far off shall come and "build in the temple of the Lord" (ch. vi. 15); and it is in course of fulfilment now! Within the borders of this ancient, this stately sanctuary, are assembled from time to time not a few ordained ministers of the English Church. In every one of these ministers, be he bishop, presbyter, or deacon, who lays as his foundation that corner stone, elect, precious, Jesus Christ,—in every one of these ministers, be he bishop, presbyter, or deacon, with whom God the Spirit works, bringing living stones to that sure foundation, and rooting and building them up in Him,—is the prophecy of my text being at this very moment accomplished. For *Britain* is one of the isles of the Gentiles; *we* are all of Gentile origin. "The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls."

Nor may I confine the prophecy within the limits of one visible Church or one earthly kingdom. Show me any man, whether at home, on the continent of Europe, or in the mission field, who truly answers to the portrait so graphically drawn by Bunyan: "A "very grave person which had his eyes lifted up to "heaven, the best of books was in his hand, the law "of truth was written on his lips, the world was behind his back. He stood as if he pleaded with "men, and a crown of gold did hang over his head."

Show me such a man, and, without pausing to inquire whether he follow with us or no, I will, if he be a brother Gentile, show you one in whom the prophecy is this very moment accomplished: for such an one also lays as his foundation that corner stone, elect, precious, Jesus. With such an one also the Holy Ghost works, bringing living stones to that sure foundation, and rooting and building them up in Him.

And so it shall be to the end of time. Like sons of strangers shall never be wanting to build the walls of Jerusalem, until the number of God's elect being accomplished and His kingdom come, the topmost stone shall be brought forth "with shoutings of grace, grace, unto it."

But, secondly, we pass to the next clause of my text: "*Their kings shall minister unto thee.*"

The contemporary history of Judah throws a very full and clear light upon this prediction. For study carefully the twenty-ninth, thirtieth, and thirty-first chapters of the Second Book of the Chronicles, and you will at once see how the words of Isaiah would be understood by those devout and spiritually minded subjects of king Hezekiah who were looking for redemption in Jerusalem. For mark well how effectually, how piously that godly monarch had

“ministered” to the Church of his days. Early in his reign he had purged the temple worship of the idolatries and the superstitions by which, in preceding years, its simplicity had been corrupted. He had also made provision for the dissemination of the Truth from Dan even to Beersheba, whether the inhabitants of that territory would hear or whether they would forbear. He had, further, reasserted, in the case of the Priests and the Levites, the ministers of the Lord, their Divinely constituted right to the tithes and offerings of the people. In other words, Hezekiah the King had ministered unto the Church by Internal Reformation, Territorial Organization, and Temporal Endowment.

Accordingly when the inspired prophet said, “Their kings shall minister unto thee,” he was doubtless understood, and that most properly, to mean that the Church should witness, as ages rolled on, a repetition at the hands of Gentile monarchs of the holy services which she had hitherto received from Jewish Kings. And the facts recorded in the Chronicles of the Gospel dispensation have, over and over again, given their “imprimatur” to this rendering of the prediction. “Over and over again,” I say: for though Constantine the Great was the most notable, he certainly was not

the only civil ruler in whom this and the kindred prophecy was accomplished ; "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers."

Take the case of that Established Church of which we are members.

It is a *Reformed* Church. Was it not reformed by the ministration of kings? I will not dwell upon the story of Henry the Eighth. It is the prerogative of the Most High to evoke good from evil. But who can name Edward the Sixth, Elizabeth, and William the Third, without thanking God for the monarchs, each fitted for the special function he had to discharge, by whom the blessed Reformation was carried forward and consolidated?

Our Church is a *Territorial* Church. Provinces, dioceses, parishes,—all are features of a wonderful system of division and subdivision by which, so far as human foresight can bring it to pass, care is taken that God's Holy Word and Sacraments shall be brought within reach of every dwelling and every inhabitant. And do we not owe all this, in its original conception and in its readjustment from time to time to the altered circumstances and increasing population of our islands, to the ministration of kings? For I take "kings," the only supreme governors known to Old Testament times, to be, in New



Testament days, a synonym for "the powers that be." And is it not to the powers that be that we owe that elaborate completeness of Ecclesiastical organization which is thus calculated to make our National Church the channel of blessing to every quarter of our land ?

But, again, the Church of England is an *Endowed* Church. And was it not endowed by the ministration of kings ? It has been shown by historical research that the origin of the lands and revenues held to this day by, or in behalf of, our National Church, was in the bounty of feudal lords and royal princes. Thus our Gentile Kings ministered to the Church in days of old. And so it is now whenever a wise and beneficent legislature reviews these revenues and improves their application, retrieving the laches of past generations, and redistributing the largesses of ancient benefactors. May the reformed faith, the parochial organization, the sufficient endowments of the Established Church of these Realms so co-operate each with the other that our children, yea, and our children's children, may thank Him, both in time and in eternity, who hath promised with His mouth and fulfilled with His hand the word, "The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee."

For these are blessings indeed !

Turn with me, thirdly, to the remaining clause of my text: "*For in My wrath I smote thee, but in My favour have I had mercy on thee.*"

Here we have the Scriptural solution of the question propounded at the commencement of this discourse. A Scriptural solution, I say; for it is the obvious duty of Christian people to bring every theory, every opinion, every scheme to the touchstone of Holy Writ. "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Now, there is a theory, an opinion, a scheme connected with the subject of to-day—and diametrically opposed to the teachings of the Fathers of English Nonconformity, yea, and to the practice of their sons who labour amongst the heathen,—which has been and still is, with strong zeal and untiring assiduity, obtruded upon public attention by home Nonconformists of the present age. According to such, the ministration of kings (that is, of civil governments) to the Church of Christ is a chastisement, not a boon; a curse, not a blessing. Accordingly the people of our land are invited to unite in severing all the ties which bind that Church to the State, in obliterating its territorial character, and

in depriving it of its pecuniary endowments. And they are assured that when she shall thus have been emancipated from all that now fetters her progress, it shall quickly be seen how great things the independence of Churches can accomplish, how vast the benefits Voluntaryism can bestow.

I will not recriminate. God forbid that I should launch against the Voluntary System that unmitigated condemnation which some of its advocates hurl against the principle of Establishments. For in truth it is well that both should grow together. While man remains a fallen creature, they will be found very remarkably to supplement and to correct each other. They supplement each other in cases like that which I have to name to you to-day. In our Diocesan Church and Parsonage Building and Benefice Augmentation Society the Voluntary System comes to the succour of our scattered populations and our ill-remunerated and houseless pastors, while the principle of Establishments, working through the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the Bounty Board, increases the volume of and gives permanency to that succour. They correct each other in cases like those in which the defects of our machinery, or, if the truth must be spoken, the supineness of our pastors, were supplied

by the labours of such men as Wesley and Whitfield. There were points in the doctrine and the practice of these men to which we might well demur; but were they to rise up again amongst us we could not forget the words of our Lord: "Forbid him not, for he that is not against us, is for us."

But when some "forbid" us, when they denounce our system as unscriptural, sinful, noxious, then, without retorting the charge, it is our duty to test their allegations by facts and by Scripture.

As to facts, I might tell you how things are in America, the very head-quarters of Voluntaryism. I might point out how Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Congregationalists,—all unite in telling of hundreds of rural flocks, of thousands and tens of thousands of sheep scattered in the wilderness, for whom it is impossible to make permanent pastoral provision. Again, I might show how, where such provision is made, the dependence of the shepherd for his temporal sustenance upon the good will of the flock, puts his fidelity to the Shepherd and Bishop of souls to a test under the strain of which that fidelity too often breaks down.

But I forbear, for I desire to bring the theory, apart from facts, to the simple test of Scripture. Place it side by side with my text. Harken to

that text again: "The sons of strangers shall build  
"up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto  
"thee," "because, forsooth, I am angry with thee,—  
"because, forsooth, my good will is departed from  
"thee,—because, forsooth, I purpose to inflict a  
"chastisement upon thee, to visit thee with a blight,  
"to smite thee with a curse?" No indeed! "The  
"sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and  
"their kings shall minister unto thee: for in My  
"wrath I smote thee, *but in My favour have I had*  
"*mercy on thee.*" "Yes!" saith the prophet to the  
mystical Church under the elder dispensation, "it  
"shall be the smiting of wrath when kings shall  
"cease to minister to thee, when for the sins of  
"thy people, kings shall no longer be thy nursing  
"fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers:  
"when, in other words, the National Church of  
"Israel shall be swept away, first at the captivity,  
"and secondly at the final destruction of Jerusalem.  
"But it shall not always be so. The enlargement of  
"the visible Church beyond the confines of Jewry,  
"and its liberation from that ceremonial yoke which  
"neither you nor your fathers were able to bear,  
"shall be accompanied by another token that my  
"wrath is quenched, that my favour is returned.  
"Gentile Kings shall awake to their duties, their

“privileges, their responsibilities, and in the correction of error, the adjustment of organization, the distribution of endowment, Gentile Hezekiahs shall minister unto thee.” Yes! in the judgment of the inspired Word, the establishment of Christianity in a land is not merely an ordinance of man (as such it is “a priori” entitled to our submission, “for the Lord’s sake”); but it is a *mercy*, a *favour*, a *gift*, a *blessing from God*, and, as such, to be known, to be used, to be cherished, to be retained, to be contended for, as amongst the choicest of the things which belong to our peace. And “what God hath cleansed, that call not thou common.”

I have now, my brethren, exhibited in outline the Scriptural argument in favour of Church Establishments which is embodied in my text. That argument might, if time permitted, be extended and strengthened by reference to other considerations and other Scriptures. It might, for example, be shown how the paternal relation in which rulers stand to their subjects involves the duty of providing for their best and most enduring welfare. Or, again, it might be shown how the filial relation in which rulers stand to the King of nations involves the duty of seeking His glory, that they may share His blessing. But time forbids, and I

will at once close my discourse by two practical remarks.

In the first place I would say, "*Distinguish between principles and their application.*"

It is for a principle that I contend to-day. It will be no rebutting of my argument, no overthrow of my conclusion, to adduce cases, either here or elsewhere, where that principle has been imperfectly, or unsuccessfully applied. Anomalies and miscarriages are inseparable from everything into which fallen humanity enters as a constituent part. Where they exist (and I by no means allow that they do exist to the extent often alleged), they call for a fresh, an improved application of the principle, they do not justify the rejection of the principle itself.

And this leads to my second and concluding exhortation. It is this, "*Do all you can, in respect of your own land, to bring to perfection the application of the principle for which you contend.*"

Every person who hears me to-day has a measure of influence, a portion of wealth. Use that influence, dispense that wealth, in ministering to Christ's Church. Of that influence it is impossible to say how much the laity can yet exert for the health and prosperity of the Establishment. Let them remember that they are an integral portion of that

Establishment, and let them vindicate their right to be heard in everything, whether of doctrine or discipline, that affects its welfare. Of that wealth we have in the Society for which I plead to-day a sample of what can be done by the laity to fortify and strengthen the walls of our Zion. I say, "a sample;" for while we can thank God for twenty churches and twenty-nine parsonages built, and thirty benefices augmented in five years, these are but a portion of what had to be done, these are but a fragment of what might have been done, if all our laity in all our villages and towns and cities had been forward to contribute each according to his ability. But I will not chide. An opportunity is now given to repair the error, to supply the defect. Right glad shall I be if my appeal to-day increases largely the number of our annual subscribers. Not less glad shall I be if a liberal collection, as the alms vessel is carried from worshipper to worshipper, proves that every worshipper gives, and that according to his ability, a thank offering to our God for that gracious enactment which decreed that not only should strangers build up the walls of Jerusalem, but that also their kings should minister unto her.





*THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY*

*Not Sacerdotal but Evangelistic.*

---

*The Charge Delivered at his Third Episcopal  
Visitation.*



THE following Charge, originally published at the request of the Clergy of the Diocese of Carlisle, is now, on the exhaustion of two Editions specially designed for local use, reprinted for wider circulation. Matters therefore of exclusively Diocesan character have been almost entirely removed from the text. Otherwise the document remains in the same state as that in which it commended itself to the approval of friends, in whose judgment the author has learned to confide. It is at their instance—but in sole dependence upon the help and blessing of the Great Shepherd and Bishop of souls—that he again sends forth this appeal to the Scriptures of Truth on behalf of the Evangelistic Ministry of the Reformed Church of England.

*Rose Castle, Carlisle,*

*January, 1868.*



## THE CHARGE.

---

SOLEMN thoughts, my Reverend Brethren, may well engage our minds, as yet once again we meet in Triennial Synod. For, since last we thus assembled, not fewer than twenty-seven of our Pastors have been removed from the scene of their labours upon earth, and now await the day on which every one of us shall give account of himself to God.

Of these there are two who deserve at my hands something more than a mere passing allusion. For William Whitmarsh Phelps, and Robert Wilson Evans, were as Scholars, as Christians, as Incumbents, men of no common mark.

