

Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Green Fund

April 25, 1879.


5930 .K57 1878

Tip, William Ingraham, 1811-
1898.

Shelf..... The double witness of the







Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE
DOUBLE WITNESS OF THE CHURCH

BY THE

RT. REV. WM. INGRAHAM KIP D.D. LL.D.

BISHOP OF CALIFORNIA

"It may be as well, then, old and trite as the subject is, to say a few words on some of those natures of our Church, which bear at once a DOUBLE WITNESS against Rome on the one hand, and mere Protestant congregations on the other."—REV. F. W. FABER.

TWENTY-SECOND EDITION

REVISED BY THE AUTHOR

NEW YORK
E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY
713 BROADWAY
1878

ONE only way to life ;
One Faith, delivered once for all ;
One holy Band, endow'd with Heaven's high call :
One earnest, endless strife ;—
This is the Church th' Eternal fram'd of old.

Smooth open ways, good store :
A creed for every clime and age,
By Mammon's touch new moulded o'er and o'er ;
No Cross, no war to wage ;
This is the Church our earth-dimmed eyes behold.

But ways must have an end,
Creeds undergo the trial flame,
Nor with th' impure the saints forever blend,
Heaven's glory with our shame :
Think on that home, and choose 'twixt soft and bold.

Lyra Apostolica.

PREFACE.

THE circumstances under which this Volume was written, are briefly these. The last winter, it is well known, was a season of strange excitement among the different denominations throughout our land. At such a time—as the best safeguard against this injurious influence—the writer thought it well to deliver to the people of his charge, a course of Lectures, plainly setting forth the distinctive principles of the Church. They were continued through ten successive Sunday evenings; and he had reason to believe that the effect produced was beneficial.

The Lectures were originally prepared without the most distant idea of publication. Having, however, been requested by the vestry, as well as by others in whose judgment he is accustomed to rely, to furnish the series for the press, the writer did not feel at liberty to decline. He has, therefore, availed himself of what hours of leisure he could find amidst the engrossing cares of Parish duty, to expand some parts of the course and to add the necessary references. The result of his attempt is seen in this volume.

He believes that this work will be found to differ somewhat in its plan, from most of those on the

claims of our Church, which are intended for popular reading. They are generally written with reference merely to the Protestant denominations around us. The public mind, however, has lately taken a new direction, and the doctrines of the Church of Rome have again become a subject of discussion. The writer has therefore endeavored to draw the line between these two extremes—showing that the Church bears her DOUBLE WITNESS against them both—and points out a middle path as the one of truth and safety. And the principle by which he has been guided in all cases, is that laid down by Tertullian, “Whatever is first, is true; whatever is more recent, is spurious.”*

To account for the tone in which some parts are written—for instance, the close of the Lecture on “The moral training of the Church”—he must ask the reader to bear in mind, the high state of religious excitement which was at that time prevailing on every side, and the strange excesses to which it naturally gave birth. These passages have been suffered to remain, because another winter may again produce the same delusions in the denominations around us. On the solemn subject of his religious interests, man seems determined not to profit by the experience of the past, but year after year courts the fever, forgetful of the chill by which it is invariably followed.

The prevalence in this country of a peculiar form of error, also occasioned the delivery of a separate

* Peræque adversus universas hæreses jam hinc præjudicatum sit id esse verum, quodcunque primum; id esse adulterum quodcunque posterius.—*Tertull. adv. Prax.*, § ii. *Oper. p.* 405.

Lecture, devoted to an exposition of "The Church's View of Baptism." In the fourth century, Pelagius, after travelling over the greater part of Christendom, could record as the result of his observations that "he had never heard even any impious heretic, who asserted that infants are not to be baptized." Such, however, is unfortunately not the case in our day. A numerous body of those "who profess and call themselves Christians," have fallen into this heresy, and it has become necessary to show plainly, how untenable are their doctrines when tested by Scripture and the voice of Catholic antiquity.

The writer cannot expect, in bringing forward so many disputed points, but that his readers will take exception to some of his statements. He trusts, however, that the views advanced will be found to be in accordance with the teaching of the great body of divines of the Church of England. In the old path which they marked out, we should all endeavor to walk. And the caution at this time is particularly necessary. The revival of an attention to Church principles which has lately taken place, will in some cases drive the unstable and the imaginative to an extreme bordering on Romanism. This danger, therefore, we must shun, seeking with care the well defined line which separates Catholic truths from Roman fallacies. And if these Lectures shall aid any inquirer in forming his opinions, and avoiding the errors by which we are surrounded, the writer will feel that his labor has not been in vain.

Festival of St. James, 1843.

PREFACE TO THE TWENTY-SECOND EDITION.

IN revising this Edition for the press, the author would express his thankfulness for the many assurances he has received that this work has proved useful in spreading the knowledge of the Apostolic Church. Written during a time of excitement, and to meet a peculiar crisis in the state of religion around, he had no idea that at the end of more than thirty-four years it would be found with an increasing circulation. To the kindness of his brethren in the ministry much of this is owing; and now, the author may truly say, that with the added study of years and the wider experience he has gained from himself witnessing the workings of mere Protestantism in Germany and Romanism in Italy, he sees no necessity for changing any views which he formerly expressed in these pages. The last quarter of a century has been a time of trial to the Church, when her principles were fully tested both in this country and in that from which she came, yet to his mind the result has proved her Catholic character, and increased his confidence in the truths he has endeavored to unfold in this volume. Once more then he sends it forth on its way, with the earnest prayer that it may not only strengthen the Churchman in his faith, but also prove useful to some among those who in an age of doubt and skepticism, are "sounding on their dim and perilous way."

SAN FRANCISCO, *October*, 1877.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I.	
Introductory. Necessity for knowing the Reasons why we are Churchmen - - - - -	9
II.	
Episcopacy proved from Scripture - - - - -	39
III.	
Episcopacy proved from History - - - - -	77
IV.	
Antiquity of Forms of Prayer - - - - -	117
V.	
History of our Liturgy - - - - -	147
VI.	
The Church's View of Infant Baptism - - - - -	190
VII.	
The Moral Training of the Church - - - - -	226
VIII.	
Popular Objections against the Church - - - - -	252
IX.	
The Church in all ages the Keeper of the Truth - - - - -	289
X.	
Conclusion. The True, Catholic Churchman - - - - -	313

MAN is a creature of extremes. The middle path is generally the wise path, but there are few wise enough to find it. Because Papists have made too much of some things, Protestants have made too little of them. The Papists treat man as all sense : and, therefore, some Protestants would treat him as all spirit. Because one party has exalted the Virgin Mary to a Divinity, the other can scarcely think of that "most highly favored among women" with common respect. The Papist puts the Apocrypha into his Canon ; the Protestant will scarcely regard it as an ancient record. The Popish Heresy, human merit in justification, drove Luther on the other side into the most unwarrantable and unscriptural statements of that doctrine. The Papists consider Grace as inseparable from the participation of the Sacraments—the Protestants too often lose sight of them as instituted means of conveying Grace.

Cecil's Remains.



I.

NECESSITY FOR KNOWING THE REASONS WHY WE ARE CHURCHMEN.

Mother! I am sometimes told,
By the wanderers in the dark,
Fleeing from thine ancient fold,
I must seek some newer ark.

* * * * *

Rather those who turn away
Let me seek with love to win,
Till Christ's scattered sheep astray
To thy fold are gathered in.

Rev. B. D. Winslow, 'To the Church.'

IN all the varied history of the Church, the most beautiful picture is that which is presented by the unity of her early days. The watchwords of a party were then unheard over the earth. No discordant tones arose, to break the delightful harmony which prevailed. No warring sects distracted the attention of the inquirer after the Truth, or pointed to an hundred different paths in which he was invited to walk. With one voice all declared themselves heirs of the same hopes, and alike numbered with the faithful. "By the operation of the Holy Ghost, all Christians were so joined together, in unity of spirit, and in the bond of peace, that with one heart they

desired the prosperity of the Holy Apostolic Church, and with one mouth professed the faith once delivered to the saints.”*

The Church then stood before our race, the sole messenger of glad tidings to the world—the only city of refuge, beyond whose shelter there was no salvation for mankind. On widely distant shores, and in many a strange tongue, the voice of prayer was uplifted, yet always its spirit was the same. “From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same,”—everywhere over the wide earth—there was “one Lord, one faith, one baptism.” All “continued steadfastly in the Apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.” There was, therefore, nothing else in this world to which the penitent could turn, but the one Catholic, Apostolic Church.

Centuries have gone by since these bright days of the Church passed away; yet, still the hope of their return sustains her children amid the toils and self-denial of the way. For this their souls are waiting “more than they that watch for the morning.” For this they labor. For this they strive to make her principles known in the world—to reclaim the wanderers from her fold—and to convince them, that there indeed they will find rest for their souls. And it is in the attempt to do my humble share in this work, and to mingle my exertions also with that tide of influence which is put forth on every side of us, that I have met you this evening, to commence a course of lectures on the distinctive principles of the Church. The field which opens before us is a wide

* From a prayer in the office of Institution.

one, but the remarks which I shall offer, on the present occasion, will be merely introductory.

You will naturally ask the question—why I have chosen this way to advance the interests of our faith, and aid the final coming of the reign of peace? Why—with so many topics opening before us on the pages of God's word, which ultimately concern man's eternal safety—I pass them by, to dwell upon forms of Church government? Why—when the apostate and the lost are perishing on the right hand and on the left—instead of sounding forth to them the solemn warning, to turn unto the Lord and live—instead of preaching that great Atonement which must be their only hope—I take up subjects which to many would appear only of secondary interest?