Of the former I will only say, that had he entered upon his Northern service at an earlier date, or had it pleased God still further to prolong his days after he had pitched his tent amongst us, every one would have learnt why, after a friendship of sixteen years, I summoned him to my aid originally as my Examining Chaplain, and subsequently as my Archdeacon. As it is, I rejoice to hear, now that he is gone, from many and sometimes unlooked for quarters, that his intrinsic modesty had not altogether concealed from

view the chastened piety, the sterling sense, the loyal Churchmanship, and the large hearted charity of my departed colleague.

Of the latter, it is certainly not necessary that I should speak at any length. For the University of Cambridge, the Dioceses of Chester, Lichfield, and Carlisle, the Parishes of Aysgarth, Tarvin, and Heversham, all unite in cherishing the memory of the solid talents, the unostentatious learning, and the genial virtues of the author of "The Rectory of Valehead" and "The Bishopric of Souls." Nor do I believe that there is a single clergyman or layman, with whom official duty brought him into contact, who could not and would not, in his measure, bear a testimony similar to my own, to the *φιλαδελφία* with which, while retaining a firm hold on his own matured convictions, our truly venerable brother recognised and cherished honesty of purpose and sincerity of heart, wherever they were discernible.

But he also is absent from the body and present with the Lord. It remains that we be "not slothful, but followers"—imitators, *μιμηταί*—"of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises." For indeed there is an advantage to be derived from the contemplation of the lives and characters of these good men, beyond the mere gratification which every one must feel in rendering honour to whom honour is due. The clergy now present before God are, with scarcely an exception, men invested with the cure of souls. And the best and most enduring praise, both of Archdeacon

Phelps and of Archdeacon Evans, was earned in the protracted discharge of strictly parochial duty. Their remembrance, therefore, may well stimulate us all in the exertion to win, by the faithful discharge of like sacred functions, that "good name," which, as inspiration teaches, is "better than precious ointment."

For it is right that we should at all times cherish such hallowed ambition. "Let no man despise thy youth," saith the Apostle to Timothy. "Let no man despise thee," is the charge he lays upon Titus. Can I be wrong in repeating the exhortation?

And assuredly this is an age in which it were folly indeed in any, and above all in the clergy, to look for a respect which is not personally merited and won by the worthy discharge of incumbent obligations.

Truly it is God's will that His Ministers should, as such, be 'held in reputation,' that they should be 'esteemed very highly in love for their work's sake.' But these injunctions pre-suppose spiritual apprehension on the part of those to whom they are addressed. And it is too certain that the majority, even of men who call themselves Christians, are slow to recognise the high dignity and supreme importance of the subjects with which, on their behalf, their pastors are professionally conversant. Accordingly, while, in respect of the things of time, as philanthropists, as pioneers in the work of public education, as contributors to the literature of the hour, many of those pastors are doubtless held in much repute, it is too plain that that honour is rendered in spite, not in connection with, much less in consequence



of, that sacred character by which they are addicted to the things of eternity.

And is the office which they fill always reckoned at its true value by the clergy themselves? I fear not. By some it would seem as if it were thought that a lack of personal holiness is, in practice, compatible with the sufficient discharge of responsibilities which are in theory rightly understood. In others, an undue exaltation of official prerogative betrays a total misapprehension of the very functions themselves with which they are intrusted. In either case the consequence is obvious. The ministry is not presented in its true "glory" to the people: how can they be expected to render to it the appropriate homage?

If this be so, I shall not do amiss on the present occasion, if I endeavour to "stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance," as I exhibit to you the Christian Ministry in its essence and operation, as set forth in the Scriptures of Truth.

It is a subject which I have long since desired and determined to bring before my brethren. But while the topic can assuredly never be out of season, so long as there exists a Church upon earth needing a ministry, it is one which, at this crisis in our ecclesiastical history, solicits attention with an especial urgency. For never was a day when, in the conflict of opinion, the minds, more especially of the younger clergy, were in greater danger of being misled, to their own hurt and that of their flocks, upon this vital question.

The enquiry then which is now proposed for our

consideration is this—what constitutes the essence of the Ministry under the Christian Dispensation ?

Now there is no concealing the fact that two distinct and contradictory theories are held upon this subject, between which it is our duty, as men whose usefulness in our day and generation will be materially affected by our decision, to make a thoughtful and deliberate choice. The one theory may be called the Sacerdotal, the other the Evangelistic. The one, the Sacerdotal, finds its most full and complete exhibition in the formularies of Trent and the communion of Rome. The other, the Evangelistic, is embodied in the documents and constitution of the Protestant Church of England, with a reverent simplicity and a chaste comeliness which justly vindicate for her the most honourable place amongst all the daughters of the Reformation.

And, first, for the Sacerdotal Theory of the Christian Ministry.

Before the dawn of the blessed Reformation, the Minister of the Church—I speak of course of one who had passed from the Diaconate to the higher degree of the ecclesiastical hierarchy—almost universally claimed to be a *sacrificing priest* and a *spiritual judge*. To these pretensions the Canons and Decrees of Trent gave authority and permanency.

He came before his flock as a *sacrificing priest*. Clad in vestments specially belonging to the function he was about to discharge, he proceeded to consecrate the bread and the wine at the altar of his God. By the process of Transubstantiation these elements were transmuted, as

the words of consecration were pronounced over them, "the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood.<sup>a</sup>" Thus changed, that which was once bread and wine now became the fitting object of adoration, the sufficient victim of sacrifice. They became, I said, the fitting object of adoration. "No place accordingly is left for questioning the duty, incumbent upon all the faithful in Christ, of reverently paying to this most holy Sacrament that worship of *latria*, which is due to the true God; . . . for we believe the very same God to be actually present in it, of whom the eternal Father, when He brought Him into the world, said, 'And let all the angels of God worship Him: '—whom the prostrate magi adored; and whom lastly the Scripture witnesses that the apostles adored in Galilee."<sup>b</sup> The bread and the wine became, I added, the sufficient victim of sacrifice. "In the first place therefore the parish priests shall instruct their flocks that the Eucharist was instituted for two purposes:—the one, that it might be that heavenly nourishment of our souls, by means of which we may maintain and preserve our spiritual life:—the other, *that the Church might possess a perpetual sacrifice*, by which our sins may be expiated, and our heavenly Father, so often grievously offended by our wickednesses, may be moved from anger to pity, from the severity of just displeasure to clemency."<sup>c</sup> And this sacrifice, I

<sup>a</sup> <sup>b</sup> *Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini, Sessio xiii. cap. iv.*

<sup>c</sup> *Catechismus Romanus, Pars ii. De Sacramento Eucharistiæ, §. 70.*

must further note, was available for the dead not less than for the living. "Then moreover shall the parish priests instruct their people that so great is the efficacy of this sacrifice, that it avails not only for him who immolates it, and for him who partakes of it; but also for all the faithful, whether they be still living with us upon earth, or having already died in the Lord, have not yet been the subjects of a full expiation." <sup>d</sup>

But again the Pre-Reformation Minister presented himself to his people—and the Documents of Trent have embodied and perpetuated the assumption—as a *spiritual judge*. Seated in the tribunal of the Confessional, he received into his ear the out-pourings of the heart of the penitent; he aided him in the searching investigation into his most secret thoughts by questions many, minute, suggestive. Neither sex, nor age, was excused from subjection to the excruciating, the humiliating, the polluting exercise. Then, when the ordeal was passed, was the requisite, the suitable satisfaction prescribed, and the formal, the authoritative absolution pronounced.

The priest, I said, presented himself before his flock as a spiritual judge. "Let him who repents of his sins . . . reverence, in the priest *who sits as a lawful judge on his case*, the person and power of Christ our Lord. For the priest, as in the case of the other Sacraments, so also in administering that of Penance, discharges the functions of Christ." <sup>e</sup>

Full and entire confession was, I added, indispensable.

<sup>d</sup> Catechismus Romanus, Pars ii. De Sacramento Eucharistiae, §. 79.

<sup>e</sup> Catechismus Romanus, Pars ii. De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ, §. 17.

“When therefore the Lord ascribed to the priests the power of retaining and remitting sins, it is clear that they were constituted judges in that matter. But since, as the holy Synod of Trent has wisely cautioned us, a true verdict cannot be come to in any matter, nor can a strict proportion of justice be observed in exacting satisfaction for offences, unless the case be thoroughly known and seen through, it follows, that *in the confession of penitents all their sins must, one by one, be laid open to the priests.*”<sup>†</sup>

Then and only then, confession being complete, satisfaction being made, might absolution follow, in the few but mysterious words, “Ego te absolvo;” but when it did follow, then was blessing like this imparted: “Reconciliation with God, which sometimes, in the case of men of piety who receive this Sacrament with devotion, is followed by peace and serenity of conscience, with strong consolation of spirit.”<sup>‡</sup>

And whence were these twofold—these sacrificial and these judicial—powers of the priesthood derived? and how were they transmitted? Deposited originally with the Twelve, they were derived, it was said, from them by the Apostolic Succession.

These powers were originally, it was taught, deposited with the Twelve by the Lord Himself.

Thus when having taken bread, having blessed it and broken it, He said, “This do in remembrance of Me,” He invested the Apostles with sacrificial privilege and

<sup>†</sup> Catechismus Romanus, Pars ii. De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ, §. 41.

<sup>‡</sup> Decreta Concilii Tridentini, Sessio xiv. cap. iii.

power. In like manner when, after His Resurrection, He breathed on them and said, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained," He clothed the same Apostles with those judicial functions, which are involved and exercised in the administration of the Sacrament of Penance.

Nor were these tremendous prerogatives to be confined to the Apostolic College. The powers thus deposited with the Twelve were to be transmitted by the imposition of Apostolic hands. As under the Mosaic economy the priesthood dwelt exclusively in the natural descendents of Aaron, so, under the Christian dispensation, the Ministry belonging solely to the men who could show by the tables of a spiritual lineage that they derived their orders from Aaron's antitype, the Lord Christ. Thus, not to weary you with too many quotations from the documents of Rome, do we find it decreed, in the twenty-third Session of Trent, that "Sacrifice and priesthood have by the ordinance of God been so conjoined, that both of them exist wherever a law is given. Since, therefore, under the New Testament the Catholic Church has received, by the Lord's institution, the holy and visible sacrifice of the Eucharist, we must also confess that she has a new visible and external priesthood, into which the old has been transformed. But that this office was instituted by the same Lord, our Saviour, and that *to the Apostles, and to their successors in the priesthood, was committed the power of consecrating, offering, and ministering His body and blood, as also of remitting*

*and retaining sins*, the sacred writings prove, and the Catholic Church has always taught." <sup>b</sup>

Such, my Brethren of the Clergy and of the Laity, was, in brief and rapid outline, the Pre-Reformation, the Tridentine theory of the Ministry of the Church. Each Presbyter, each Bishop, was but an articulation in a vast Ecclesiastical organism, instituted for the purpose of receiving, exhibiting, and transmitting mighty, mysterious, stupendous sacrificial and judicial power. And the consequences to the laity were awful indeed. The salvation of every individual man, woman, and child, depended entirely upon his or her adhesion to the One Body Corporate, in which alone these awful prerogatives resided and were perpetuated. It might indeed be demonstrably proved from the pages of inspiration, from the chronicles of nations, yes and from the confessions of the very sons of the Church themselves, that that society had practically departed very far from the simplicity of Christian doctrine, and the purity of Christian morals; yet were the laity at least safe so long as they obediently followed the teaching of their divinely-appointed, their apostolically-descended guides. But woe to the man, of whatever age and degree, who should venture to attach himself to a body which might indeed pretend to proclaim Scriptural doctrine, which might indeed allege that it emulated Scriptural practice, but which had severed itself from the Apostolic centre of unity and life!

<sup>b</sup> *Decreta et Canones Concilii Tridentini, Sessio xiv. cap. i.*

I turn, secondly, to the Evangelistic theory of the Christian Ministry.

In no ecclesiastical documents is that theory exhibited more clearly, more fully, more practically, than in those of our Reformed Communion.

Do any inquire into the nature of the Christian Ministry as it respects those that are without the fold of the visible Church? The answer is distinct. It is a Ministry of Evangelism. The Lord Jesus, having "made perfect our redemption by His death," ordained that the glad tidings of salvation by grace, through faith, should be proclaimed to every creature. Accordingly "He sent abroad into the world His Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Doctors, and Pastors: by whose labour and ministry He gathered together a great flock in all parts of the world, to set forth the eternal praise of His holy name."<sup>1</sup>

Would any learn what is the most weighty function of the same Ministry as regards the sheep which have been already gathered into the fellowship of Christ's religion? Again is the reply of our formularies unequivocal. The presbyter in the household of faith is still an evangelist. Suffrages in the Litany, prayers for the whole state of Christ's Church Militant here in earth, special intercessions for Ember Seasons, collects for Sundays and Holydays, all conspire to instruct us that "all Bishops and Pastors should diligently preach God's holy Word;" that all Bishops and Curates should, "both by

<sup>1</sup> Form and Manner of Ordering of Priests.



their life and doctrine, set forth God's true and lively Word," as well as "rightly and duly administer His holy Sacraments." Nay more, so thoroughly paramount, in the judgment of the compilers of our Ordination office, is the Ministry of the Word, that in that most copious, most solemn monition which the Bishop addresses to the collective body of candidates for the Presbyterate, the discipline, the Sacraments of the Church are not even once mentioned; while "teaching, premonishing, feeding, and providing for the Lord's family," "doctrine," "exhortation," are named as constituting the "one thing" to which they must "apply themselves wholly," and in the way of which they must "draw all their cares and studies."

The value and efficiency of the Ministry depends, on this hypothesis, on the soundness of the doctrine which it propounds. Every possible safeguard accordingly is taken to engage those to whom so high a trust is committed to strict and unbending loyalty to the Scriptures of Truth, the sufficient, the exclusive, the infallible standard and canon of the Faith once delivered to the Saints. Need I quote words which were, on the most memorable day in the life of every Presbyter here present, addressed to him by the Bishop? "Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? and are you determined, out of the said Scriptures, to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you

shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?" "Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word?" "Will you be diligent in prayers, and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same?" "Be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God." "Take thou authority to preach the word of God."†

Nor let it be said that these are but partial citations from the offices of our Reformed Communion. No! we acknowledge that coupled with the words which we have just recited occur those memorable utterances, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained." But we note herein a doubly significant divergence from the Roman Pontifical. For therein the words, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins thou shalt remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins thou shalt retain, they are retained," are preceded by an important addition, while they are succeeded by no qualification whatever. They are preceded, I say, by an important addition: "The pontiff," so the rubric runs, "delivers to each candidate for the priesthood successively a chalice with wine and water, and a paten with a host lying upon it;" he then says

† Form and Manner of Ordering of Priests.

to each one, "Receive thou power to offer sacrifice to God; and to celebrate masses as well for the living as for the dead." They are followed by no qualification whatever: no Bible is placed in the hands of the candidate, no recognition of the Scriptures as the criterion of truth is to be found throughout the Service, no distinct commission to "preach the word." Not until we come to the consecration of Bishops is any certain honour paid to the written Word; and that is quickly tarnished by the mention, as endued with coordinate authority, of patristic tradition and papal prerogative.

Surely Bishop Jewel—and remember that his Apology is an authoritative document of the Church of England—was a true expositor of the mind of our Reformers when he gave forth these burning words: "We say that Christ hath given to his ministers power to bind, to loose, to open, to shut: and that the office of loosing consisteth in this point, that the minister should either offer, *by the preaching of the Gospel*, the merits of Christ and full pardon to such as have lowly and contrite hearts, and do unfeignedly repent them, pronouncing unto the same a sure and undoubted forgiveness of their sins, and hope of everlasting salvation; or else that the minister, when any have offended their brothers' minds with a great offence, and with a notable and open fault, whereby they have, as it were, banished and made themselves strangers from the . . . body of Christ, then, after perfect amendment of such persons, doth reconcile and restore them to the unity of the faithful. We say also that the minister doth execute the authority of

binding and shutting, as often as he shutteth up the gate of the kingdom of heaven against unbelieving and stubborn persons, denouncing unto them God's vengeance and everlasting punishment; or else when he doth quite shut them out from . . . the Church by open excommunication. And touching the keys, where-with they may either shut or open the kingdom of heaven, we, with Chrysostom, say, that they be 'the knowledge of the Scriptures;' with Tertullian we say, they be 'the interpretation of the law;' and, with Eusebius, we call them 'the word of God.' Moreover, that Christ's disciples did receive this authority, *not that they should hear the private confessions of the people, and listen to their whisperings, as the common massing priests do every where now-a-days; . . . but to the end they should go, they should teach, they should publish abroad the Gospel, and be unto the believing a sweet savour of life unto life, and to the unbelieving and unfaithful a savour of death unto death. . . . Seeing then the key, whereby the way and entry to the kingdom of God is open to us, is the word of the Gospel and the expounding of the law and Scriptures, we say plainly, where the same word is not, there is not the key.*"<sup>k</sup>

Not that we are therefore taught to depreciate either Ecclesiastical Order or Divine Sacraments.

With regard to the former, we learn, to cite once more the words of Jewel, "That the minister ought lawfully, duly, and orderly to be preferred to that office of the

<sup>k</sup> On the three Prayer-Book forms of absolution, see Appendix A.

Church of God ; and that no man hath power to wrest himself into the holy Ministry at his own pleasure and list." And then in respect of the outward model upon which the Christian society should be framed, we are instructed that Episcopacy alone is discernible in the record of the New Testament Scriptures. " We believe," I quote again from Jewel, " that there be divers degrees of ministers in the Church : whereof some be deacons, some priests, some bishops ; to whom is committed . . . the whole charge and setting forth of religion."

But then with regard to the Ministers so ordained, we gather from our formularies that an inward personal vocation by Him who is emphatically " the Spirit of Truth," should precede the reception of the outward official commission. Hence the question which—in varying form, but with uniform intent—is addressed to the candidate for either one of the three orders of the Ministry, in the corresponding office of our Church, " Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this Office and Ministration, to serve God for the promoting of His glory, and the edifying of His people ? " <sup>1</sup>

And so, as concerns the outward framework of the Christian society, we maintain that Episcopacy is so great a blessing, so high a privilege, that we can never thank God enough that it hath been preserved to our Church and nation. But we are taught, by the practice not less than by the precept of the compilers of our

<sup>1</sup> The Form and Manner of Making of Deacons.

Prayer-Book, to add that the Truth, as it is in Jesus, is a greater treasure, and the possession of it a higher privilege still ; and that they are more really built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, who, less favoured than ourselves, in the humbler the homelier setting of a northern Presbyterianism, exhibit the image of Christ, than they who in the more ancient, the more gorgeous framework of an Italian Episcopacy, delight to shew forth the glories of Mary in place of those of her Son. <sup>m</sup> Nay more, to come nearer home, we doubt not that Archbishop Sancroft did but express the mind of the Fathers of the Reformation, when he bade the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury “ assure our brethren the Protestant Dissenters, that we are really and sincerely irreconcilable enemies to the errors, superstitions, idolatries, and tyrannies of the Church of Rome : ” and “ we would warmly and most affectionately exhort them to join with us in daily fervent prayer to the God of peace for the universal *blessed union of all Reformed Churches both at home and abroad* against our common enemies : that all they who do confess the holy name of our dear Lord, and do agree in the truth of His holy word, may also meet in one holy communion, and live in perfect unity and godly love.” <sup>n</sup>

In like manner with regard to the Divine Sacraments, which it is a special duty of Christ's servants to dispense ; we hold them to be effectual means of grace, but always in subordination to, in co-operation with the Word. Let

<sup>m</sup> Appendix B.

<sup>n</sup> D'Oyly's Sancroft, vol. i. pp. 320, 324, 325.

Baptism be administered intelligently, prayerfully, believingly, as respects those who gather round the font : then, not by any official power inherent in him who bathes that little one, that adult, in the sacred flood, but by virtue of prayer to God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, is privilege, yea, and as we must assume till the contrary is proved, is grace also conferred on the recipient. Let the bread and the wine be received intelligently, prayerfully, believingly, as respects those who assemble at "the Lord's board ;" then, not in virtue of the uttered words of the consecrating celebrant, but by force of the unseen faith of the recipient guest, not "*objectively*" but "*subjectively*," does the believing communicant spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood—then doth Christ spiritually dwell in His true disciple, and His true disciple in Him.<sup>o</sup>

And herein we are reminded of the vast difference, *as respects the determination of the spiritual standing of individuals*, between the two theories of the Christian Ministry which have now been laid before you. In the one the *objective* element predominates, in the other the *subjective* takes the lead. Embrace the Sacerdotal theory, and the first and chief enquiry of the anxious soul will be directed outwards, to the notes of the visible communion with which it is in fellowship. Submit to the Evangelistic theory, and it will be your primary desire to see within your bosom the certain workings of an inward and spiritual grace. In the one case the question

<sup>o</sup> See Appendix C ; and the author's Sermon on 'Eating Christ's Flesh and Drinking Christ's Blood.'

will be, "Am I, by dutiful allegiance to the authorized human priesthood, maintaining my union with that great visible corporation which claims to be called the Catholic Church?" In the other case the scrutiny will be this, "Am I, by a living faith in Jesus, the Son of God, proving that His Gospel has come unto me not in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance?"

Nor may we conceal from ourselves the very serious *ecclesiastical* issues which depend upon our decision.

Let the Sacerdotal theory of the Christian Ministry be adopted, even with those modifications which, as it is fondly believed by its advocates amongst ourselves, vindicate for it an Anglican as distinguished from a Roman character, and it becomes a matter of the greatest difficulty—to honest and straightforward minds well-nigh an impossibility,—to justify our national secession from the Latin obedience in the sixteenth century. Pleas such as we have lately seen alleged for continuance in our "schism," drawn from the so-called "mission" of the English hierarchy, may possibly for a time answer the purpose of quieting unsettled spirits within the limits of our sea-girt island: but they leave them under a constraining obligation to worship in the sanctuaries, and to make use of the ministrations of Rome in those lands beyond the seas where she has, on this theory, sole authority. Will they not, have they not, must they not, ultimately prove utterly futile to keep these troubled ones back, as the power of an irresistible fascination draws them nearer and nearer,



and finally absorbs them altogether in that fore-doomed apostasy,<sup>p</sup> which,—misappropriating the terms Holy, Catholic,—practically interpolates the creed with the words Visible and Roman ?

On the other hand, let the Evangelistic theory of the Christian Ministry be retained, and our position as sons and servants of the Protestant Church of England becomes definite, clear, firm, impregnable. We were delivered at the blessed Reformation from an enormous Sacerdotal usurpation. We were brought back into the clear light and shining of the Gospel. With all our faults, all our shortcomings, we have for three centuries rejoiced in belonging to a “ congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments are duly administered, according to Christ’s ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.”<sup>q</sup> We hail, as helpers of our joy, all those His faithful servants who, loyal to these simple, these Scriptural principles, come to us, determined to know nothing amongst us but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. We reject, even though they present themselves as angels of light, all who, assuming a dominion over our faith, would corrupt us from the simplicity that is in Christ: for this is our watchword, for ourselves and for our children for ever, “ Stand fast in the liberty with which Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.”<sup>r</sup>

<sup>p</sup> 2 Thess. ii. 2, 8. See Archdeacon Wordsworth on St. Paul’s Prophecy concerning the Man of Sin. Rivingtons.

<sup>q</sup> Article XIX.

<sup>r</sup> Gal. v. 1.

But yet once again, apart from individual and ecclesiastical considerations, *pastoral concerns* of an eminently practical character are involved in the decision which we are called upon to make between the Sacerdotal and the Evangelistic theories of the Christian Service. That service is pre-eminently one "for the salvation of mankind." It is God's own appointed instrument for the 'accomplishment of the number of His elect and the hastening of His kingdom.' But it is only an instrument. He Himself, by the quickening power of the Holy Ghost, is the mighty agent: "Salvation is of the Lord." How needful then that the instrument should be one of His making, His tempering, His appointing! For such, and only such, will He second and bless—such, and only such, shall share with Him, if the expression may for a moment be permitted, the glorious name of "Saviour"—"thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee."\* Adopt then and act upon an unsound theory of the Christian Ministry, and, whatever may be the present semblance of success, the only possible ultimate issue shall be that foretold in the words, "Can the blind lead the blind? shall they not both fall into the ditch?"† Embrace and carry out in practice a true theory of the Christian Ministry, and whatsoever may be the discouragements of the passing hour, ye shall "doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing your sheaves with you."‡

But how shall our choice be determined? To what

\* 1 Tim. iv. 16.

† Luke vi. 39.

‡ Psalm cxxvi. 6.

touchstone, what criterion, shall we bring these conflicting, these incompatible theories of the Christian Ministry? How shall we that hold the *King's* commission ascertain whether it is to be read as constituting us Priests, or as making us Evangelists? Surely we must betake ourselves to the *King's* written instructions. As Churchmen, as Christians, we can give but one reply to this enquiry, so long as the Sixth Article of Religion remains unrepealed, so long as the sixteenth and seventeenth verses of the third chapter of the Second Epistle to Timothy remain uncanceled. "What saith the Scripture?"<sup>v</sup> "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."<sup>w</sup>

Yes, turn with me, my Brethren, to infallible pages. Go not to the Pre-Reformation æra; pause not even at the days of an undivided visible Church: the writers of those ages are not safe expositors of truth, the traditions of Christendom had even then long entered upon a phase similar to that which, in the case of Jewry, called forth the searching rebuke of Incarnate Wisdom, "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?" . . . "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition."<sup>x</sup> No, we will not appeal even to the Fathers of the Reformation themselves as arbiters in this momentous controversy. True indeed it is that we may well "entertain for the martyrs and confessors to whom,

<sup>v</sup> Rom. iv. 3. Gal. iv. 30.

<sup>w</sup> Isaiah viii. 20.

<sup>x</sup> Matt. xv. 3, 6. See for the *early* Fathers, Appendix D.

under Him who raised them up and enlightened and strengthened them, we owe that great deliverance of the sixteenth century, a far deeper feeling of reverence than for any guides which the Church has had since the Apostles." <sup>7</sup> "There were" moral and spiritual "giants in those days." But they were still men. And the question before us is vital. No! we must appeal to the *λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ*—"What saith the Lord?"