In answer to these inquiries I can only say, that I am fully aware of the unspeakable importance of these themes. You, too, I trust, can bear me witness, that when I have stood before you, week after week, for nearly six years, in the ministrations of this sanctuary, it has ever been my object to lead you through the sorrows of a broken and contrite heart, to that peace and joy which are to be found only at the Cross of our Lord. It has been my earnest prayer, that never might I lose sight of that maxim of the Apostle which regulated his preaching, and which he declared so explicitly in the words: "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." But every truth which God has revealed must be important, and should hold its proper place in the instructions of the pulpit. Under the Jewish law, no commands which he had given were thought too inconsiderable to

receive their strict attention. Even the "paying tithes of mint, anise, and cummin," our Saviour declared they "ought not to leave undone." Who, then, can say, that the question, What form of government did our Lord prescribe for His Church? is one which does not deserve our earnest investigation? There is indeed "a time to speak," as well as "a time to be silent"—a time to warn the sinner that he flee from the wrath to come, or to call the Christian to press onward in his course—and a time to proclaim to those around us, the rules of outward order which characterize our Church. There must indeed be a symmetry in our teaching. "He," says Bishop McIlvaine, "is a poor husbandman, who spends so much time upon the tilling of the ground, that his enclosures are forgotten; or who thinks that because the fence is not the grain, therefore it may take care of itself. So would that be a very defective ministry, and would prove at last, should it be generally prevalent, a ruinous ministry to all abiding fruits of righteousness, which, for the sake of more attention to inward and spiritual religion, should despise or neglect the careful maintenance, in their right claim of reverence and obedience, of those outward things of Church ordinance and order, which are just as necessary to the abiding of spiritual religion in the world, as the human body is to the abiding of the human soul." Neither, indeed, are these single and isolated facts, standing by themselves. They have their influence on the whole circle of our religious duties. And since all truths are linked together, the reception of any one may be the means of pouring light into the mind, and in-

ducing us to go on step by step, until "the Truth shall make us free." While, therefore, "the time is short" in which our warfare is to be waged, it is surely well for us at once to decide, in what arena the conflict must be fought.

To this duty then I am called, by the very vows which bound me to the altar. Among the earliest charges inculcated upon the ministry, even by an Apostle, was the duty of declaring to their people "all the counsel of God," because thus only could they be "pure from the blood of all men." Yes, brethren! "*all* the counsel of God"—not merely a few great and cardinal doctrines—those of repentance and faith—but everything which forms a part of our common Christianity. How, then, can he be fulfilling this requisition, who omits any truth which can exert an influence upon the Christian life and conduct? Would the ancient Jewish priest have discharged his duty to the people, if, when commanded to instruct them in the law, he had spent all his time in directing their attention to that coming Messiah, who was then revealed in prophecy? No, his business was to teach them also the rites of the ceremonial law—to show why they were severed from the surrounding nations—and to recall the history and explain the object of that splendid ritual with which they worshipped. And this is the wide duty of the Christian priest in our day. He must also unfold before you the government and polity of that Church which his Master founded, when, as the earliest Herald of the faith, He preached among the villages of Judea, and which He then

constituted to be in all ages "the pillar and ground of the truth."*

Again—in our ordination service, the question put by the Bishop to one about to be admitted to the holy order of Priests is—"Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word?"—to which he replies—"I will, the Lord being my helper." And the exhortation also is given—"See that ye never cease your labor, your care and diligence, until ye have done all that lieth in you, according to your bounden duty, to bring all such as are or shall be committed to your charge, unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and that ripeness and perfection of age in Christ, that there be no place left among you, either for error in religion, or for viciousness in life." How then can he be innocent, who beholds what he regards as errors rife around him, and yet warns not the people of his charge against their influence—who suffers them to live on year after year, attending the services of the Church, yet liable to be "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine," because they are without any definite knowledge of the reasons why they should be Churchmen?

Such, then, are the motives which have induced me to address you on these subjects. They are points which for the last three centuries have exercised the intellect and pens of some of the most gifted in each generation. There is no room therefore for any at-

* 1 Tim. iii. 15.

tempts at originality, but all that we can now do is to go forth, and reap here and there, with what judgment we may, in the wide fields which the learned of former days have cultivated. "Other men labored, and we have entered into their labors." In the elucidation, too, of each single topic which I can bring before you in the narrow compass of these lectures, volumes have been written. But how few comparatively will turn to the hoarded wisdom of the past—the works of those who were giants in the intellectual warfare of older days—and search for themselves in the rich mines which have been thus bequeathed to us? The very magnitude of the materials which are offered to their view, causes them often to turn away in despair, while to a simple statement of the argument they will listen readily. Many too need to have their attention first awakened, and their interest excited, before they will commence the examination. My endeavor therefore shall be, merely to open this subject before you, in the hope that afterwards, from the hints and suggestions given, you will feel inclined yourselves to prosecute the study of this important argument.

And now, brethren, a few words with regard to the spirit in which I propose to conduct this inquiry. It is with no feeling of unkindness or opposition to those who differ from us on these topics. Born and educated in a denomination which discards the distinctive features of the Church, the recollections of youth are not easily forgotten, nor the ties of relationship which bind me to those who reject, as a corruption of the dark ages, the claims of our ancient Apostolic ministry, and almost regard as heresy the

way in which we worship our God. But if compelled from principle to decline uniting with their communion, and to differ from them on doctrines which the Church holds to be most important, I would still speak of them only in the spirit of love. In setting before you, therefore, most distinctly the points on which we are at variance, and protesting against what we believe to be a departure from the Scriptural standard, it shall still be done with no other feeling than that of deep regret that thus the followers of the same Lord can disagree. Remembering, with the excellent Hooker, that "there will come a time, when three words uttered with charity and meekness shall receive a far more blessed reward, than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit,"* he who now addresses you would desire in this, as in all other things, not to record a single line,

"——which, dying, he would wish to blot."

In that fearful conflict which is waging against "the Prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience," we may hail with gladness of heart, the success of any who are winning souls from sin to holiness, even though they "follow not with us." Though error may be mingled with the truth they inculcate, still if they can thus lead the lost and perishing to their God, our spirits may well be lifted up with gratitude, that thus the faith is advanced, "if by any means we might save some." When, therefore, we learn that through the efforts of those who disclaim our ministry, new triumphs are won to the cross among the snows of

* Preface to Eccles. Polity, Sect. 2.

Greenland, or on "the palmy plains" of Ceylon—when we read how the Jesuits, Cavallero and Anchieta taught their creed among the mighty forests of our own Southern continent, and for the first time the wild tribes of Brazil bowed to the emblem of our common Master, we thank God our hearts can respond to the announcement of their success,* and our faith is strengthened as we journey on amid the gloom and trials of this lower world. We can adopt, we trust, alike the feelings and the language of the Apostle and say,—“What then? notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.” Yet still, we may be clearly sensible of the errors of those, who thus in a greater or less degree have departed from that standard which our Lord left for his followers. Let our motto then be expressed in the words of an ancient writer—“Unity, in things that are necessary—liberty, in things that are unnecessary—charity, in all things.”†

Again—it shall be my endeavor to speak plainly. The trumpet should never utter an uncertain sound. There is no use on this point, or on any other, of

* “It was a land of priestcraft, but the Priest
Believed himself the fables that he taught:
Corrupt their forms, and yet those forms at least
Preserv'd a salutary faith that wrought,
Maugre the alloy, the saving end it sought.
Benevolence had gain'd such empire there,
That even superstition had been brought
An aspect of humanity to wear,
And make the weal of man its first and only care.
Southey's Tale of Paraguay, Cant. IV. 10.

† In necessariis, unitas—in non necessariis, libertas—in omnibus, charitas.”—*Witsius ap Turretin, de Fund. p. 45.*

that smooth and equivocal preaching which leaves the hearer in doubt as to the practical conclusion. The pulpit is no place from which to utter dark sayings, or to address you in the language of parables. I shall endeavor, therefore, fully and faithfully to lay before you the distinctive principles of the Church—showing that she is now, in her form and ministry, as founded by Christ and his Apostles eighteen centuries ago, and that this view is confirmed alike by the voice of Scripture and of History. And if the conclusions to which we come should strike at the very foundations of the claims of those who surround us, we are not responsible for the result. We must interpret the word of God in accordance with the light we have—deliver faithfully the message with which He has charged us—and then leave consequences to Him. It was not always with pleasant minstrelsy that the prophets of old approached those to whom they were sent. Often they were charged with a sterner message, as they rebuked their infatuated countrymen for abandoning the Holy Temple at Jerusalem and worshipping in groves and high places which their own hands had made.

WHY THEN SHOULD YOU SEEK TO UNDERSTAND THE REASONS FOR BEING CHURCHMEN?

The first I shall mention is—*because our Divine Master when on earth certainly founded and established a Church.* Had He not done so—had he merely inculcated the general principles of His faith, and left each body of believers to regulate their own ecclesiastical government—the obligations resting on us would be widely different. Then, we might justly consider every self-constituted society, and every

assembly professing itself to be Christian, as a regular and duly organized Church of Christ. Then every individual who imagined himself moved to preach the Gospel, or who was asked to do so by any number who had chosen thus to unite together as a congregation, would be fully entitled to ministerial authority, and as much qualified to administer the sacraments, as if he had received a direct commission from heaven.

You perceive, then, that there must have been some visible Church established by our Lord, and some regularly constituted ministry, or every thing has been left entirely unsettled, subject to the caprices of man. And you will readily see, to what fluctuations and changes the want of this established system would necessarily give rise. If at any particular time—take that of the Reformation in the sixteenth century for example—a body of men, for some reason which seemed sufficient to themselves, had a right to abandon that ministry which was derived in uninterrupted succession from the Apostles, and without any new commission from our Lord, to constitute another ministry of their own, then any individuals have at any time a right to do the same. Either the ministry of the Church must have been handed down from our Lord and his apostles, through the long line of those who succeeded them—and it is from this fact that I stand before you your authorized teacher—or else there is no law at all on this subject, and each one who occupies these pews has as much right as I have—should his fancy lead him to do so—to stand at this altar, and minister to you

in holy things. There is therefore no middle ground in this matter.

But our Lord did not, we believe, thus abandon the precious truth He came to communicate, to be, through all the following ages, swept about upon the surging, changing sea of popular will. He formed also the casket, and left it to contain and guard the precious treasure, until His coming again. He constituted His Church to be, in the Apostle's words, "the pillar and ground of the truth." He found His disciples living under the Mosaic ritual—under a well defined, strictly organized plan of government, and is it to be supposed that He released them from this, and yet substituted nothing in its place? While the Christian faith was but the continuation, the perfection of the Jewish, was it to have no restrictions—no form of polity whatever? Our reason would dictate to us, that this cannot be. Our Lord knew too well what was in man thus to abandon him to his own idle caprices.