And truly materials for the formation of a Scriptural judgment upon the matter are sufficiently plentiful. No one, my Reverend Brethren and my Brethren of the Laity, who has not read the entire New Testament record through, for the express purpose of ascertaining the mind of the inspired writers upon the subject at issue, can have any idea how various, how copious, are the instructions they communicate concerning the Christian Ministry. It would almost seem as if this were the one object which the Holy Ghost had kept ever in view. For indeed not a Gospel, not an Epistle, not even the Apocalypse, fails to contribute its full measure of unerring instruction. The internal conflicts and trials of Christian Churches in Palestine, in Asia Minor, in Achaia and Italy, seem all to be spread before us: the personal histories of Peter, and John, and Barnabas, and Paul, seem all to be submitted unreservedly to our gaze, in order that we may learn from them, not less than

<sup>7</sup> Bishop O'Brien on the Nature and the Effects of Faith; Preface to Edition of 1863, page xxi. The Bishop cites, as witness to this truth, Archdeacon Hare, in Note W to his "Mission of the Comforter." pp. 705—712.

from the three distinctly Pastoral Letters addressed to Timothy and to Titus, what are the qualifications the Christian Minister should possess, what are the objects at which he should aim, what are the functions which he should discharge.

And what is the verdict of the Book of God when thus consulted upon the question before us to-day ?

Without hesitation I reply, that the Scriptures decide unequivocally against the pretensions of Sacerdotalism ?

They do so by their silence.

Where, when admitted, as I have just remarked, into the inner life of Pastors and Churches, do we find the Sacrament of Penance, or the Sacrifice of the Mass ? No where ! and yet on the Sacerdotal theory they ought to have been every where ! "It is surely"—as was very well spoken many years ago—"not only improbable, but, on the supposition of the Apostolic inspiration, quite inconceivable, that the priestly attributes, if they really existed in the Christian Ministry, should not have taken their place, at all events in these *elaborate charges* to pastors which yet, in this view, *omit the most awful part of their office*. If they have any existence at all, they are *not capable*, as we have seen, of a *secondary place* ; and universal experience, and an experience too even under our own eyes, has, I will not say, rendered it probable, but demonstrated, as far as such a term is applicable to a moral truth, that every thing else in our relations to God and to our flocks will be absolutely subordinated to them. No man, holding the Christian priesthood, in the Romanist sense, *could have written to*

those who bore the office, as the Apostles have written : he would never have said *what they* have said, nor adopted the tone and manner *in which* they have said it ; nor, on the other hand, have omitted what they have omitted : and yet, neither omission nor assertion, in inspired men, who were to constitute, in their writings, the canon of Christian truth, could possibly have happened, but by the special overruling of the Spirit by which they spake.”<sup>a</sup>

It is indeed possible, if we draw nigh to the pages of Holy Writ with the determination to discover some support for a system in which the heart's affections are already implicated, to point to isolated texts, here one and there another, which at first sight may seem susceptible of an interpretation in harmony with our opinions. But such suffrages entirely fail to succour us, when that canon of interpretation which bids us prophesy according to the proportion of the faith<sup>a</sup> re-asserts its supremacy.

Thus, for example, it has been urged that the verb *ποιέω—τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*<sup>b</sup>—has in the Septuagint the same sacrificial import as that which has been ascribed to the Latin verb “*facio*.”<sup>c</sup> And

<sup>a</sup> Archdeacon Garbett's Bampton Lectures (for 1842), vol. i. pp. 185, 186.

<sup>a</sup> Romans xii. 6.

<sup>b</sup> Luke xxii. 19.

<sup>c</sup> “The plea from *hoc facite*, when first set up, was abundantly answered by a very learned Romanist ; I mean the excellent Picherell, who wrote about 1562, and died in 1590. Protestants also have often confuted it ; and the Papists themselves, several of them, have long ago given it up.” Waterland, Works, vol. viii. pp. 194, 195 : cited by Goode, Divine Rule, vol. ii. p. 152.

then we have been called upon to recognize in those memorable syllables, "this do in remembrance of me," "hoc facite in meam commemorationem," the institution of an expiatory oblation in the Eucharistic Service. But the verb *ποιέω* has also, in more than five hundred passages in which it occurs in the pages of the New Testament, the ordinary significance of the vernacular "do." We are at liberty, therefore, nay rather we are under a moral obligation, to ascertain whether there is a Scriptural necessity to admit the unusual, the forced, exposition of these words in place of their common, their natural rendering. The result of our enquiry is,—for the speech of Scripture is not less emphatically anti-sacrificial than its silence,—"take the verb *ποιέω* in its ordinary sense as it is uttered by the Master, and learn from Him to keep a Feast, not to offer a Sacrifice, at the table of the Lord." For read only the Epistle to the Hebrews, and you must come to the conclusion that there remaineth upon earth, now that Jesus the Son of God is passed into the heavens, neither priest, nor altar, nor sacrifice for sin!<sup>d</sup> Shall the uniform and emphatic teaching of this, yea and of the other Epistles also, on this subject, be neutralized by the adoption, in this one passage, of a technical sense of the verb *ποιέω*, elsewhere unknown to the New Testament? Or shall the universal testimony of these supreme documents of the Christian economy exclude the exceptional, and confine us to the usual rendering of the word? To

<sup>d</sup> Appendix E. See also the author's sermon on Heb. xiii. 10.

such a question there can, I conceive, be but one legitimate answer.

Once more it is possible to affirm that those memorable verses, the twenty-second and twenty-third of the twentieth chapter of St. John, invest the Christian priesthood with that judicial power which is said to be exercised in the administration of the Sacrament of Penance. But another interpretation is also possible, one which makes the passage in question,—in its primary intention, the basis of the plenary inspiration of Apostolic Scriptures,—in its secondary application, the guarantee that, so far as your preaching and mine is consistent with those Scriptures, our declarations, whether of acquittal or condemnation, respecting the sinners with whom we have to deal, shall be ratified by the Judge of all.\* Which exposition shall be accepted? Study the Epistle to the Romans, and you must come to the conclusion that, as to the means by which they can be absolved and remitted, the distinction between pre-baptismal and post-baptismal sin has no warranty of Holy Scripture, for that with regard to both, by direct believing access to Christ alone, the word remains in fullest force, “therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.” So that indeed the judicial power of the priesthood, interposing as it does the person of the minister and the works of the penitent between that penitent and

\* See the Author's Charge of 1864, pp. 55, 56 ; and his Sermon on the Apostolic Commission and Auricular Confession.



Jesus, is "against the true Christian liberty," and worthy only of "the time of blindness and ignorance."<sup>f</sup>

Truly Sacerdotalism must needs be sustained, if sustained at all, by other than Scriptural proof.

Far different is it with regard to the Evangelistic theory of the Ministry.

Here also the very silence of Holy Scripture is highly significant. The Sacraments, of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, were ordained of Christ Himself. But even they are thrown into the shade by the *Κήρυγμα*—the *λόγος—τοῦ Σταυροῦ*. In the Pastoral Epistles neither of them is even once certainly named. In the other Apostolic writings the position they occupy is distinctly subordinate. "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel;"<sup>g</sup> that is, we may well believe, not that the Apostle would disparage Baptism, but that he would have it emphatically stated, and fully understood, that the grand, the pre-eminent function of the Ministry with which he was put in trust, was the "proclamation of peace by Jesus Christ."<sup>h</sup> And so it is even until now. Still is neither the font, nor the table, but the pulpit "the parson's joy and throne."

For note well the *names, styles, and titles* by which the servants of Jesus Christ are designated in the pages of the New Testament volume!

The term *ιερεὺς*, consecrated though it was by the inspired usage of the Old Testament economy, has altogether disappeared as the divinely-authorized official

<sup>f</sup> Homily of Repentance, Part ii.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. i. 17.

<sup>h</sup> Acts x. 36.

designation of the Ministers of God; that of *πρεσβύτερος* has taken its place in the Christian dispensation. The very Apostles themselves seem to rejoice in this as not their least honourable distinction in the household of faith.<sup>1</sup> "The elder unto the elect lady," saith St. John: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder," saith St. Peter.<sup>1</sup> Now mark the qualifications which are to be kept in view in the selection of these "elders" or "presbyters:" they must be "apt to teach"<sup>k</sup>—they must "in doctrine hold fast the faithful word"<sup>l</sup>—it is when they have laboured "in the word and doctrine" that they are to "be counted worthy of double honour."<sup>m</sup> And so it is with regard to the other names given to the servants of Jesus Christ. They are "apostles, prophets, teachers,"<sup>n</sup> "evangelists,"<sup>o</sup> "messengers,"<sup>p</sup> "ambassadors,"<sup>q</sup> "heralds."<sup>r</sup> And each

<sup>1</sup> "In truth the word *presbyter* doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable, than *priest*, with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ. For what are they that embrace the Gospel, but sons of God? What are Churches, but His families? Seeing therefore we receive the adoption and state of sons by their Ministry, whom God hath chosen out for that purpose; seeing also that when we are the sons of God, our continuance is still under their care which were our progenitors, what better title could there be given them than the reverend name of *presbyters*, or fatherly guides? *The Holy Ghost throughout the body of the New Testament, making so much mention of them, doth not any where call them priests.*" Hooker, E. P. iii. 78.

1 Appendix F.

<sup>k</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Titus i. 9; ἀνερχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου.

<sup>m</sup> 1 Tim. v. 17.

<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 28.

<sup>o</sup> Eph. iv. 11.

<sup>p</sup> Rev. i. 20.

<sup>q</sup> 2 Cor. v. 20.

<sup>r</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 7; a preacher, κήρυξ.

one of these terms implies either the delivery of a message, the teaching of a lesson, the propounding of a doctrine, or the proclamation of a decree. The same statement holds good in the case of the metaphorical designations given by inspiration to the Ministers of God. They are "sowers,"<sup>s</sup> and "builders,"<sup>t</sup> and "fathers,"<sup>u</sup> and "nurses."<sup>v</sup> But if so, "the sower soweth the word,"<sup>w</sup> the foundation is Christ set forth in the word,<sup>x</sup> the "incorruptible seed" by which souls are born again is still "the Gospel which is preached"<sup>y</sup> unto them, and it is still "the sincere milk of the word"<sup>z</sup> by which they are nourished unto spiritual maturity. In like manner are we "workmen?" We cannot as such be "approved to God," unless we "rightly divide the word of truth."<sup>a</sup> Have we to "war the good warfare?"<sup>b</sup> It is "for the defence and confirmation of the Gospel" that we are "set."<sup>c</sup> Are we the "guides," the "rulers" of the people of God? The ground on which we may lawfully claim their allegiance is that "we have spoken unto them the word of the Lord."<sup>d</sup>

Nor does that well-known passage establish any the least exception, in which it is written; "Let a man so account of us, as of the Ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God."<sup>e</sup> For observe particularly what these "mysteries of God" in the terminology of

<sup>s</sup> Matt. xiii. 3. John iv. 36, 37.

<sup>t</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 10.

<sup>u</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 15.

<sup>v</sup> 1 Thess. ii. 7.

<sup>w</sup> Mark iv. 14.

<sup>x</sup> 1 Peter ii. 3—8.

<sup>y</sup> 1 Peter i. 23, 25.

<sup>z</sup> 1 Peter ii. 2.

<sup>a</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 15.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Tim. i. 18.

<sup>c</sup> Phil. i. 7, 17.

<sup>d</sup> Heb. xiii. 7, 17.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 1.

the New Testament Scriptures really *are*. "In the terminology," I say, "of the New Testament Scriptures;" for some, bringing an uninspired usage of the term "mystery" to the interpretation of the inspired record, have contended that here at least the Sacerdotal character of the Christian Ministry is recognized, for that by the mysteries of God are signified His *Sacraments*.<sup>f</sup> But indeed it is not so! Examine carefully the several passages, text and context, in which the word occurs, and you will be led to the inevitable conclusion that the "mysteries," of which we are stewards, are those blessed Gospel truths which natural "eye hath not seen," which natural "ear hath not heard," and which have not entered into the natural "heart to conceive," but which "God hath revealed unto us by His Spirit."<sup>g</sup> Let me cite but one proof—it will be found in the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, immediately following the picture of the "panoply of God:"—"Praying always," saith the Apostle, "for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known *the mystery of the Gospel*, for which I am an ambassador in bonds: that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak."<sup>h</sup>

<sup>f</sup> *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* are never in Scripture even once called "mysteries." The mysteries in it are 'the Incarnation,' 1 Tim. iii. 16: 'the union of Christ and His Church,' Eph. v. 32: 'the incorporation of the Gentiles into the Church,' Eph. iii. 3, 6: 'the ingathering of the Jews,' Rom. xi. 25: 'the great apostasy,' 2 Thess. ii. 7: 'the resurrection of the body,' 1 Cor. xv. 51.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 7—10.

<sup>h</sup> Eph. vi. 18, 19, 20.

But again, I would invite you to notice the full instruction on the question now before us, which may be derived from the very *wording itself of the Ministerial Commission* as it is, in varying form, registered in the inspired records of the Christian Church. *Preaching* in every case stands prominently forward as the great and characteristic ordinance of the Gospel dispensation in all the stages of its development—*Βόσκει τὰ ἀρνία μου*—*Ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου*—*Βόσκει τὰ πρόβατά μου*<sup>1</sup>—twice *Βόσκει*, once only *Ποίμαινε*.

In all stages, I remarked, of the Gospel dispensation is this prominence given, in the inculcation of ministerial obligations, to the preaching of the word. Of this being so in the initial stage, there can, of course, be no doubt. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature."<sup>1</sup> "It behoved Christ to suffer and to rise again from the dead, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."<sup>2</sup> Nor can it be maintained that to them that were without, to the unbaptized, the Apostles and Elders were indeed *κήρυκες*, "heralds;" but that to the initiated, the disciples, they became *ιερείς*, "priests." By no means. Still does preaching, teaching, instruction stand forth as the great ministerial function. "Go, make disciples of all nations, baptizing them . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."<sup>1</sup> Mark well this Apostolic Commission—after Baptism it

<sup>1</sup> John xxi. 15, 16, 17.

<sup>1</sup> Mark xvi. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xxiv. 46, 47.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, margin.

enjoins *instruction* still. To the same effect is the charge given to Timothy with regard to the Church over which the Holy Ghost had made him overseer: "Take heed to thyself and to the doctrine."<sup>m</sup>—"I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom; preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine. . . . But watch thou in all things, . . . do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry."<sup>n</sup> And in strict accordance with this conviction of the supreme importance of the preaching of the word, even in regularly constituted Churches, were the considerations by which Timothy was to be guided in the choice and appointment of presbyters: "the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to *teach* others also."<sup>o</sup>

Time bids me hasten forward. I therefore invite you to note, in further prosecution of the enquiry now before us, the *recorded practice of the Apostles* and their immediate successors. Still is the unfaltering reply, "Necessity is laid upon me, yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel."<sup>p</sup> Passing by, as irrelevant to the matter under immediate investigation, the Ministry exercised for the searching out and the bringing in of the lost sheep, I invite your attention at once and

<sup>m</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 16.

<sup>n</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 1—5.

<sup>o</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 2.

<sup>p</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 16.

exclusively to the Ministry exercised with regard to those already within the fold. It is still throughout, pre-eminently, emphatically, a Ministry of "the word." Let St. Paul be heard as, at Miletus, he reviews his three years' labours at Ephesus: "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." . . . . "Wherefore I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men; for I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God."<sup>q</sup> Or let the same Apostle himself inform us how he dealt with the Churches in general: "Christ . . . whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: whereunto I also labour, striving according to His working, which worketh in me mightily."<sup>r</sup>

Or, viewing this part of our subject from another point of observation, mark the paramount importance attached to *doctrine* in all the Apostolic addresses to the flock and its pastors. Not one single word is there about external criteria of mission, commission, or descent—not one single word is there about the alleged distinction between contrition and attrition, about sacramental penance and priestly absolution, about the comparative value of actual or spiritual communion, in one or both kinds; but many, very many, words

<sup>q</sup> Acts xx. 20, 21, 26, 27.

<sup>r</sup> Col. i. 28, 29.

about sound doctrine, exhortations “earnestly to contend for *the faith* once delivered to the saints;”<sup>s</sup> entreaties to take heed lest their “minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ,”<sup>t</sup> admonitions not to receive into the house, nay not even to bid God speed to any who bring not the doctrine of Christ,<sup>u</sup> charges to reject as “accursed” even “an angel from heaven,” if his gospel be abhorrent to the Gospel of Christ.<sup>v</sup>

Surely the reply of all the Apostolic practice to the question before us is still the same: the servants of Christ are not priests, but preachers, teachers, pastors; this is their highest, their peculiar honour, that they have received a “Ministry of the Lord Jesus to testify the Gospel of the grace of God.”<sup>w</sup>

And how, we may well ask, could it be otherwise? If the teaching of Holy Scripture with regard to the work of the Lord Jesus be exclusively authoritative, we cannot be *ιερείς*, expiating priests, there is no place left for the discharge of such functions; we can only be *κήρυκες*, heralds of glad tidings of peace. For Christ our Lord is the true Aaron,—*ἐφάπαξ*, “once for all,”<sup>x</sup> hath He made “there,” “upon the cross” “(by His one oblation of Himself once offered), a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world;”<sup>y</sup> “there is none other satisfaction for sins, but that alone”<sup>z</sup>—the one great and final day

<sup>s</sup> Jude 3.<sup>t</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 3.<sup>u</sup> 2 John 10, 11.<sup>v</sup> Gal. i. 8.<sup>w</sup> Acts xix. 24.<sup>x</sup> Heb. x. 10.<sup>y</sup> Order of Holy Communion.<sup>z</sup> Article XXXI.



of atonement is past and gone—"it is finished," "consummatum est," τετέλεσται<sup>a</sup>—all that is left to us, and an unspeakable honour it is, is to swell,—in notes loud and clear and full,—the trumpet sound of a world-wide, a perpetual jubilee, as, till the end of time, we proclaim that "perfect law of liberty,"<sup>b</sup> "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God."<sup>c</sup>

Such are the two great ruling theories of the Christian Ministry, the Sacerdotal and the Evangelistic. That they are incompatible cannot be denied. That they are at this moment contending for the mastery within the precincts of our National Church is equally certain. The one, the Sacerdotal, is the rallying point of men who, more or less explicitly, avow their dissatisfaction with the actual condition of our Church. Her organization, her worship, need, they seem to declare, to be brought into closer assimilation to those of that body which is now, by a frequent euphemism, designated the Western Church. Let this be accomplished, and it is the fond hope of many of them that the desired consummation may yet be witnessed of the restoration of a visible oneness between Anglican and Oriental, not less than Occidental Christendom. Of the other, the Evangelistic, its adherents, affirm, that it is because it is wrought up into the whole tissue and fabric of the constitution of England's Church that they love her so well. Let her sons, they protest, but exhibit it fully, fearlessly, at home, on the continent, in the colonies, and in the mission field, and the Anglican

<sup>a</sup> John xix. 30.

<sup>b</sup> James i. 25.

<sup>c</sup> 1 Tim. i. 11.

communion shall yet prove to be what she certainly was in the days of her Reformers, the "pillar and ground of the truth," the refuge of every troubled soul who, prizing dearly Apostolic order, would still obey that warning voice which cries aloud of the Apocalyptic Babylon, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."<sup>d</sup>

These being the issues really involved, I have invited you to refer the question to that one only infallible tribunal, the Scriptures of Truth. And I think that we have seen that, though isolated passages may be alleged as giving a divine sanction to the pretensions of Sacerdotalism, they cease to yield them any countenance whatever when fairly interpreted in the light of the teaching of Holy Writ taken in its integrity. At the same time we have been confirmed in our adhesion to the doctrine which holds the Christian Ministry to be Evangelistic in its essence, by a cogency of inspired evidence which, from its variety and abundance, is perfectly overpowering. In truth, as it is well in passing to observe, so conclusively anti-Sacerdotal is the verdict of the Bible felt to be, that it is invariably found that the earliest efforts of the Apostles of the Mediaeval as opposed to the Reformed—of the Hieratic as opposed to the Evangelistic—theory of the Christian Ministry, are directed to the disparagement of Scripture as the sole, the sufficient rule of faith, and the practical

<sup>d</sup> Rev. xviii. 4. See Wordsworth's "Union with Rome."—Rivingtons.

substitution of so-called Church authority for that divine canon of doctrine and practice. Surely this fact, for a fact it unquestionably is, should at once, my Brethren of the Laity, determine you to close your ears to the overtures, how seductive soever they may be, of such teachers. There must be a lie in his right hand who instinctively shrinks from contact with the one only volume of truth.

The conclusions which flow from these premises are simple and practical.

Is it the honest desire of the Clergy that when they depart hence their memory should be blessed? Is it their reasonable wish that, while yet in the land of the living, they should be held in honour in their parishes and in their neighbourhoods? Above all, is it their holy ambition to hear, as addressed to themselves, those words of supreme approval, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord?" Let them seek to compass these legitimate ends, by the adoption of legitimate means.

Let them forswear as unscriptural, as unhallowed, as unblessed, all Sacerdotal assumption.

Let them cherish, as well indeed they may, the honoured liturgies, the grave discipline, the apostolic order, of England's Church. But let them remember withal that these are the casket not the jewel, the material form not the spiritual life, the body not the soul. Carnal genealogy and sensuous ceremony distinguished the ritual of the Jewish economy. Spiritual devotion and intelligent service characterize the minis-

trations of the Christian dispensation. "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."\* Beware then of all approaches to a system, the central point of which is an imposing exhibition addressed to the fancy and the senses. Truly it is easy to take up this livery. Nature can do all that is required. No wonder then if men whose conscience is still sensitive enough to tell them that they lack spiritual qualification, should hasten to adopt opinions which so easily supply the sad deficiency. Nor will there be wanting those who shall applaud their course. In some, idle and ignorant love of new things; in others, delight in the discovery of a religion which reconciles the Church to the world, the service of God to that of mammon; and in others again, a superstitious and sickly imagination:—all will unite in conceding your claim to awful spiritual prerogative. But bring that system to perfection. In secret let the practice of auricular confession invest you with a power over the maidens and the matrons of your flock, which bids defiance to the authority of the parent and the husband, and, so far as it is permitted to extend its noxious influence, places human society itself at your feet. In public let form, and colour, and music, and incense, all combine to lend their delights to the office in which, clad in garment unused for three hundred

\* John iv. 23, 24.

years, you elevate the host before the prostrate, the adoring throng. The result can be but one. Christ is not there, and where Christ is not, there, in spite of all artistic, all "histrionic" representations of the Prince of Life, the only presence is that of death. Meanwhile the sheep will not, cannot, may not, hear the voice of the stranger. Who shall forbid their turning aside to folds, where their hungry souls can at least find the food which they seek in vain at their lawful pastor's hands?

And even with regard to the general congregation your present success will be but transitory. Study well the working of Romanism in its own acknowledged dominions. Influential as *some* "churchmen" there have, from time to time, become, by the sheer might of native intellect and energy, the great body of the clergy are held in but little honour. The very awe with which the poor contemplate the office is not unmingled with contempt for the person who fills it. And society has, as respects its moral condition, subsided to the level of its leaders; "the disciple is not above his master."<sup>f</sup> Similar fruits will inevitably be produced by the baneful exotic when once more implanted on the British soil. Yes! should the lessons of the Reformation be unlearnt; should Ministers of the Church of England succeed in procuring any general recognition of a claim to be sacrificing priests and spiritual judges; should the Mass and the Confessional be again established amongst us, the issue must beyond all question be the same as in days of yore. For a while indeed the ardour of an

<sup>f</sup> Luke vi. 40.

individual enthusiasm may combine with the zeal of an organized partisanship to produce seeming ecclesiastical revival : churches may be thronged, brotherhoods and sisterhoods may be multiplied : large monies, for the advancement of Sacerdotal interests, may be poured into the priestly treasury : but the stream cannot rise higher than its source : in the end we shall have but the repetition—as in all their promises, so also in all their failures—of the history of those fitful resuscitations of the slumbering energies of the Papacy, from which the various monastic orders of the Pre-Reformation Church date their origin. The Spirit of God was not in those movements, He is not in this. The rain of heaven, the river of the water of life, was not there ; it is not here. Beautiful, alluring, as the vision may appear, it will, sooner or later, vanish as the mirage, and leave nought but the fruitless, dreary, desolate waste behind.

But there may be those who desire to carry out in practice that theory of Christian Ministry which I have commended to you to-day, but are deterred by the frequent allegation that it fails when tried by that inspired, that crucial test, “ye shall know them by their fruits !”<sup>g</sup>

There will of course never be wanting men, even amongst the clergy, who say, “Lord, Lord,” but “do not the will of their Father which is in heaven.”<sup>h</sup> But there are, and I thank God for it, many pastors and many flocks even within our bounds, whose every-day

<sup>g</sup> Matt. vii. 16. 20.

<sup>h</sup> Matt. vii. 21.

life and conversation is a living protest against the charge, when adduced as of general application. I prefer, however, quitting altogether the personal and the local aspect of the question, and allaying any apprehensions which may have arisen upon the point, by reminding you of phenomena patent upon the face of the history of our Church during the last three quarters of a century.

You know, my Brethren,—the truth is acknowledged even by those who would have it that the movement has now expended its original force, and given place to healthier energies,—that the Church of England was, at the era to which I am now alluding, roused from the sleep of a death-like lethargy by men who carried out the Evangelistic theory of the Christian Ministry, in all its ramifications. With them self-denial and prayer were accompanied by the preaching of the word “in season out of season,” publicly, privately, in the church, the school, the cottage, the street, and the common.

Now—without intending in the very least degree to depreciate or to ignore the worthy service done by men who were never outwardly identified with this section of the Clergy—what were the results—over and above the known and confessed awakening of the Church throughout these realms?