It was after our Master had burst the bonds of death and triumphed over the grave—while for a time He was still lingering on the earth to cheer His disciples, and fit them for the trials and labors which were at hand—that He gave them the high commission to go forth and lay the foundations of that spiritual kingdom which was to embrace within its fold, "all nations, and kindreds, and tongues." His clear and unequivocal language was: "Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when He 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." " And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."* The general belief has been, that during the forty days which intervened between our Lord's resurrection and ascension, while He instructed His disciples in " the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God," He also inculcated the organization of the Church He had founded. It is evident, that when immediately afterwards they commenced their ministry, there was no doubt, no hesitation on their part. They at once proceeded to developpe this plan—to fill the vacancy in the number of the Apostles—" to ordain them elders in every Church "†— and to constitute the order of Deacons.‡ This then was the three-fold ministry of the Church.

* John xx. 21, 22, 23. Matt xxviii. 18, 19, 20.

† Acts xiv. 23.

‡ Bishop H. U. Onderdonk argues, (*Epis. Examined*, p. 234,) that this was not the first appointment of Deacons, but that they existed "*in re*," at least, long before. He derives this conclusion from the following arguments—1. The Apostles, even before this time, could not have attended personally, as is generally supposed, to the distribution of alms. The work was too extensive from the first, and they would have had to "leave the word" altogether, had they discharged this lower office. 2. Had this work been in the hands of the Apostles, they would hardly have shown partiality. It must, therefore, have been previously committed to other agents. 3. If this was the beginning of the order of the Diaconate, seven would have been hardly enough for the converts, daily increasing by thousands. There must, therefore, have been others also. 4. The Jewish converts were

If, therefore, a Church was founded with its valid ministry, is it not our duty to seek out this fold and unite with it? Christ—the Apostle tells us—“is Head over all things to the Church, which is His body.”* Now the Body can no more be divided than the Head. Again, he says—“*There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism.*”† It is indeed a common opinion, and one which we often hear announced, that “as long as an individual is truly religious, it is a matter of no importance to what body of Christians he belongs.” But if this be of no consequence, why was a Church established at all? And—to go a step farther—if a

of course much the most numerous. They did not, however complain of any neglect. The murmuring came from the foreign converts. There does not, however, appear to have been one native Hebrew among “the seven;” an omission which, without the construction before us, would have invited a “murmur” from the party before favored. The probability therefore is, that this was no new order at that time in the Church, but that additional deacons, selected from foreigners, were then ordained to minister to the foreign converts who had begun to increase. They were added to provide for a special emergency.

Such also is the view of Mosheim. He says—“The *first deacons* of the Church, being chosen from among Jews who were born in Palestine, were suspected by the foreign Jews of partiality in distributing the offerings which were presented for the support of the poor. To remedy, therefore, this disorder, *seven other deacons* were chosen by order of the Apostles, and employed in the service of *that part* of the Church, at Jerusalem, which was composed of the foreign Jews converted to Christianity. Of these *new* ministers, six were foreigners, as appears by their names; the seventh was chosen out of the proselytes, of whom there were a certain number among the first Christians at Jerusalem, and to whom it was reasonable that some regard should be shown in the elections of the Deacons as well as to the foreign Jews.—*Comm. de Rebus Christ.* p. 118.

* Eph i. 22, 23.

† Eph. iv. 4.

Church has been established, and that Church is the body of Christ, unless we are members of her fold, how can we be members of Christ ?

Divisions certainly were not regarded by the Apostles, as matters of but little moment. The declaration of St. Paul is—"That there should be no schism in the body,"* and when the Corinthian converts, in their dissensions, began to arrange themselves under the party names of Paul and Apollos, and Cephas, they were most sternly rebuked by the great Apostle of the Gentiles. His indignant inquiry was—"Is Christ divided?" and the exhortation which he wrote them was—"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that *there be no divisions* (σχισματα) *among you ; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind*, and in the same judgment."† So fearful did he regard this sin of schism, that the authors of it were not to be treated as Christians. His instructions on this head were—"Now I beseech you, brethren, *mark them which cause divisions* and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned ; and *avoid them*, for they that are such *serve not our Lord Jesus Christ.*"‡ And so St. Jude speaks of those "who separate themselves," as "having not the spirit." Is it not, then, a matter of importance to belong to that Church which our Lord founded? And if you are now numbered with her members, should you not understand the ground of your belief—the reasons why you are Churchmen ?§

* I Cor. xii. 25.

† I Cor. i. 12.

‡ Rom. xvi. 17.

§ The early Fathers always wrote on the subject of schism, in the

Again—a second reason for acquiring this knowledge is *because if we are members of that Church which*

same strain with the Apostles. Ignatius says—“As children of light and truth, avoid the division of unity.” *Epist. ad Philad.*

Ireneus says—“The spiritual man will also judge those who work divisions; vain men, devoid of the love of God, seeking their own advantage more than the unity of the Church; who for trifling, nay, for any causes, rend and divide the great and glorious body of Christ, and as far as in them lies, slay it; who speak peace, and work warfare; who truly strain at the gnat, and swallow the camel; *for no improvement can be made by them so great as is the evil of schism.*” *Adv. Hæres. iv. c. 33.*

The martyr Cyprian wrote a treatise—“*De Unitate Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*”—especially upon this subject. He says: “Heresy and *schism* are his [Satan’s] invention, for the subversion of faith, the corruption of truth, the division of unity. Those whom he can no longer retain in the blindness of the former way, he circumvents by betraying them into deviation from their new progress. He tears men away from the Church; and while they imagine themselves to have come unto the light, and to have escaped the night of this world, he secretly infuses a second accession of darkness; so that they continue to call themselves Christians, while they stand not by the Gospel of Christ, and never heed or obey him.”

In the same work he speaks also of Episcopacy as a witness for Unity. “He who holds not this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the faith? When a man struggles against the Church, and resists it, does he suppose that he continues to belong to it?”

In the same way St. Augustine writes against the Donatists, and his testimony is particularly valuable, because this was a sect whose only error was schism, while in other points—as Mosheim states—“their doctrine was conformable to that of the Church, as even their adversaries confess.” (*Cent. iv. part ii. ch. 5. sec. 8.*) But mark with what severity he reproves their sin. He supposes the Church thus to address them—“My children, why do you complain of your Mother? I wish to hear why you have deserted me. You accuse your brethren, and I am rent asunder by you. When the Gentiles persecuted me, I suffered much; many left me, but they left me through fear. No one forced *you* thus to rebel against me. You say that you are with me, but you must perceive that this is false! I am called Catholic; you are on the side of Donatus.” (*Contra Donat. ix. 8.*) And again he says: “The question between us and the Donatists is, Where is the Church of God? With us, or with them? This Church is one,

our Lord founded, we must be free from many errors on various subjects which mingle with the faith of those who dissent from her. Our object of course must be, to receive the truth as pure as possible. How should we have acted, therefore, had we lived in the days of our Lord's personal ministry on the earth? There would then have been no doubts on this subject. We should, of course, have attached ourselves to Him, as members of His own household of faith—the little Church of which He was the Visible Head.

But the Church did not end with our Lord, for when He ascended up, He left others as His appointed successors, saying unto them: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." Of course, then, at this time we should have thought it safest to unite with them in visible fellowship, esteeming ourselves in this way more certain of spiritual blessings, than by belonging to any self-constituted societies in Galilee or Antioch, (had such things existed,) which had merely received some of the prominent doctrines of our Lord, yet without submitting to the rule of His chosen Apostles. Yet these Apostles also appointed their successors, to whom this same authority was thus transmitted, and they again consecrated others, and so the chain was kept up through the second century, and the third, and the fourth, until it reaches down even to our day. Is not, then, the obligation to belong to this Church as imperative upon us, in the nineteenth century, as it was upon those who lived in the first?

denominated by our ancestors, *Catholic*; to denote, by the very name, that it is every where diffused." *Ep. ad Cath.* ii. 338.

And if we now find the Christian world divided into contending sects, which have strayed off from her fold—disclaimed some of her doctrines—and renounced her Apostolic ministry—I submit to you the question, Which is the part of prudence? Is it not to find out this Church, which has come down from the earliest age, and to unite with her? Let your reason decide.

But we are told that each one who loves the Lord Jesus in sincerity and truth, shall be saved at last through His atonement, even though he “follow not with us.” We deny it not, for sorrowful indeed would be our view of human life could we believe otherwise. When the voice of strife is loud around us, and the truth is defaced by passion or obscured by prejudice, we can look forward with joy to the hour when the end of all these things shall be. Then, we trust that those mighty spirits who now display so much intellectual power while they have “fallen out by the way,” will meet in peace before their Father’s throne, and as they rejoice together in the light of His countenance, will forget the differences which divided them on their journey thither. “The spirit of Christianity is a spirit of love, and it often dwells among those who, in this world of corruption and folly, are most widely severed. It is cheering to think, that when the films which obscure our earthly vision are removed, we may all be found prostrate in adoration before the Lamb who died to redeem all by His most precious blood.”* Yet still, those who have abandoned the Church, must necessarily be mingling some errors with the

* Dr. Jarvis’s Sermon on Church Unity, in 1836, p. 26, n.

truths they receive; may they not therefore be depriving themselves of advantages, and cutting themselves off from spiritual blessings, which otherwise they would enjoy, on their way to heaven? This is a point which we shall not fully know until the last day. Admit, however, the principle on which this objection to our claims is founded, and you may as well assert that, since we believe the heathen who lives up to the light he has will be saved,* therefore there is no use in his ever hearing of Christianity, because he can reach heaven without it. This view indeed confounds all principle of belief—renders truth utterly unimportant—and inculcates the notion, that God may impart directions to us, yet if we in our wisdom believe them to be of secondary importance, we may entirely disregard them.†

* Rom. ii. 14.