One test of genuine Christianity prominent in the Apostolic Scriptures is that of *almsgiving*. And it is to be observed, that the almsgiving most largely chronicled is that to alleviate distant need. The poor saints at Jerusalem were, in country, aliens to the Churches of

Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia. And so it was at the great Evangelical Revival in our own land. One of the very earliest impulses of renewed life was the institution of a Missionary Society,<sup>1</sup> which, by steady and gradual increase, has gone forward for sixty-eight years, until it commands a voluntary income of some one hundred and fifty thousand pounds; an income which is, now as formerly, mainly drawn from parishes and congregations actuated by the same principles as those which originally called this valuable association into existence. Nor have our home populations been overlooked. The same principles elicit at this moment, and that from identical sources, an income of some fifty thousand pounds per annum, in aid of an institution established more than thirty years ago: <sup>1</sup> an institution, moreover, which was the first, in connection with our Church, to come to the aid of our overworked and underpaid clergy, by providing them with the stipends for lay-agents and assistant curates. I might dwell upon this point at much greater length. For statistics, national, diocesan, and parochial, supply me with ample proof that they which have believed in the Gospel of the grace of God do give "good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over."<sup>k</sup>

But I forbear. For the charge of unfruitfulness is renewed in another form. Now, for the first time, it is alleged, is the Gospel preached to the poor: now, for

<sup>1</sup> The Church Missionary Society.

<sup>1</sup> The Church Pastoral Aid Society.

<sup>k</sup> Luke vi. 38.



the first time, it is asserted, are the sick visited, and the outcast reclaimed, by lay brethren and sisters in Christ. Truly this may be the first time that preachers approach the poor in cord and sandal in the name of England's Church. It may be the first time that monachism walks our fields and threads our alleys, under the "direction" of England's pastors. But the work, the real work, has long since been done unostentatiously and well, wherever Christ has been faithfully preached. Let any who hesitate to give their immediate assent, at least pause and enquire before they repeat the charge. I believe they will find that, wherever the Evangelist has laboured patiently, consistently, prayerfully, there has the wisdom he teaches been proved to be "from above," not only by its being "first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated;" but also by its being "full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy."<sup>1</sup> No where else will be found congregations more devout, more spiritual; no where else communicants<sup>m</sup> more fervent, more sincere; no where else conversions to God more substantial; no where else attachment to our Church more enlightened, more steadfast. No where else is the co-operation of laymen with the clergy more cordial, more steady. I will add, that no where else do Christian women serve God more quietly, more lovingly, more perseveringly, and

<sup>1</sup> James iii. 17.

<sup>m</sup> In fact it was the increased frequency of celebrations, and the overflowing numbers of the communicants consequent on the Evangelical revival, which first led to the adoption of the practice of addressing the words of administration to several participants at once.

more truly on the primitive model ; for it is without that severing of domestic ties, that invasion of parental authority, of which we hear so much in the history of the papacy, but for which we search in vain in the Scriptural records of the Primitive Church.<sup>n</sup>

But I will detain you no longer. My Brethren of the Laity will pardon me, if I have dwelt principally on matters which might by some be thought exclusively to concern the Clergy. For they are, I trust, becoming increasingly alive to the fact that they are themselves an integral portion of the Church. They have therefore a vital interest in the spiritual life and health of the clerical members of the Christian body. For "whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it ; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it."<sup>o</sup>

Nor will my Brethren of the Clergy chide me for having spoken to them fully, frankly, freely. It would be an idle affectation to pretend that we are all of one mind on *every* point. It would be wrong if I did not give my Brethren who differ from me credit for the same honesty of purpose of which I am conscious myself. But this I may fairly claim of all, that they should accord to my exhortations calm and dispassionate con-

<sup>n</sup> "We did not lay aside our charities when we dispensed with our vows ; we did not languish in the practice when we rejected the profession ; the religious motive acts not less powerfully, because the name is less commonly put forward ; and, in as far at least as the tender sex is concerned, there is not a district in our cities, nor a village in our provinces, which does not profit by the unpretending, unavowed, enlightened benevolence of Protestant Ursulines." Waddington's Church History, chap. xix.

<sup>o</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 26.

sideration. The responsible position I occupy in the providence of God as your Bishop, the affectionate relation in which I stand with regard to you as your friend, warrant me in entreating this at your hands. Thoughtfully then, my Brethren, return to your cures; deliberately weigh what I have said in "the balances of the sanctuary;" prayerfully beseech our God to discover to you any "way of grief" that may be in you; and earnestly plead with Him, should any the least error be made known by the scrutiny, to give you grace and strength to renounce it manfully, fearlessly, promptly. "Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you." <sup>p</sup> "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." <sup>q</sup>

<sup>p</sup> Phil. iii. 15.

<sup>q</sup> Heb. xiii. 20, 21.

## APPENDIX A.

Note k, p. 19.

“Without troubling myself to follow him or you minutely in this part of your work, I shall proceed to state briefly what else our Church teaches, or requires, in respect both to confession, especially secret confession, and also to absolution.

“The confession ordinarily required is only general and public confession to Almighty God, made simultaneously by the whole congregation, every individual being expected tacitly to include the acknowledgment of his particular transgressions under the general form. This confession occurs at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer, and in a different form in the office of Communion, and is always followed by absolution. In the two former cases the nature of the absolving power committed by God to His Ministers is expressly stated; it is ‘to declare and’ (not only declare, but) ‘pronounce’ (that is, authoritatively declare in God’s name) ‘to His people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins;’ and having made that statement, the Priest exercises his power by declaring that God *then* ‘pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel.’

“In the Communion Service, the Church does not again state the nature of the absolving power (it would have been unnecessary), but directs the Priest to exercise it in a somewhat different, an optative form. *But this form is equivalent to the other: it consists of a declaration of God’s general evangelical promises, and invokes the fulfilment of those promises in favour of those who have just made their humble confession to Him.*—SUCH IS THE ORDINARY CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION OF OUR CHURCH. But in the office last mentioned, the Church further invites those who need ghostly

counsel and advice (in the terms cited) to have recourse to particular confession, and to seek the benefit of particular absolution. And here again the nature of that particular absolution is distinctly intimated to be of the same kind as the two former instances of general absolution; *it is to be exercised (not by the judicial sentence of the Priest, after a process—carried on before his Tribunal, as your Church insists—but) ‘BY THE MINISTRY OF GOD’S HOLY WORD,’ or an authoritative declaration of God’s general promises applied in favour of that particular penitent, if he be indeed penitent.*

“There remains one other instance, that in the Visitation of the Sick . . . The Rubric requires, that at a certain part of this office ‘the sick person shall be moved by the Minister to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.’ I have said that this is ordered *at a certain part of the office*, and it is important that this be borne in mind. For so little is our Church inclined to encourage its Ministers in prying into the secrets of their penitents, that it enjoins every other step to be previously taken, before the last measure of particular confession be proposed.—‘The Minister shall (first) examine whether he (the sick person) repent him truly of his sins, and be in charity with all the world; exhorting him to forgive, from the bottom of his heart, all persons that have offended him; and if he hath offended any other, to ask them forgiveness; and where he hath done injury or wrong to any man, that he make amends to the utmost of his power.’

“Now, it is after he has done and said all this,—after he has satisfied himself on such general inquiry, whether the sick person have indeed a true sense of the awful condition in which he stands, of the nature and necessity of sincere repentance, and universal charity—and whether he have, by God’s blessing, attained those graces, as well as learned the necessity of attaining them,—that the Minister’s duty respecting particular confession is laid down. *If from the sick man’s answers to his inquiries he find him in*

*a state of penitence and peace, his business is completed: he is not authorized,*—HE IS BY IMPLICATION FORBIDDEN,—*to move him to any further disclosure;—and in this case (as it will be necessary to bear in mind) no absolution is pronounced, evidently because particular absolution is to be given in our Church only to those whose minds cannot be quieted without such especial application to them of God's general promises.*—But if, after all general discourse and advice on the nature of repentance and the means of making his peace with God have been exhausted, the sick man still exhibit signs of distrust and dismay,—he is to be asked, whether 'he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter: ' and if he say that it is, THEN, AND ONLY THEN, he is 'to be moved to a special confession of his sins;' evidently, in the words of the former exhortation, that he may receive ghostly counsel and advice to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.

“Now, as nothing can be more prudent than this reserve and backwardness in inviting to secret confession, when the end of our ministry can be obtained without it; so nothing certainly can be more necessary to the due discharge of the commission we have received, as Christ's Ministers, Christ's Ambassadors, appointed and empowered to reconcile sinful man to God, than that, when all other instruction and means have failed, we should then require of those for whom we are to give account, that they enable us to know more clearly of their state; that they tell us specially what it is that weighs them down, and deprives them of that most important grace and duty, Christian hope. 'Confess your sins to God,' such is our counsel: 'we wish not, we seek not to know them; but if you cannot otherwise apply what you have been taught of God's general promises to your own case, unbosom yourself freely to us,—tell us, in that sacred confidence which ought to subsist between a Christian Minister and him who is about to stand before his Judge,—tell us what it is that shakes your soul with dread, and renders you

incapable of the holy consolations of the Gospel of Peace. Your very terrors prove at least that you are not hardened; that your state is better than that of the unhappy soul, which is ready to wing its flight into an eternal world, in stupid and reckless insensibility to its danger. We are ordained to preach the glad tidings of great joy; to minister the word of God; to pronounce the pardon of God over all who with true faith turn to Him. And weak though we be,—sinners, miserable sinners, though we be,—we have yet the promise of Him, who cannot lie, that He ‘will be with us always, even unto the end of the world,’—and that He will bless His own ordinances, and make them, when rightly administered and devoutly received, effectual to the salvation of men.’

“You, Sir, in all this will, I am sure, see nothing to condemn, except the caution and hesitation with which we admit the special communication of the penitent. You know that this is the only case in which we venture to urge the practice of secret confession—the case of him for whom nothing else will do:—that we are indeed ready to receive it, if tendered for the purpose of quieting a perplexed conscience, at any time, and especially to enable the penitent to approach the table of the Lord in faith and hope.—But you also know, that in the course of our exhortation and practice in this particular, we are directly opposed to the Church of Rome. . . .

“But it may be said, ‘a particular absolution is given to him who has given a particular confession:’—true, it is enjoined in the Rubric, and after what has preceded, if the sick man humbly and heartily desire it, the Priest shall absolve him in the form annexed, A FORM, THE MEANING OF WHICH, IF IT BE AMBIGUOUS, MUST BE UNDERSTOOD FROM COMPARISON WITH THE EXPRESS DOCTRINE AND UNIFORM PRACTICE OF OUR CHURCH, IN ALL THE PRECEDING INSTANCES. But even in this very form there is an implied declaration of the nature of the absolving power: it is given ‘to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe

in our Lord Jesus Christ; and therefore on the penitent's '*humbly and heartily* desiring it' (the very terms imply the sincerity both of his repentance and his faith) the Priest feels himself at liberty to use it, and to say, 'By Christ's authority committed to me,' an authority the limits of which have been just before stated, 'I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' *Need I add, that it is immediately followed by a prayer to God 'to consider the sick penitent's contrition, to accept his tears, to assuage his grief as shall seem to the Divine Wisdom most expedient for him?'* WOULD THIS BE CONSISTENT WITH A JUDICIAL, ABSOLUTION ALREADY GIVEN TO THE PENITENT? We have seen then, Sir, the real meaning of that absolution which you affect to believe, and persons of less information than you really believe, the same with that which is claimed and exercised by the priesthood of the Church of Rome. *It has been explained by reference to clearer and more express declarations of our absolving power; and if you will not take our assertions of the meaning of a part of our own Liturgy (particularly when our explanation rests on the uniform analogy of our doctrine on this particular),—with what right, I had almost said with what face, can we be asked to understand (as yet we are unwilling to understand, on the declaration of your Church) the language of your own indulgences, which grant to those who acquire them 'pardon of all their sins,' to mean no more than a remission of the temporal punishment still due to sins which have been remitted before?*

“But, even if the power of absolution exercised in our office of visiting the sick were the very same with that of your priesthood, would there be no difference between claiming and exercising the power in so extreme a case, and with so much of interposed check and caution against the frequent use of it that it very rarely indeed is in fact exercised,—and that doctrine of yours, which requires your people to have recourse to it at least once in every



year, and makes it (I repeat) even indispensably necessary to salvation?" *Phillpotts' (now Bishop of Exeter) Letters to Butler, on the Insuperable Differences which Separate the Church of England from the Church of Rome. Letter ix. pp. 106—111. London, Murray, 1866.*

## APPENDIX B.

Note m, p. 21.

The following quotations bearing upon this important question will interest my readers. They prove that, to the writers at least, Scriptural truth was more precious than even Episcopal discipline.

“QUI STATIS IN DOMO DOMINO. Ut secundum quod ait Apostolus; Donec, inquit, venio ut scias quomodo disponas domum Dei quæ est ecclesia. *Ecclesia non parietibus consistit, sed in dogmatum veritate. Ecclesia ibi est ubi fides vera est. Cæterum ante annos quindecim aut viginti, parietes omnes hic ecclesiarum hæretici possidebant. Ante viginti enim annos omnes ecclesias has hæretici possidebant. Ecclesia autem vera illic erat, ubi vera fides erat.*” Hieronymus in Psalm cxxxiii. (cxxxiv.) v. 1. Operum, tom. viii. fol. 92.