† There is probably no body of Christians more inclined to narrow down salvation than the Romanists, and yet they do not confine it to those within the pale of their own Church. They extend it also to others who from conscientious motives have remained separated from it. Thus, their great writer Dr. Milner says—"Catholic divines and the holy fathers, at the same time that they strictly insist on the necessity of adhering to the doctrine and communion of the Catholic Church, make an express exception in favor of what is termed *invincible ignorance*; which occurs when persons out of the true Church are sincerely and firmly resolved, in spite of all worldly allurements on the one hand, and all opposition to the contrary on the other, to enter into it, if they could find it out, and when they use their best endeavors for this purpose. This exception in favor of the *invincibly ignorant* is made by the same St. Augustine who so strictly insists on the general rule. . . . our great controvertist, Bellarmine, asserts that such Christians, 'in virtue of the disposition of their hearts, belong to the Catholic Church.'" *End of Controversy, Letter xxi.* p. 137, Lond. 1841.

Again—in another place, in his letter on "the Qualities of Catholicity," he says, when speaking of the Church of England, and other bodies of Christians not in union with the Romish Church—"All the

In examining this principle, indeed, I know not how better to explain it, than by bringing before you the striking illustration employed by the Bishop of Vermont. He thus shows its absurdity. "The respectable society of Friends, frequently called Quakers, are well known as professing Christianity, and as being on some points remarkably zealous followers of the precepts of the Gospel. Their love of peace—their order—their patient endurance of persecution—what more lovely exhibition of practical religion have modern days to boast, than this remarkable people have displayed in these particulars? But they have adopted the erroneous idea, that a purer dispensation of the Gospel was committed to George Fox, the founder of this sect, which superseded in some respects the directions of Apostolic rule, and hence they have no order of the ministry, no water baptism, no administration of the communion. Their women are allowed to teach in public equally with men, and they are strong opponents in all these points of the Church established by the Apostles. Now is it competent for us to say, that the pious and sincere Quaker shall be cast out of the kingdom of Christ, on account of these serious errors in his system? God forbid! We are not the judges of our fellows. Nay, it is the voice of the Redeemer

young children who have been baptized in them, and all *invincibly ignorant Christians*, who exteriorly adhere to them, really belong to the Catholic Church, as I have shown above." *Letter xxix.* p. 190.

The same view of this doctrine as held by the Church of Rome is given by Palmer in his *Treatise on the Church*, vol. i. p. 240. When therefore they assert—"There is no salvation without the pale of the Catholic Church"—the question is, What do they mean by "the Catholic Church?"

himself which saith, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged.' On the other hand, shall we admit that the pious Quaker is on an equality with those who, being equally sincere, have retained faithfully the whole system of the Book of God? Surely not, for this would be an absurdity. It is preposterous to say, that the man who is in error can be on an equality with him that is not in error. It is preposterous to say, that he who departs from the rules of the Christian Church, is as safe as he who diligently keeps them. Consequently, while we behold the Quaker with all benevolence of feeling, and willingly praise everything in his faith and practice which accords with the Word of God, we hesitate not to declare, plainly and unequivocally, that he has fallen into error on the points specified; that in this error we cannot take any part, nor can we give it either allowance or encouragement; while, nevertheless, we do not undertake to define the peril to which it exposes him before God, but leave him to that tribunal before which we must all stand at the day of final retribution."*

Now we may apply this view to the whole controversy, on the claims of the different denominations of Christians. The question is not—can a person be saved without the Church? but, has God established any Church with a particular organization, which is still in existence? If He has, it is clearly our duty to be included with this fold. Thus shall we be conforming ourselves most nearly to the divine standard, and of course be most certain of spiritual blessings.

* The Prim. Church compared with the Prot. Episcopal Church, by *Bp. Hopkins*, p. 7.

All these various sects cannot be right. Truth cannot have a hundred forms. She is one, and we must search her out among all the counterfeits by which she is surrounded, and then cleave to her.

Again—another reason why we should understand our distinctive Church principles is, *because without this knowledge we cannot be useful or consistent Churchmen.* The times in which we live are peculiar. It seems to be a crisis both in the intellectual and moral history of our race. It is an age of inquiry and investigation—an age “emulous of change”—when the truths in which our fathers rested are questioned and disallowed, and the maxim of many around us is—“Old things have passed away; all things have become new.” And with reference to no subject is this spirit more fully displayed than that of religion. Whatever may be the result, the time of indifference at least is going by. Men seem to be awakening to the truth, that it is a matter of concern and importance whether or not they are in the right way. Experience is beginning to demonstrate to them, that he whose creed is erroneous, will at length become erroneous in his life also, and they are therefore learning to discard that shallow sophism of the poet—

“For modes of faith, let graceless zealots fight;
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right.”*

For it is evident, that if his religion has any hold upon him at all, his life will partake of the eccentricities of his belief, and be, in fact, but his creed developed in action. The consequence is, that the

* Pope's Essay on Man, Ep. iii.

sound of theological warfare has lately come up with redoubled energy from all quarters of the Christian world. We hear on every side the earnest inquiry—"What is truth?" And the brightest sign of the times is, that the thoughtful and the serious in such numbers are looking to the Church. They see her standing unaltered in the midst of all this conflict. It rages around, yet her venerable battlements are untouched. The spirit of the age is continually modifying the sects about her, yet she is now in doctrine, and worship, and ministry, what she was in the Apostles' days. Time writes no wrinkle on her brow, and impairs not her strength. Is it not natural, then, that the question should be often asked by those who are tired of the contention and change they meet with elsewhere—What is the secret of this stability? Is it not also the duty of each Churchman, to study her distinctive features, that he may be enabled both to stand fast in the old ways, and also to give a reason for his choice to the many who are inquiring?

We can see, too, that the day is approaching in which she must take part in the conflict, to repel the assaults of her enemies. Her wonderful increase has not been unmarked by those who are opposed to her, and now there is on every side a rallying to stop her progress. Should not her friends then know why they belong to her fold, and the points in which she differs from those who are arrayed against her? No one can long labor with effect in a cause which he does not perfectly understand. He may be aroused to a spasmodic effort by some sudden burst of enthusiasm, but it needs something more to

sustain him amid the weariness and self-denial of continued exertion. To inspire him with an abiding earnestness, his views must be clear and distinct. He must be, as it were, deeply penetrated with the truth he would advocate, and then he will be compelled to listen reverently to her voice, and to go forth and labor in her behalf, when she points him to the field. Otherwise a secret, lurking unbelief will belie the cold profession of his lips, or else, if believed at all, the truth for which he is bound to contend will be entirely inoperative, and "lie bed-ridden in the dormitory of the soul."*

The Church can never depend upon the stability of her ignorant members. He who attends her services, merely because he was born a Churchman—or because to do so is convenient—or because he prefers the minister who happens to officiate at her altar—can be of but little benefit to her cause. The slightest reason will induce him to leave her fold and unite with others. He has merely a personal preference, not founded on any distinct understanding of her claims. Far be it from me, my brethren, to speak in the slightest degree in disparagement of that feeling of affection which binds a people to their pastor, for no one prizes it more highly than I do. Yet it must be engrafted upon Churchmanship, not substituted for it. Let an individual be attached from principle to the Church herself, and then any pastoral tie will but strengthen his love for her. But where this exists alone, pleasant as it may be to the individual towards whom this affection is direct-

* Coleridge's *Friend*, Essay xv.

ed, it will often in the end cause the Church to suffer.

In proof of this, we could point you to cases in which large and flourishing congregations, upon the death or removal of their minister, have been sadly injured by their members scattering to the sects which surrounded them. And the reason is evident. There was no Church principle there, and when their head was removed they thought not of the Apostolic Church, but merely looked around for some one else whom personally they could admire. But had they been grounded in a knowledge of the claims of their Church, they would have felt that the first duty was to her—to cling to her through good report and evil report—to devote themselves to build her up—while the question of their allegiance was entirely independent of any attachment or dislike to the individual who, for the time, was ministering at her altar. Fearful indeed was often the wickedness of the Scribes and Pharisees in the days of our Lord; and yet, while He condemned their conduct, He declared that they were the authorized teachers of the nation, and directed his disciples to reverence them accordingly. “The Scribes and the Pharisees”—said he—“sit in Moses’ seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say and do not.”*

And now, let me close this part of the subject, by giving you the testimony of one whose name and worth have been widely known through the religious community. Probably few among our clergy have been more honored by those who differ from us on

* Matt. xxiii. 2, 3.

the subject of Church government, than the late Dr. Bedell of Philadelphia. We find, however, his biographer, Dr. Tyng, of the same city, in describing his views towards the close of his ministry, remarks: "He had seldom preached in Philadelphia upon what are termed the 'distinctive principles' of the Episcopal Church, finding so much more pressing calls for his time and efforts in teaching the great principles of the Gospel, which are indispensable to man's salvation, and desiring first to build up his people in the acceptance and love of these . . . That the time however had come, when a more decided exhibition of these points of distinction might have been desirable, when his own health failed and his ministry closed, I have no doubt. And this seems to have been, at that time, his own impression and plan; for he had commenced a course of sermons upon this class of subjects, which his failing health never allowed him to deliver or to complete." He referred to this fact in a conversation with one of his brethren in the ministry, at Bedford, but a few weeks before his death. That gentleman thus relates it, in a letter to Mrs. Bedell—"He said, like many who thought and acted with him, he had for years said little on the *peculiarities* of our Church; but the period had arrived when they should be taught and preached. While many in their preaching had given them too much prominence, he had given them too little; but the state of the times seemed to require it. These had now changed for the better, and the same foundation for difference did not exist. He then added, very emphatically, 'If God spares my life, I intend delivering a course of sermons on Episcopacy

this coming winter.' This course, he informed me, he had then in preparation. On this passage Dr. Tyng remarks: "As certainly as it is our duty to declare the whole counsel of God, I concede it is our duty to declare the doctrines of the scripture in regard to the Church of Christ."*

Such then are some of the reasons why you should understand your distinctive principles as Churchmen. In concluding, then, this Introductory Lecture, I would ask your candid attention to those which shall follow. Much which may be presented, if new and strange, will be regarded at first with but little favor. It may be at variance with views previously adopted. It depends, however, entirely upon argument, and we ask you to dismiss all prejudice and weigh candidly and fairly what may be said. We shrink not from investigation on this subject. We court the most rigid inquiry.