“But here they will ask me, how shall a man know whether he be in the right faith, but by this church? To this Christ shall make answer Himself, saying, in the Gospel of John, ‘My sheep hear My voice, and shall not hear a stranger.’ *And where, I pray you, hath Christ left any voice to be heard or followed, but in His Word written?* ‘Search the Scriptures,’ said He, ‘for they bear witness of Me.’ Where He biddeth you not search unwritten verities, such as the outward, seen, and pompous church shall of their own heads shew you, but the written verities contained in the Holy Scriptures, ‘which are profitable to teach, to improve, to amend, and to instruct in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect and prepared unto all good works.’

“If thou, therefore, be desirous to know whether thou be in the right faith or no, seek it not at man’s mouth; for ‘all men be liars.’ *Seek it at God’s own mouth, which is His Holy Word written, which can neither lie, deceive, nor be deceived.* Ask, I say, seek and knock, by diligent study and earnest prayer to God, who hath promised to give to all them that ask faithfully of Him the certainty of good faith in their conscience, taught and confirmed by the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.” CRANMER, *Confutation of Unwritten Verities, The Preface.* Parker Society’s Edition, Vol. ii., pp. 13, 14.

“‘Succession,’ you say, ‘is the chief way for any Christian to avoid antichrist.’ I grant you, *if you mean the succession of doctrine.* Therefore St. Paul saith, ‘In the latter days some shall depart from the faith.’ He saith not, They shall depart from their place; but ‘from their faith.’ And St. John saith, ‘If any man come unto you, and bring not this doctrine, salute him not.’ He saith not, If he keep not his place; but ‘If he bring not this doctrine.’ It is the doctrine whereby antichrist shall be known, and not his place; for, as I have said, ‘he shall sit in the place of Christ.’

“*It is not sufficient to claim succession of place; it behoveth us rather to have regard to the succession of doctrine.* St. Bernard saith, ‘Quid prodest, si canonicè eligantur, . . . et non canonicè vivant?’ ‘What availeth it, if they be chosen in order, and live out of order?’ So saith St. Augustine; ‘Ipsum characterem multi et lupi et lupis imprimunt:’ ‘The outward mark or right of a bishop many give to wolves, and be wolves themselves.’ Therefore the ancient father Irenæus giveth us this good counsel: ‘Eis qui sunt in ecclesiâ presbyteris successione charisma veritatis certum secundum [bene] placitum Patris acceperunt;’ ‘*It becometh us to obey those priests in the church which have their succession from the apostles; and together with the succession of their bishopricks, according to the goodwill of God the Father, have received the undoubted gift of the truth.*’

Jewel, Defence of the Apology, Parker Edition, vol. iii., pp. 348, 349.

“We do esteem and reverence the continual succession of good bishops in any place, if they can be found; if they cannot, we run not from God, but rather stick fast to His Word.

*“Succession of good bishops is a great blessing of God; but because God and His truth hangs not on man nor place, we rather hang on the undeceivable truth of God’s Word in all doubts, than on any bishops, place, or man; ‘for all men are liars,’ and may be deceived; only God and His Word is true, and neither deceives, nor is deceived.”* Bishop Pilkington, *The Burning of St. Paul’s. Confutation of an Addition, Sect. xi.* Parker Society’s Edition, pp. 598, 599.

“It is willingly confessed, that the Scripture of God is a store-house abounding with inestimable treasures of wisdom and knowledge in many kinds, over and above things in this one kind barely necessary; yea, even that *matters of ecclesiastical polity are not therein omitted, but taught also, albeit not so taught as those other things before-mentioned.*

“For so perfectly are those things taught, that nothing ever can need to be added, nothing ever cease to be necessary. *These on the contrary side, as being of a far other nature and quality, not so strictly nor everlastingly commanded in Scripture, but that unto the complete form of church polity much may be requisite, which the Scripture teacheth not, and much, which it hath taught, become unrequisite, sometimes because we need not use it, sometimes also because we cannot.*

“In which respect, for my own part, although I see that certain Reformed Churches, the Scottish especially and French, have not that which best agreeth with the sacred Scripture, I mean the government that is by bishops, inasmuch as both those Churches are fallen under a different kind of regimen; which to remedy, it is for the one altogether too late, and too soon for the other, during their present affliction and trouble. *This*

*their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in such a case than exagitate, considering that men oftentimes without any fault of their own may be driven to want that kind of polity or regimen which is best; and to content themselves with that, which either the irremediable error of former times, or the necessity of the present, hath cast upon them."* Hooker, E. P. Book iii. 10. iv.

## APPENDIX C.

Note o, p 22.

“If we doubt what those admirable words may import, let him be our teacher for the meaning of Christ to whom Christ was Himself a Schoolmaster; let our Lord’s apostle be His interpreter, content we ourselves with his explication, My Body, *The Communion of My Body*, My Blood, *The Communion of My Blood*. Is there any thing more expedite, clear, and easy, than that as Christ is termed our Life, because through Him we obtain life; so the parts of this Sacrament are His Body and Blood, for that they are so to us, who receiving them receive that by which they are termed? The bread and cup are His Body and Blood, because they are causes instrumental, upon the receipt whereof the participation of His Body and Blood ensueth. For that which produceth any certain effect, is not vainly nor improperly said to be that very effect whereunto it tendeth. Every cause is in the effect which groweth from it. Our souls and bodies quickened to eternal life are effects, the cause whereof is the person of Christ: His Body and Blood are the true Well-spring out of which this life floweth. So that His Body and Blood are in that very subject whereunto they minister life: not only by effect or operation, even as the influence of the heavens is in plants, beasts, men, and in every thing which they quicken; but also by a far more divine and mystical kind of union, which maketh us one with Him, even as He and

the Father are one. THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S MOST BLESSED BODY AND BLOOD IS NOT THEREFORE TO BE SOUGHT FOR IN THE SACRAMENT, BUT IN THE WORTHY RECEIVER OF THE SACRAMENT. *And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth, FIRST, 'Take and eat;' then, 'This is My body which was broken for you.'* FIRST, '*Drink ye all of this;*' then followeth, '*This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.*' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and WHERE THE BREAD IS HIS BODY, OR THE CUP HIS BLOOD, BUT ONLY IN THE VERY HEART AND SOUL OF HIM WHO RECEIVETH THEM." Hooker, *E. P.*, Book v., § 67.

## APPENDIX D.

Note x, p. 26.

With regard to the *early*, or *apostolical*, Fathers, the following quotation from Dean Goode is valuable.

"It is worthy of observation, that the word used to describe the Levitical Priests, *ιερεῖς*, is never used in the New Testament for the ministers of Christ; but wherever it is used it is applied generally to the whole body of believers. *Nor is the term so applied by the apostolical Fathers, or Justin Martyr. One passage only occurs in their genuine remains that has ever been thought of as an instance, namely, in Ignatius (Ad Philad. § 9), where Pearson, Smith, understand it of Levitical Priests, and in Jacobson's view rightly.*" Divine Rule of Faith and Practice, chap. viii., vol. ii., pp. 166, 167. First Edition.

With regard to the later Fathers, the following extracts are of interest.

"Although Augustine, and other of the ancient Fathers, call the Ministers of the New Testament, by the name of *sacerdotal*, and *ιερείς*, which signify the Ministers of the Old Testament; yet *the authority of the Holy Ghost, making*

*a perfect distinction between these two appellations and functions, ought to be of more estimation with us.* The Fathers were content to speak in Latin and Greek, as the terms were taken up by the common people newly converted from gentility; *but yet they retained the difference of the sacrificing priesthood of the one, and the ministerial office of the other.*" Fulke, Defence of the English Translations of the Bible, Parker Society's Edition, p. 243.

"Nec vero de vocabulis dimicamus. Paulus generali appellatione vocat ministros, doctores, pastores. *In Scripturâ Novi Testamenti, appellatio sacerdotum et sacerdotii, nusquam tribuitur ministerio Novi Testamenti.* Sed Ecclesiasticorum Scriptorum usu invaluit, ministerium vocari sacerdotium, et ministros sacerdotes. Ita Chrysostomus *ιερωσύνην* vocat, quidquid ad ministerium Novi Testamenti pertinet. Augustinus de Civitate Dei, l. 20, inquit: 'Episcopi et Presbyteri proprie jam in Ecclesiâ Sacerdotes Testamento esse externum sacerdotium, hoc est, externum ministerium verbi et Sacramentorum, sicut jam explicavocantur.' Si igitur hoc tantum vellent Pontificii, in Novo Testamento esse externum sacerdotium, hoc est, externum ministerium verbi et sacramentorum, sicut jam explicavimus, nulla esset controversia, nec propter appellationem sacerdotii moverentur turbæ, modo res, quæ veræ et necessariæ sunt, salvæ essent." Chemnitius, *Examen Decretorum Concilii Tridentini, Pars ii., Locus xiii., § 1, cap. i.*

"In spite of new and unscriptural forms of expression, and that which the apostolical Fathers avoid—the direct and familiar application of the Jewish Titles to the Christian Orders—the whole context and declarations of the most illustrious Fathers of after times, when one passage is compared with another, is irreconcilable with a Sacerdotal theory—I mean Sacerdotal, in the Romanist and popular sense of it, as sole mediators and sacrificers." Garbett, Bampton Lectures, vol. i. p. 177.

## APPENDIX E.

Note d, page 30.

“ I know not, indeed, how any man can read the Epistle to the Hebrews, and persevere in maintaining such a notion as that which we are here opposing.

“ The apostle in that Epistle seems with studied assiduity to impress upon our minds the fact, that with us there is but one Sacrifice and one Priest,—a Sacrifice all-prevalent for the full remission of sins, and a Priest who, being eternal, for ever liveth to present it, and make intercession for us ; and that, consequently, *every true Christian has, at all times, a Sacrifice and a Priest to present it for him to God, without the intervention of any other person or thing whatever.*

“ *And further, we may remark, that St. Paul, when speaking of the ministers of the Old and New Testament, describes the former as ‘ they which wait at the Altar,’ and the latter as ‘ they which preach the Gospel ;’* A DISTINCTION VERY DIFFERENT TO WHAT HE WOULD HAVE DRAWN, HAD HE HELD THE VIEWS OF THE TRACTATORS.” *Goode, Divine Rule, vol. ii. p. 167.*

## APPENDIX F.

Note j, page 33.

“ The word *priest*, by popish abuse, is commonly taken for a sacrificer, the same that *sacerdos* is in Latin. But the Holy Ghost never calleth the Ministers of the Word and Sacraments of the New Testament *iepeis*, or *sacerdotes*. Therefore the translators, to make a difference between the Ministers of the Old Testament and them of the New, calleth the one, according to the usual acceptation, *priests*, and the other, according to the original derivation, *elders*. Which distinction seeing the Vulgar Latin text doth always rightly observe, it is in favour of your heretical sacrificing priest-

hood, that you corruptly translate *sacerdos* and *presbyter* always, as though they were all one, a *priest*, as though the Holy Ghost had made that distinction in vain, or that there was no difference between the priesthood of the New Testament and the Old. The name of priest, according to the original derivation from *presbyter*, we do not refuse: but according to the common acception for a sacrificer we cannot take it, when it is spoken of the ministry of the New Testament. And although many of the ancient Fathers have abusively confounded the terms of *sacerdos* and *presbyter*, yet that is no warrant for us to translate the Scripture, and to confound that which we see manifestly the Spirit of God hath distinguished. For this cause we have translated the Greek word *πρεσβύτερος*, an *elder*, even as your Vulgar Latin Translator doth divers times, as Acts xv. 22, Acts xx. 17, 1 Peter v. i, and elsewhere calleth them *seniores*, or *majores natu*, which you commonly call the *ancients* or *seniors*, because you dare not speak English, and say 'the elders.' Neither is *presbyter* by ecclesiastical use so appropriated to signify a priest, that you would always translate it so in the Old Testament, where your Vulgar Translator useth it for a name of office and government, and not for priest at any time. Neither do we always translate the Latin word *episcopus* and *diaconus* for a bishop and a deacon, but sometimes for an overseer, as Acts xx., and a minister generally, oftentimes." *Fulke, Defence of the Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue. Parker Society's Edition, p. 109.*



LONDON :  
WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY.

## BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

### *New Testament Millenarianism;*

or, the Kingdom and Coming of Christ, as Taught by Himself and His Apostles. Being the Bampton Lectures of 1855. Second Edition. 524pp. Post 8vo. 10s.

#### CONTENTS.

- Lecture 1.—The Right Order of Scriptural Inquiry Concerning the Millennium.  
" 2.—The Kingdom of Heaven, as now existing, the proper Kingdom of Christ.  
" 3.—The Kingdom of Christ, as now existing, the true Kingdom of His Father David.  
" 4.—The Ingathering and Glorification of the Church.  
" 5.—The Judgment of Quick and Dead at the Coming of the Lord.  
" 6.—The Recompense of Reward to be conferred upon the Saints at the Second Coming of their Lord.  
" 7.—The Thousand Years and the Little Season.  
" 8.—The True Burden of Old Testament Prophecy.
- Appendix to the Lectures.  
Indice 1.—Of Texts Quoted and Illustrated.  
" 2.—Of Authors Cited.  
" 3.—Of Matters Discussed in this Volume.