And let me not be met at the outset with the usual cry of *bigotry*. That epithet is surely misapplied to one who is discharging a duty to which he is called by his ordination-vow, while it is done in no hostile or unkindly spirit towards others. There is, indeed, no middle path on the subject. If the ministers of the Church believe her doctrines on this point, they are as much bound to set them before their people, as they are those which relate to any other point. With the result they have nothing to do. They must feel as did the Apostle, when he said—"With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment but he that judgeth me is the Lord."† Their business is to

* Life, pp. 287, 288.

† 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4.

preach the eternal truths of the Gospel, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear. Even when all gainsay and reject, they can adopt the consoling reflection of the ancient prophet—"Yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work is with my God. "

We know, indeed, that to advocate the doctrines we are inculcating, is not to act in accordance with popular views. Yet he is surely unworthy of his sacred calling, and regardless of the solemn hour of retribution which is at hand, who, through fear of censure or a wish to court applause, could shrink from declaring anything which he conscientiously believes. A different path is marked out for him, in the discharge of his duty as a faithful watchman. He must warn the people of his charge against every opinion and every practice which would rend, by schism, the mystical body of their Redeemer. There is, too, a loftier destiny to be accomplished, than that which falls to the lot of him who glides along easily with the current, winning the praise of "a generation that are wise in their own eyes." It is to contend earnestly against the opinions of this mistaken world—to be "faithful found among the faithless"—breasting the storm, and rebuking the cherished delusions of those around him, even though he should be obliged to stand forth (to use Milton's words) as "the sole advocate of a discountenanced truth." Human language, therefore, could not write above the champion of the Church a nobler epitaph than that encomium which the first Bishop of Calcutta, Dr. Middleton, pronounced upon the unbending Horsley

* Isaiah xlix. 4.

—“He ran a glorious but unpopular career, in the midst of an heretical and apostate age.”

But we may remember that, if now these principles are disputed and disallowed, there was a time when their reception was far different. In the earliest ages of our faith, when the memory of our Lord had not yet become dim in the minds and hearts of his followers, all gladly acknowledged those truths for which now we are forced to contend. We stand not alone then in this profession. We hold it with “the glorious company of the Apostles,” and “the noble army of martyrs.” And these days of union we believe shall once more return. Dark though the clouds may be which gather around us, the Sun of Righteousness shall yet pour his beams over this benighted world, dispelling these mists of prejudice and error. And already the distant horizon is lighted up with the glory which heralds his coming. “Truth”—says the Eastern proverb—“is the daughter of Time;” and though we wait long for her coming, yet at last she will appear. Her progress cannot be stayed, or her final triumph prevented. She mocks the vain efforts of her adversaries. They may, for a season, imprison her in the tomb, but it will only be that she may burst forth with a new and more glorious beauty. In vain for her will be the stone, the seal, the guard. She must have her resurrection. She must enjoy her own immortality.

In this hope, then, we live; when error is rife around us, striving to hold fast to our steadfastness—to set forth the truth in humility—and looking forward to the time, when all warring sects which now distract the Christian world shall profess with “one

heart the faith delivered to the saints," and with "one mouth glorify God." And for this we pray, when gathered in His Holy Temple, we utter those solemn words of our own Litany:

"From all FALSE DOCTRINE, HERESY and SCHISM,
Good Lord, deliver us."

II.

EPISCOPACY PROVED FROM SCRIPTURE.

Who then, uncalled by Thee,
Dare touch Thy Spouse, Thy very self below ?
Or who dares count him summoned worthily,
Except Thy hand and seal he show ?

Keble.

LET us look back this evening through the long vista of nearly eighteen centuries, to a little group which then had gathered in Judea. It was our risen Lord, surrounded by His eleven disciples. The time of his triumph had come. The fearful conflict with our great enemy was over, and his power broken. Death had been vanquished, and the grave robbed of its prey. And now, when the Son of God was about to leave this world of suffering and ascend to his Father, His faithful followers had collected about Him, to hear His last injunctions before "the cloud received Him out of their sight."

The outward, busy world knew not of this little assembly, and cared not for its doings. Yet in that hour words were spoken which changed the destiny of man, and a command was given, whose influence should be felt to the end of time. Then was issued that broad commission—"Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." Here is the Charter of the Christian Church—the source of all power to her rulers. The twilight dim-

ness of Judaism was over, and the full glory of the Sun of Righteousness was about to shine. Our Master's kingdom was to fill the whole world. The faith, no longer shut in by the hills of Judea, was to go forth everywhere, enlightening the nations. His ministers were to inherit the earth.

But what is His Church, and who are His ministers? and how did He constitute them? To be equal in rank—or each, according to his degree, to yield obedience to those above him? Did He, “of his wise providence appoint divers Orders in His Church”—or one grade of ministers only? Was the office of an Apostle to be perpetuated, or did its authority expire when the last survivor of the twelve died at Ephesus? These are the points on which the Church differs with those about her, and to a consideration of which we would ask your candid attention. They are not questions which can be set aside, or regarded as unimportant. They act upon our conduct in daily, practical life. They have their influence on the spiritual interests of millions of immortal beings. Are we—or are those who dissent from us—walking in the path which our Lord marked out, and enjoying the ministry which He instituted? These therefore are surely subjects to be approached, not “lightly,” but “reverently, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God.”

And where shall we begin this investigation? It is the glory of our Church, that she refers everything to the decision of Scripture. Her Sixth Article declares most explicitly—“Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is

not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." To this tribunal then let us go in the settlement of the important subject now before us, viz., the authority for the Episcopal form of Church government. Let us turn at once "to the law and to the testimony," and make our first inquiry, What says the Word of God? What do we learn from its pages with regard to the government of that Church, which our Lord and his Apostles in their day established?

The first thing is—to set plainly before you what we believe to be the truth on this subject, and in what respects we differ from the various denominations around us. We contend, then, that in accordance with directions given by our Lord, His Apostles, acting under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit, established a Church, having a ministry of three orders, and which ministry has been continued by their successors down to the present time. These three orders were, 1st, the Apostles—called in the following age, the Bishops; 2nd, the Presbyters, or Elders; and 3d, the Deacons. We contend, also, that there is no instance of ordination recorded in Scripture, as being performed by any except the Apostles, or others, as Timothy, or Titus, who had been invested by them with the authority of Bishops; in other words, that there is no instance anywhere of mere Presbyters ordaining. And we believe, also, that this remained an established rule of the Church, never violated for more than 1500 years, until at the Reformation in the sixteenth century, when some bodies of Christians, who had separated from the

Church, proceeded to ordain ministers by the hands of mere priests or Presbyters. We therefore require in those who officiate at our altars, that they should be Episcopally ordained, that is, that they should be ordained by some Bishop, who has derived his authority from those Bishops who went before him in the Church in uninterrupted succession since the Apostles' days.* This is the doctrine of the Apostolical succession.

On the other hand, those who deny the necessity of Episcopal government, assert that the Apostles of the Early Church left no successors—that it is not necessary for ordination to be performed by a Bishop—that there is but one order of ministers in the Church, that of Presbyters—and that these have a right, by their own authority, to ordain and admit to the ministry. Such then is the dividing line between us, and to decide which view is right, and most in accordance with the government of the Primitive Church, we must refer to the intimations given in Scripture, and the testimony of History in the earliest ages of our faith.

The first argument, then, we would advance, is *the analogy to be drawn from the nature of the ministry in the Jewish Church.* The Church in all ages is the same, only developing itself at one time in a greater maturity than it had done under the dispensation which preceded it. In this way we may interpret the illustration used by St. Paul, in the xi. of Romans, where he compares the Church to an

* “No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in this Church, except he hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.”—*Preface to the Ordinal.*

olive tree, from which, when the appointed time had come, some branches (that is, the Jews) were broken off, and the wild olive tree (that is, the Gentile nations) was grafted in.

If, indeed, we look at the different dispensations, we shall find that each one was but an expansion of the last—elevating man to a higher stage of religious truth than he had before enjoyed. Thus the Jewish dispensation was an advance as compared with the Patriarchal—while the Christian Church is but the continuation—the ripening—the fuller development of the Jewish. All things in the Mosaic economy were but preparatory to things in the Christian dispensation, and typical of them. Therefore it was that each was prescribed by God Himself with such distinctness, and the direction given—“See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount.”* Look, then, how one thing answers to another. There were sacrifices in the Jewish Church, but these were only intended to shadow forth the one great sacrifice of our Lord. The rite of entrance into the former Church was circumcision, but in the latter, Baptism took its place. The Passover, in the old dispensation, commemorated the deliverance of the people of Israel from the bondage of Egypt, and at the same time pointed forward to the Lamb of God. But this was set aside by our Lord, when He substituted in place of it the Sacrament of His Supper, which in the Christian Church was to commemorate the greater deliverance which He had wrought out from a more fearful bondage. Thus, you may perfectly draw the

* Heb. viii. 5.

parallel between the two Churches, and you will find, as we remarked, that the one is only the continuation of the other, modified by the clearer light which had beamed upon the world. The difference is, that in the former, they looked forward to an expected Saviour—while, in the latter, we look back to this Saviour who has already come.

Now let us turn to the ministry, and see how the analogy holds good in this case. We find that, in the Jewish Church, God Himself instituted a priesthood, consisting of three orders, viz., the High Priest, the ordinary Priests, and the Levites. These, through all ages, were the only authorized teachers of the nation—the only ones permitted to offer sacrifice in behalf of the people. Should we not then naturally expect, that when the Christian ministry took the place of this priesthood, it would be, like everything else, conformed in some degree to the ancient model? Such would be our reasonable supposition, and we find it realized. In the early Church—as its condition is learned both from Scripture and History—we recognize everywhere the traces of a three-fold ministry—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

See, too, how strictly, under the old Dispensation, the Priesthood was guarded from the intrusion of those who could not enter it by regular descent from the family of Aaron. “No man”—writes the Apostle in his Epistle to the Hebrews—“taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.” In every case the most fearful punishment awaited those who ventured to discharge its sacred duties without having been thus regularly commissioned. Such was the case with Korah and his

company. In that spirit which prevails so extensively at this day, they raised their voices against the authorized ministers of the Sanctuary, and in language the very counterpart of which we too often hear around us, proclaimed themselves to be as good as those whom God had commissioned, and therefore authorized to assume the duties of the priesthood. "They gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, and said unto them, Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them: wherefore, then, lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?" But mark the reply of Moses—"Hear, I pray you, ye sons of Levi: Seemeth it but a small thing unto you, that the God of Israel hath separated you from the congregation of Israel, to bring you near to Himself to do the service of the tabernacle of the Lord, and to stand before the congregation to minister unto them? and seek ye the priesthood also?"* Read, too, how God gave forth His verdict on this point. Fire from the Lord burned all who joined in that act—the earth opened her bosom, and swallowed those who favored them—while the breath of the pestilence was poured forth until it had destroyed the people who murmured at these judgments.†

* Num. xvi.

† Mr. Percival, in his "Apostolic Succession," has paraphrased this passage, to adapt it to modern times. Let it be read as overlined, and the address might be made to some in our day :

Presbyters

"Hear, I pray you, ye *sons of Levi*; Seemeth it but a small thing
 Son of God Christian

unto you that the *God of Israel* hath separated you from the *congre-*

Again—we have another example of the same kind in King Uzziah. Listen to the account in the sacred record—“When he was strong, his heart was lifted up to his destruction; for he transgressed against the Lord his God, and went into the temple of the Lord to burn incense upon the altar of incense. And Azariah the priest went in after him, and with him fourscore priests of the Lord, that were valiant men. And they withstood Uzziah the king, and said unto him, ‘It appertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but to the priests, the sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to burn incense; go out of the sanctuary; for thou hast transgressed; neither shall it be for thine honor from the Lord God.’ Then Uzziah was wroth, and had a censer in his hand to burn incense; and while he was wroth with the priests, the leprosy even rose up in his forehead before the priests in the house of the Lord, from beside the incense altar. And Azariah the chief priest, and all the priests, looked upon him, and behold, he was leprous in his forehead, and they thrust him out from thence; yea himself hasted also to go out, because the Lord had smitten him. And Uzziah the king was a leper unto the day of his death, and dwelt in a several house, being a leper; for he was cut off from the house of the Lord.”* Thus, you perceive that he entered the sanctuary an unaccredited priest, and came forth smitten with the plague of leprosy.

people

gation of Israel, to bring you near to Himself, to do the service of the tabernacle of the Lord, and to stand before the congregation to min-

Episcopate

ister unto them? . . . and seek ye the *Priesthood* also?”

* 2 Chron. xxvi. 16-21.

And do you think, that for fifteen centuries God thus carefully guarded the priesthood, and by fearful judgments taught His people, that none could be numbered with it except they received the privilege by direct succession, and then, as soon as His Church had expanded into a nobler form, did he leave this subject totally unsettled? Did He give no authority, as in old time, to be transmitted down by descent? Did He, instead of sending authorized heralds who bore the terms of peace, do what no earthly monarch would have done, permit His rebellious subjects to appoint their own messengers to proclaim to them His will? No, brethren, such is not the lesson which we learn from the analogy of the Jewish priesthood.

Neither is there any force in the objection sometimes advanced, that this argument proves too much—that it would support, not only Episcopacy, but also the Papacy. We are told—“There was but a single Jewish High Priest, and therefore, according to your analogy, there should be but a single Bishop. The ancient Church had but one head; if then the principle is to be carried out, but one universal Bishop should preside over Christendom. You, therefore, are sustaining the claims of the Romanist.” A moment’s reflection, however, will show the futility of this objection. There was but a single High Priest among the Jews, because that Church was to stand single and alone, confined in a great measure to but one land. All men were obliged “to go up to Jerusalem,” as the centre of their faith. But one single temple was allowed to be built, in which sacrifices could be offered. Under the Christian dispensation, however, the Church assumed a Catholic cha-

racter and form. It was to be universal—diffused everywhere. Jerusalem could no longer claim extraordinary privileges, as “the place where men ought to worship,” for everywhere “the true worshippers could worship the Father in spirit and in truth.” The land became, under the new economy, but a portion of the Church, and as such had its Bishop—its single head and ecclesiastical ruler. And so it was throughout the world. The office is everywhere one and the same, although, from the extended limits of the Church, it must be held in different countries, by different and numerous individuals. The Catholic believer, therefore, in passing from diocese to diocese, finds everywhere a successor of the Jewish High Priest, but all the while he is under one Apostolate, as under one sky and sun.

But let us proceed to the direct Scripture evidence. The first proof we advance is—*that there is a recognition, in the Acts and the Epistles, of the existence of three orders in the early Church.* A confusion is, indeed, sometimes created in the minds of readers, in consequence of the indiscriminate use of the title *Bishop*. A few sentences, however, of explanation will remove this difficulty. As we already remarked—the three orders of ministers were 1st, Apostles; 2nd, Bishops or elders; 3d, Deacons. After, however, the death of the Apostles, who were the first Bishops, those who succeeded to the Episcopal office, out of respect to them, as having stood nearest to our Lord, would not assume the *name* of Apostles, although they inherited their *authority*. They therefore took the name of Bishops, leaving those in the second rank of the ministry to be called, as before, Elders or

Presbyters — and the third, to retain the title of Deacons. Thus it is that the early historian, Theodoret, gives the history of this change of name. “The same persons were anciently called promiscuously both Bishops and Presbyters, whilst those who are now called Bishops, were called Apostles. But shortly after, the name of Apostles was appropriated to such only as were Apostles indeed; and then the name Bishop was given to those who before were called Apostles.”* Thus, he says, that Epaphroditus was the Apostle of the Philippians, and Titus the Apostle of the Cretians, and Timothy the Apostle of the Asiatics. And this he repeats in other places.†

The ancient writer under the name of St. Ambrose asserts the same thing. “They who are now called Bishops, were originally called Apostles. But the holy Apostles being dead, they who were ordained after them to govern the Churches, could not arrive to the excellency of these first, nor had they the testimony of miracles, but were in many other respects inferior to them. Therefore they thought it not decent to assume to themselves the name of Apostles, but dividing the names, they left to Presbyters the name of the Presbytery, and they themselves were called Bishops.‡ Here, you perceive, is a full explanation of the change. The name however is a matter of no importance. It is the office and the authority for which we contend. We only wish to

* Theodoret, *Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 1.*

† *Ibid. Com. in Phil. i. 1, and ii. 25.*

* Bingham's *Orig. Eccles. lib. ii. c. 2, sec. 1.*

prove, that there was a grade of ministers higher in rank than the Elders or Presbyters.*

* If a more familiar illustration of this change of title may be allowed, we would give the following. Suppose that Washington had been elevated to the office of Chief Magistrate over this country, with the name of Dictator, while the highest magistrate in each state was called, indiscriminately, President or Governor. We will imagine, also, that the successors of Washington, although placed in office with exactly the same powers, out of respect to him as the *Pater Patrie*, would not assume the same title. They therefore took the name of President, leaving that of Governor to be still borne by the magistrate of each state. Would this change make any difference in the office itself, or render it difficult for us to prove, that those who in 1785 were called Presidents or Governors, held the same office with those now called Governors? Or would any one deny, on account of the change of name, that he who is now called the President of the United States holds the same office which his first predecessor held under the title of Dictator?

Bishop H. U. Underdonk has given an admirable explanation, drawn from Scripture. "The word 'Sabbath' is applied in *Scripture* to only the Jewish day of rest; by very *common use*, however, it means the Lord's day. Now, 'the Sabbath' is abolished by Christianity, and the observance of it discountenanced; yet ministers of Christian denominations are constantly urging their Christian flocks to keep 'the Sabbath.' Does any confusion of mind result from this confusion of names? We suppose not. All concerned understand, that *in* Scripture the word means the Jewish Sabbath, while *out* of Scripture the same word is constantly applied to the Christian Sabbath. Let the same justice be done to the word 'Bishop.' *In* Scripture, it means a Presbyter, properly so called. *Out* of Scripture, according to the usage next to universal of all ages since the sacred canon was closed, it means that sacerdotal order, higher than Presbyters, which is found in Scripture under the title of 'Apostle.' When a Christian teacher who enjoins the observance of the day which he calls 'the Sabbath,' is asked for his New Testament authority, he has to exclude all the passages which contain that word, giving them a different application, and go to other passages which do *not* contain it; and he agrees that he seeks the *thing*, not the *name*. And when we Episcopalians are asked for inspired authority for 'Bishops,' we do the very same; we give a different application to the passages which contain that word, and build on other passages, which teach the *fact* of the existence of Episcopacy, without that *appellation*." *Episcopacy Examined*, p. 13

Now turn to the Acts, and you will find everywhere recognized the three orders, Apostles, Elders, and Deacons. The first chapter contains an account of the election of Matthias, as *Apostle*, that he might "take the bishopric" of Judas. In the fourteenth chapter, we are told the Apostles "ordained them *Elders* in every church;" and in the sixth chapter, is the record of the selection of seven men "full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom," on whom "the Apostles laid their hands," and thus appointed them *Deacons*. In several places "Apostles and Elders" are mentioned as distinct classes of ministers.* Nor can it be said, that the Elders here referred to were laymen, for these also are carefully distinguished in some passages, as being again a class distinct from the other two. The statement made is, "Apostles, Elders, and brethren."†

And so it is in the Epistles. Take a single instance in which all the orders of the ministry are mentioned together. We refer to that salutation with which the Epistle to the Philippians opens—"Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons." Here are certainly three orders of ministers—the two Apostles, Paul and Timothy, sending their salutations to the Bishops and Deacons. Now, change the titles to those which we have shown you the same orders bore in the next age, and it will read thus—"Paul and Timotheus, *Bishops*, to all the saints (*Laity*) at Philippi, with the *Elders or Presbyters*, and *Deacons*."