### *Words of Eternal Life;*

or, the First Principles of the Doctrine of Christ: set forth in Eighteen Sermons, originally preached in the Cathedral Church of Salisbury. Crown 8vo. 7s., cloth.

#### CONTENTS.

- Sermon 1.—The Words of Life. (John vi. 66—69.)  
" 2.—True Nobility. (Acts xvii. 10—12.)  
" 3.—The Heavens and the Word. (Ps. xix. 1—11.)  
" 4.—The Spirit of Truth. (John xv. 26.)  
" 5.—Sin, and its Wages. (Rom. vi. 23.)  
" 6.—The Living Redeemer. (Job xix. 25—27.)  
" 7.—Sacrifice. (Eph. v. 2.)  
" 8.—Christ Lifted Up. (John xii. 32, 33.)  
" 9.—Coming Unto Christ. (John vi. 37.)  
" 10.—Justification by Faith. (Rom. iii. 23—26.)  
" 11.—Abraham's Faith. (Rom. vi. 18—25.)  
" 12.—Everlasting Life. (John vi. 47.)  
" 13.—Following Jesus. (John xii. 26.)  
" 14.—Justification by Works. (James ii. 20—24.)  
" 15.—The Backslider Forgiven and Chastised. (2 Sam. xii. 13, 14.)  
" 16.—The New Birth. (John iii. 8.)  
" 17.—The Prosperous Soul. (3 John 2.)  
" 18.—The Joyful Sound. (Ps. lxxxix. 15.)

### *The Way of Peace;*

or, the Teaching of Scripture concerning Justification, Sanctification, and Assurance. In Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford. Fourth Edition. Post 8vo. 4s. 6d.

LONDON: WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY,

Holles Street, Cavendish Square; and Ave Maria Lane, Paternoster Row.



SELECTION FROM THE  
**NEW PUBLICATIONS**  
OF  
**WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY.**

---

---

**Biblical, Practical, and Expository.**

*The Three Heavens.*

The First Heaven, or World of Air. The Second Heaven, or World of Stars. The Third Heaven, or Heaven of Heavens. By the Rev. Josiah Crampton, M.A., Author of "The Lunar World." Large post 8vo. With numerous Illustrations.

*Chief Women ;*

or, Higher Life in High Places. By Mrs. Gordon, Author of "The Home Life of Sir David Brewster," "Work : Plenty to do, and How to do it," etc. Crown 8vo. Extra cloth. 3s. 6d.

*Evangelical Principles.*

A Series of Doctrinal Papers explanatory of the Positive Principles of Evangelical Christianity. With Introduction and Edited by the Rev. Edward Garbett, M.A. Crown 8vo. Extra cloth, 5s.

*Thoughts on the Christian Life ;*

or, Leaves from Letters. By the late Hetty Bowman, Author of "Christian Daily Life," etc. With Introduction by Mrs. Gordon, Author of "The Home Life of Sir David Brewster," etc. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

*A Selection of the Words and Works of our Lord*

Jesus Christ, from the Four Evangelists. With Introduction by the Rev. G. H. Wilkinson, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Eaton Square. Beautifully printed with Carmine borders and headings, and photographic frontispiece.

*Memoir of the Life and Labours of the Rev. Jeremiah Horrox.* Author of "The Transit of Venus over the Sun." Nov. 24th, 1639. By the Rev. A. R. Whatton, B.A., LL.B. Small 8vo. 2s. cloth.

*Sanctification.*

Expository Sermons. By the Rev. Edward Hoare, M.A., Vicar of Trinity, Tunbridge Wells. Second edition, enlarged. Small post 8vo. Cloth boards. 2s. 6d.

*The Nature and Evidences of Regeneration.*

By the Rev. George Townshend Fox, M.A. With a Preface by the Rev. Octavius Winalow, D.D., Incumbent of Emmanuel Church, Brighton. Limp cloth, red edges, 1s. 9d.; extra cloth, bevelled boards, gilt edges, 2s. 6d.

*The Man with the Book;*

or, The Bible among the People. By J. Weylland, Author of The "Standard of the Cross in the Champ-de-Mars." With Introduction by the Earl of Shaftesbury. Crown 8vo. Eighth Edition. Illustrated. 3s. 6d.

*Life in the Ghetto;*

or, the Jewish Physician. By the Author of "Doing and Suffering," and "Broad Shadows in Life's Pathway," and uniform in size. 5s.

*Civilized Christianity.*

NOT by the Author of "The Fight in Dame Europa's School." Crown 8vo. Extra cloth. 2s.

*The Track of the Light;*

or, Christ's Footsteps Followed. By the Rev. J. George Bullock, M.A., Rector of St. Runwald's, Colchester. 2s.

*Veins of Silver;*

or, Treasures Hid beneath the Surface. By Samuel Garratt, M.A., Vicar of St. Margaret's, Ipswich; Author of "A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John," "Signs of the Times," etc. Post 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Christian Chivalry;*

or, the Armour of God on the Soldier of the Cross. By Samuel Garratt, M.A. Small 8vo. Extra cloth, 3s.

*Handbook of Special Mission Services :*

containing Suggestions, Services as sanctioned by the Bishops of London and Rochester, Hymns, and Specimen Addresses. By the Rev. C. F. S. Money, M.A., Incumbent of St. John's, Deptford. F'cap 8vo. Cloth, 1s.

*Our Father.*

A Word of Encouraging Remembrance for the Children of God. By the Author of "Thoughts on Conversion." With an Introduction by the Rev. A. Hewlett, D.D., Vicar of Astley. Second edition. Cloth extra, bevelled boards. 3s.

*Carrying Things to Extremes.*

By the Author of "Copsley Annals." Square 16mo, cloth, red edges. 1s.

*The Intermediate State of the Blessed Dead ;*

in a Series of Meditational Expositions. By the Rev. Joseph Baylee, D.D. Second edition, enlarged. Cloth extra, 3s. 6d.

*The Anatomy of Scepticism.*

An Examination into the Causes of Modern Unbelief. By R. B. Girdlestone, M.A., Christ Church, Oxon. Post 8vo. 3s. People's edition, 1s. 6d.

*The Ministry of Home ;*

or, Brief Expository Lectures on Divine Truth. Designed especially for Family and Private Reading. By Octavius Winslow, D.D. Crown 8vo. 5s. Extra binding, gilt edges, 6s.

*The Choice.*

Five Lectures on Confirmation. By the Rev. Sir Emilius Bayley, Bart., Vicar of St. John's, Paddington. Limp cloth. 1s. Extra cloth, gilt edges, 1s. 6d.

*The Faithful Witness.*

Being Expository Lectures on the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia. By R. W. Forrest, M.A., St. Jude's, Kensington. Crown 8vo., 6s.

*Lay Preaching.*

A Divinely-appointed part of Christian Ministry. By John Purcell Fitzgerald, M.A. Crown 8vo. Extra cloth, 3s.

*Hearts made glad and Homes made happy.*

Sketches of Subjects for Mothers' Meetings and Fathers' Classes. Post 8vo. Extra cloth. 3s. 6d.

*The Unseen Guide ;*

or, Stories and Allegories to Illustrate the Fruits of the Spirit. By M. and E. B. With twelve Illustrations by the Brothers Dalziel. Small 4to. Emblematic cloth. Second edition. With Introduction by Miss Charlesworth, Author of "Ministering Children." 3s. 6d.

*Morning and Evening Hymns for a Week.*

By the late Miss Charlotte Elliott, Author of "Just as I am." Forty-first thousand. Limp cloth, gilt edges. 1s.

*Short Sermons for Sick Rooms.*

In very large Type, with Hymns. By the Rev. Josiah Bateman, M.A., Author of the "Life of Henry Venn Elliott, of Brighton," etc. Second edition. With Hymns appropriate to each Sermon. Crown 8vo. Limp cloth, extra, 2s. Extra cloth, gilt edges, 2s. 6d.

*Songs in Suffering :*

or, the Voice of Trust and Praise in Sickness and Sorrow. By the Rev. W. O. Purton, B.A., Rector of Kingston-on-Sea. F'cap 8vo., cloth boards, 3s. ; cloth extra, bevelled boards, gilt edges, 3s. 6d.

*Sun-Glints in the Wilderness.*

Our Lord's Temptation, and other subjects. By the Rev. Hugh Macmillan, LL.D., Author of "Bible Teachings in Nature." Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

HOLLES STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE.

BY THE REV. J. C. RYLE, M.A.,

*Honorary Canon of Norwich;*

*Vicar of Stradbroke, and Rural Dean of Hoane, Suffolk.*

*Knots Untied.*

Being Plain Statements on Disputed Points in Religion, from the Standpoint of an Evangelical Churchman. Large Post 8vo. 500 pp. Second Edition. Extra cloth, 7s. 6d.

*Expository Thoughts on the Gospels.*

Designed for Family and Private Reading, with the Text complete, and copious Notes.

ST. MATTHEW. Extra cloth, 6s.

ST. MARK. Uniform with the above. 5s.

ST. LUKE. Vol. I. 5s. 6d. Vol. II. 7s.

ST. JOHN. Vol. I. 6s. 6d. Vol. II. 6s. 6d. Vol. III. 8s.

*This work is also kept in half Morocco, at an excess of 3s. per volume. In extra half Morocco binding, at 5s. 6d.; or whole Turkey Morocco, 6s. 6d. per volume. Also in extra bindings, for presentation.*

*Hymns for the Church on Earth.*

Being Three Hundred Hymns, for the most part of modern date. Selected and arranged by the Rev. J. C. Ryle, M.A. Ninth Edition.

*In small 8vo., black cloth, red edges, 4s.; limp cloth, for invalids, 4s.; black antique, 4s. 6d.; violet and extra cloth antique, gilt edges, 5s.; Turkey Morocco, 10s. 6d. Also in Russia and other bindings, for presentation.*

*A Portable Edition of "Hymns for the Church on Earth." Printed on toned paper. Extra cloth, gilt edges, 3s. 6d.; red edges, 3s.*

*Home Truths.*

Being the Miscellaneous Addresses and Tracts, revised and corrected especially for this work. Sixth Edition. F<sup>cap</sup> 8vo, extra cloth, lettered. Eight Series. Each illustrated with a Frontispiece and Vignette Title. Each volume, 3s. 6d.

*This work is also kept in Morocco, Russia, and other elegant bindings, for presents; prices and specimens of which will be forwarded on application to the Publishers.*



WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY,

BY THE REV. GEORGE EVERARD, M.A.,

*Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton.*

*Day by Day ;*

or, Counsels to Christians on the Details of Every Day Life. With Introduction by the Rev. T. Vores, Incumbent of St. Mary's, Hastings. Sixth edition. Fcap 8vo. Cloth, red edges, 3s.; antique, gilt edges, 3s. 6d. Cheap edition. Uniform with "Not Your Own." 1s. 6d.

*Steps Across ;*

or, Guidance and Help to the Anxious and Doubtful. A Companion volume to "Day by Day." Cloth boards, 2s. 6d.; extra cloth, gilt edges, 3s.

*Home Sundays ;*

or, Help and Consolation from the Sanctuary. Cloth extra, 3s.; bevelled, gilt edges, 3s. 6d.

*"Not Your Own ;"*

or, Counsels to Young Christians. Sixth edition. 18mo., cloth limp, 1s.; extra binding, 1s. 6d.

*Safe and Happy.*

Words of Help and Encouragement to Young Women, with Prayers for Daily use. Second edition. Uniform with "Not Your Own," etc. Limp cloth, 1s.; extra cloth, gilt edges, 1s. 6d.

*Before His Footstool.*

Family Prayers for One Month, with Prayers for Special Occasions. Fcap 8vo. 2s. 6d.

BY BROWNLOW NORTH, B.A.,

*Magdalen Hall, Oxford; Registrar of the Diocese of Winchester and Surrey.*

*Think on These Things ;*

Wisdom: her cry—Wisdom: who has it!—The Grace of God—Christ the Saviour: Christ the Judge. Uniform with "Ourselves." 3s.

*The Prodigal Son ;*

or, the Way Home. Cloth boards, extra, antique binding. 2s.

*Ourselves :*

A Picture sketched from the History of the Children of Israel. Fourth edition. Cloth boards, 2s. 6d.; antique bindings, 3s. Seventh and cheaper edition, 18mo., cloth limp, 1s. 9d.

*Yes! or No!*

or, God's Offer of Salvation. (Gen. xxiv. 58.) Uniform with "Ourselves." Third edition. Extra cloth, 3s.; cloth limp, cheap edition, 1s. 9d.

BY THE REV. GORDON CALTHROP, M.A.,

*Vicar of St. Augustine's, Highbury New Park, London.*

*Words Spoken to my Friends.*

Sermons preached at St. Augustine's, Highbury. Crown 8vo. 6s.

*Pulpit Recollections.*

Being Sermons preached during a Six Years' Ministry at Cheltenham and Highbury New Park. Revised and adapted for general reading. One vol. Post 8vo. 5s. 6d.

*The Children's Pulpit.*

Addresses to Children. In two volumes, each 3s., in appropriate binding.

Series 1. The Twin Brothers, and other Sermons to Children.

„ 2. The Lost Sheep Found, and other Sermons to Children.