But let us proceed to the main point—the authority

* Acts xv. 2, 4, 6, 22. and xvi. 4. † Acts xi. 1, and xv. 23.

exercised by Bishops in **that** day—and see how entirely different it was **from** that entrusted to the second rank in the ministry. For instance, when an Apostle gives a charge to a Bishop, we perceive at once that he is addressing “one having authority,” and set to rule in the Church of God. He instructs him as to the manner in which he should conduct himself towards the presbyters or elders over whom he had been placed. We shall find, on the contrary, that with these elders he dwells upon a totally different class of duties. They are always addressed, and cautioned, and advised, as those who are merely pastors over congregations. There is no allusion made to their exercising ecclesiastical discipline, or admitting others to the ministry.

Let me give you a striking example of this. We are told that when St. Paul was on his way to Jerusalem, having stopped at Miletus, he sent from thence to the neighboring Church, at Ephesus, that its elders might come to him, and receive his final charge, since “they should see his face no more.” And what does he tell them? why, he addresses them as those whose functions are entirely pastoral, whose business it is to rule, and feed, and instruct the flock committed to them. He directs them “to remember his warnings for the space of three years”—“to take heed unto themselves”—“to take heed unto the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers”—“to feed the Church of God”—“to watch against the grievous wolves that would enter in among them, not sparing the flock”—and also to guard against “men who should arise among them-

selves, speaking perverse things.”* This is the amount of his address—that they should be vigilant in guarding themselves from error, and also in preserving their people from those who would inculcate strange doctrines. There is nothing said about discipline to be exercised among the ministry—not a syllable about one having authority over another to depose him—not an intimation that any one among them had power to ordain. It is, in fact, precisely the kind of charge which any Bishop in this day might deliver to his clergy, to warn them to be faithful in the discharge of their pastoral duties.

Now mark the contrast in the Apostle’s language, when he writes to Timothy, at this same church in Ephesus. Timothy was a young man, probably younger than most of the elders at Ephesus, for St. Paul charges him—“let no man despise thy youth,”—and yet every line of the Apostle’s letter proves, that Timothy was invested with Episcopal authority over these same presbyters. The Epistle is not intended to guide him in any pastoral connection with his flock, but rather to instruct him as to the manner in which he should rule over the elders. Everything, for example, is addressed to him personally, and in the singular number, as being something in which the others could not share: “This charge I commit unto *thee*, son Timothy”—“these things write I unto *thee*, that *thou* mightest know how to behave *thyself* in the house of God”—“if *thou* put the brethren in remembrance of these things.”†

Look at the directions with regard to his exercising ecclesiastical discipline. “That thou mightest

* Acts xx. 17-35.

† I Tim. i. 18 ; iii. 14, 15 ; iv. 6.

charge some that they teach no other [that is, no false] doctrine"—“against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses;”—“them [that is, the elders thus accused] that sin, rebuke before all, that others also may fear;”—“I charge *thee*, that *thou* observe these things [these rules for the regulation and discipline of the clergy,] without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality.”*

See, again, the rules given him with respect to ordinations. The third chapter of the first epistle is taken up with describing qualifications, for which he should look in those who are to be admitted to the ministry. Thus, he says, that the deacons “must first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless”—“the deacons must be grave, not doubled-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre, holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience”—“they that have used the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree”—“literally,” says Dr. Bloomfield, “obtain an honorable post, or step, that is, a higher degree, viz., of Presbyter or Bishop.”†

In the same way, the proper qualifications of a presbyter are given—“A Bishop [elder or presbyter] must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality,” &c. These descriptions are to guide him in observing the directions afterwards given—“lay hands suddenly on no man”‡—and again—“the things which thou hast heard of me, the same com-

* 1 Tim. i. 3; v. 19, 20, 21.

† Bloomfield's Greek Test. in loco.

‡ 1 Tim. v. 22.

mit *thou* to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."*

Now, I would ask, if, as we are told, Timothy was not a successor of the Apostles, but only a Presbyter, and a young Presbyter too, what right had he to be "receiving accusations," against his brother presbyters, and "rebuking them before all?" How could these things be, if all ministers were equal in the early Church? or, is it in accordance with human nature, that the elders of the Church at Ephesus should thus have submitted to the rule of one of their own number, evidently, too, their junior in years? On the Presbyterian scheme of Church government, I cannot understand what was the position of Timothy in the Church, or his relative situation with regard to those who were in the ministry with him. These Epistles are to me, in this case, a sealed book. But look at the page of Ecclesiastical History, where we are told that Timothy was the first Apostle or Bishop of Ephesus,† and all is plain. Then, I see the meaning of every direction given by St. Paul. Totally out of place as they would be, if written to a mere presbyter, they at the same time compose exactly the kind of charge which, in this day, an aged Bishop of the Church might write to one who was younger in the Episcopate, that he might know how to act towards the clergy of his diocese.

Look at another example, equally striking—that of Titus. He says Eusebius, "was appointed over

* 2 Tim. ii. 2.

† Eusebius, lib. iii. c. 4. "Timothy is recorded as having first received the Episcopate at Ephesus." Also Chrysostom, Hom. I, in Philip. Jerome, Catal. Scrip. in Tim. Theodoret Com. in 1 Tim. iii. 1.

the Churches in Crete;" and all ancient writers unite in making the same assertion.* It is certainly confirmed most fully by the Epistle, in which St. Paul addresses him as one invested with Episcopal authority. He writes to him—"For this cause left I thee in Crete, that *thou* shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and [that *thou* shouldest] ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." He then goes on to describe, as we have already seen him doing to Timothy, what qualities Titus should require in one who was to be ordained—"for a Bishop [elder or presbyter] must be blameless, as a steward of God, not self-willed, not soon angry," &c.† And he afterwards directs—"a man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition [do *thou*] reject."‡ Here is certainly full Episcopal authority—ordination—admonition—rejection or degradation—all committed to Titus personally. We know, from history, that there were many Churches in Crete. Why, then, when the field was the world, and men were so much wanted to publish the Gospel elsewhere amid the darkness of heathenism, was Titus withdrawn and sent to spend his life in this island,§ if any of the elders there could ordain as well as he? or allowing that at first there were not enough there for that purpose, why must he ordain elders in *every* city? After doing so in one or two cities, could not *they* be left to keep up the succession? It would be difficult, indeed, to find an answer to these questions on the Presbyterian scheme. The only solution is,

* Eusebius, Chrysostom and Theodoret, as cited above. Jerome Catal. Scrip. in Tit.

† Titus i. 5.

‡ iii. 10.

§ Cave's Lives of the Fathers, i. 128.

that Titus could ordain by right of his authority as Bishop, and the others could not. Yet this is Episcopacy.

Let us now turn to the address made to "the angels" of the Seven Churches of Asia. In each of these Churches—as, for example, Ephesus and Smyrna—history tells us there were many congregations and Elders. Yet the warnings and admonitions are not written to these Elders, nor to the Church collectively, but to the "angel" or chief-officer. There was evidently some one presiding over the spiritual welfare of each of those Churches, who was held personally answerable for it. Look, for example, at that written to the angel of the Church at Ephesus. Here we find that in the year 96,* its chief officer is evidently exercising the same discipline over the clergy, in investigating and rejecting their claims, which was ascribed to his predecessor Timothy, thirty years before. The address to him is—"Thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." And so it is with all these Churches. "I know *thy* works," is the announcement to the ruler of each one. We might copy the greater part of the second and third chapters, in proof of what we have asserted. "And [*thou*] hast borne, and hast had patience, and for my name's sake [*thou*] hast labored, and hast not fainted"—"*thou* hast left thy first love"—"remem-

* St. John was banished to Patmos in the latter part of Domitian's reign, and returned to Ephesus upon Nerva's succeeding to the empire, which was in 96. This book was written while still in the island. Irenæus, speaking of the vision, says—"It was not very long ago that it was seen, being but a little before our time, at the latter end of Domitian's reign."

ber from whence *thou* art fallen"—"*thou* holdest fast my name"—"I have set before *thee* an open door"—"*thou* hast a little strength, and hast kept my word"—"I have a few things against *thee*"—"because *thou* hast there, them that hold the doctrine of Balaam"—"*thou* sufferest that woman Jezebel . . . to teach," &c.—"if *thou* shalt not watch, I will come on *thee* as a thief"—"*thou* art neither hot nor cold"—"be [*thou*] watchful and strengthen [*thou*] the things that remain"—"hold fast that which *thou* hast." And such is the tenor of these seven Epistles. There is no intimation any where given that the Elders of the Churches shared in this responsibility, for which their chief ruler is so pointedly addressed.

That these seven angels were the Diocesan Bishops of the Churches, is indeed a fact, so fully proved from early history, that it would seem to be almost beyond contradiction. All the early fathers assert it. "So say Irenæus, Clemens of Alexandria, Eusebius, Ambrose, and others. That Polycarp was then Bishop of Smyrna, is testified by Irenæus, who knew him well; by Ignatius; by Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, who calls him Bishop and martyr in Smyrna; by Eusebius; by Tertullian; by Jerome; and by all antiquity. And Ignatius names Onesimus as Bishop of Ephesus, when he wrote, which was but about twelve years after the inditing of these Epistles. It being then so evident, that one of those to whom St. John writes, under the name of *Angel*, was Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and, most probably, another, Onesimus, Bishop of Ephesus, we may be sure that all the rest were Bishops of their

respective Churches, as well as Polycarp and Onesimus.”*

So evident indeed is this truth, that some of the leading writers on the Presbyterian side of the question have felt themselves obliged to acknowledge it. Such is the case with the learned Blondel, in his “Apology,” which was written at the earnest request of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. He contends that the Angels of these Seven Churches were “exarchs or chief governors,” who were superior in office to the other clergy, holding their places for life, and indeed so superior, that “the acts of the Church, whether glorious or infamous, were imputed to those exarchs.” And this, he says, is necessary to be maintained, otherwise the difficulties are insuperable.

So also Dr. Campbell, President of Marischal College, Aberdeen, is forced to make concessions, from which he evidently shrinks. He remarks—“But one person, called the Angel of that Church, is addressed in the name of the whole. . . . Shall we affirm, that by the angel is meant the Presbytery?” With this interpretation, he declares himself dissatisfied. He concludes, at last, that it means one who had a kind of presidency over the rest, derived from the model of the Jewish Sanhedrim.† So difficult is it to evade the natural explanation, or rather, so eager are men to adopt any theory which may enable them to escape the argument, that in the Apostolic days each Church had its chief ruler.‡

* Dr. Bowden’s Letters, Vol I. p. 118.

† Campbell’s Lect. on Eccles. Hist., Lect. V. p. 82.

‡ Dr. Miller of Princeton, in his despair, has resorted to the amusing explanation that the Angel was only the *Moderator of the Presbytery*. We cannot forbear giving Dr. Bowden’s reply to this theory.

There is but one more fact which we will briefly notice. It is, as we have already mentioned, a favorite declaration of our opponents that the thirteen Apostles were the only ones holding that office, and that they left no successors. And yet we find St. Paul referring to "false apostles" (*ψευδα ποστολοι.*)* There were therefore some, even in his day, who assumed that office, and pretended they were called to the highest rank in the ministry. Now, as we cannot suppose that they endeavored to pass themselves off for any of the thirteen who were first called, † it is evident that the office itself must have

"When our Lord blamed and threatened the Angel of the Church of Sardis, might he not have said, 'Lord, why blamest thou me? I have no more authority in thy Church in this city than other Presbyters. We do everything, as thou well knowest, by a plurality of votes, and those Presbyters who wish for a majority, for the purpose of beginning the work of reformation, have not yet been able to obtain it. I need not tell thee, that I am no more than the Moderator of the Presbytery, appointed to count their votes and keep order. Upon what dictate, then, of reason, upon what principle of justice, am I to be blamed for the defects and corruptions in the Church? As a Moderator, I have no relation whatever to the *Church*; my relation is entirely to the *Presbytery*, and there I have but a casting vote. What then can I do? Why am I addressed in particular, and threatened with excision, unless I repent? For my personal faults, I humbly beg forgiveness; but I cannot possibly acknowledge any guilt as the governor of this Church, when I bear no such character.' Might not the Angel of Sardis have addressed Christ with the strictest propriety in this manner? And does not this show how utterly inconsistent your scheme of Church government is with these Epistles?"—*Letters, Vol. I. p. 117.*

* 2 Cor. xi. 13.

† Bishop H. U. Onderdonk has thus clearly illustrated this point. "That it was infinitely improbable that the 'false apostles' pretended to be of the original twelve or thirteen, will appear from such considerations as these :—There are sixteen of our Bishops in the United States [this was written in 1835], but never has it been attempted to counterfeit the person of any of them, either at home or abroad. So

been widely known in the Church, and their pretence was, that they had received it. Still stronger is the inference which may be drawn from that warning which St. John gives against "them which say they are Apostles, and are not."* At this time St. John was well known to be the sole survivor of the thirteen. Could any impostor, therefore, have attempted to counterfeit the person of one of his colleagues who had been invested with that office by our Lord Himself? The want of age would at once have revealed the deception. At this time more than sixty years had passed since our Lord's ascension, and he who was once the youngest of that little band, was now among them in the feebleness of extreme old age. St. John, too, would, in that case, have stated, that no Apostle but himself was then living, and this would have set all such claims at rest for of the twenty-six Bishops and Archbishops in England—of the nineteen Bishops and Archbishops in Ireland—and of the six Bishops in Scotland. We may add the same remark, as far as we recollect, of all the Bishops in the Christian world. Persons have feigned to be Bishops, as in the case of West, and perhaps the Greek mentioned in the accounts of Mr. Wesley ; but none have counterfeited the persons of other Bishops—if otherwise, the cases are so rare and so obscure, as not to affect this illustration of our argument. What the impostors mentioned in Scripture claimed, was, to be apostles or bishops in their own persons, not in the persons of any of the thirteen. Of course, the Apostleship was not confined to these last.

"Our fellow-citizens generally will perhaps see more clearly the force of this analogy in another case. There are twenty-four governors of States in our Union. In no instance has it occurred that any man has pretended to be one of these. The same may probably be said of all our magistrates of the higher grades. So clear is it, that the 'false apostles' would not have pretended to be of the original thirteen who held that office—and so clear, that others besides the thirteen were made Apostles—many others."—*Episcopacy Examined*, p. 275.

* Rev. ii. 2.

ever. This very attempt, then, shows that there were many apostles besides the original thirteen, and that the Apostolic office itself was extensively recognized in the Church. These passages alone, therefore, refute the Presbyterian argument, that the office expired with its original holders.

Let us now, before closing this subject, briefly notice some of the usual objections advanced by those who differ from us.

I. One is—*that Paul and Barnabas received an ordination only from Presbyters.* In the beginning of Acts xiii. is this passage: “Now, there were in the Church that was at Antioch, certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.” This, we are told, was their ordination. We reply—this could not be, for they were “prophets and teachers” before, and employed in “ministering to the Lord.” They are placed on an exact footing with the other three. If the three, therefore, were in orders, so were Paul and Barnabas. If, on the other hand, Paul and Barnabas were laymen, then the other three were also, and if an ordination at all, it was performed by laymen. These two brethren were, in truth, in this way merely commended to a special missionary work on which they immediately set out, and at the completion of which we are explicitly told—“And

thence they sailed to Antioch, *from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God for the work which they fulfilled.*"* St. Paul himself disclaims any human ordination, and says, that he is "an Apostle, *not of men, neither by man*, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father."† He had, indeed, previous to this, been on a mission to Tarsus and Cilicia (Acts ix. 30, and Gal. i. 21), where, as Prof. Burton has shown,‡ he founded the Churches which he afterwards (Acts xv. 41) revisited in company with Barnabas. Bishop Whittingham has well compared this transaction in Acts xiii. to "a farewell missionary meeting, in which persons, previously ordained presbyters or bishops, receive jurisdiction in the mission to which they have been appointed."§

II. Again, it is said—*Timothy did not receive Episcopal ordination.* This inference is drawn from St. Paul's address to him—"Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the *presbytery*."|| Timothy, therefore, we are told, was ordained to his office in the ministry by the hands of a body of Elders. We reply—first, it is not clear, by any means, that the word here translated *presbytery* does not refer to the *office* conferred, and not to the *persons* who conferred it. In that case it would read thus—"with the laying on of hands to confer the presbyterate or presbytership." Such was the opinion of Jerome, Ambrose, Eusebius, and Socrates, among the ancients, and

* Acts xiv. 26.

† Gal. i. 1.

‡ Lect. on Hist. of Ch. in first Cent. p. 135, 147, 158.

§ Note to Palmer's Treatise on the Ch. v. ii. p. 391.

|| 1 Tim. iv. 14.

Grotius, Calvin, and many of the leading Presbyterian writers, among the moderns.*

But, second, even allowing that it does refer to persons, we find St. Paul, in another place, claiming Timothy's ordination as performed by himself. He writes to him—"Stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of *my* hands."† We can easily, however, reconcile the two passages. It has been customary, in all ages of the Church, when a Bishop laid his hands upon the head of an individual to elevate him to the office of the priesthood, that Presbyters who were there should unite with him in that act, in token of their concurrence. Might not this have been the case at Timothy's ordination? St. Paul conferred that office on him, the presbyters also "laying on their hands." If we critically examine these two passages, we shall find that the words selected clearly point out the different shares of the ordaining apostle and the consenting presbyters. He was ordained, St. Paul tells us, "*by* (*δία*) the putting on of *my* hands," "*with* (*μετα*) the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Such is the acknowledgment of Dr. Macknight, the Presbyterian commentator, when discussing this text. He says—"Since it appears, from 2 Tim. i. 6, that the Apostle, by the imposition of *his own* hands, conferred on Timothy the spiritual gift here mentioned, we must suppose that the eldership at Lystra laid their hands on him *only to show their concurrence with the Apos-*

* See many of these quoted by Bishop Onderdonk, in *Episcopacy Examined*, p. 19-22, 193-196. Dr. Miller, finding his great authority, Calvin, against him on this point, says, that for interpreting the word *office*, "he deserves nothing but ridicule." (P. 58, 1st Edit.)

† 2 Tim. i. 6.

tle in setting Timothy apart to the ministry by prayer."

III. Again, another objection is—that *Deacons were not in the ministry*, but merely laymen appointed to distribute the contributions made for the poor.* In reply, we say, first, that the whole testimony of Scripture is against this view. If this had been only a secular office, why did they require, not merely integrity, honesty, and piety, but the highest *spiritual* qualifications? They were to be "men full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom," and Stephen is described as a man "full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." This requirement of the noblest gifts seems to point to something more elevated than the mere distribution of alms, in which there would be no field for the exercise of such lofty qualities. The same inference may be drawn from the First Epistle to Timothy, where the Apostle instructs him in the qualifications necessary for that office, one of which is—"holding the mystery of the faith in a good conscience."

* We copy the following passage from a Review of *Episcopacy tested by Scripture*, in the *Biblical Repository*. "It is plain that the 'order of deacons,' as one of the 'three orders of clergy' for which our Episcopal brethren contend, cannot stand the test of Scripture. It must undoubtedly be given up, if we would be governed by the Word of God. Deacons there undoubtedly *were* in the Apostolic Church; but they were evidently curators of the poor, and attendants on the tables of the Church; precisely such as were found in the Jewish synagogues, before the coming of Christ, and such as are found in all completely organized Presbyterian churches at the present day. And this continued to be the nature of the office for several hundred years after the Apostolic age. But when a spirit of carnal ambition began to reign in the Church, and led ecclesiastical men to aspire and encroach, deacons invaded the province of preachers, and committed to 'sub-deacons' the burthen of their primitive duties."

But, second, we learn their ministerial character also from the duties they performed. As soon as Stephen was ordained, we are told that, "full of faith and power, he did great wonders and miracles among the people," and that he preached also, is evident from the fact that his enemies first *disputed* with him (vi. 9), and then "suborned men, which said, we have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and against God" (vi. 11). Similar to this was the conduct of Philip, another of the newly ordained deacons. After the persecution in Jerusalem, he "went down to the city of Samaria, and *preached* Christ unto them (viii. 5). "And they believed Philip, *preaching* the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ," (viii. 12). He afterwards went to Arotus, and "*preached* in all the cities, till he came to Cesarea," (viii. 40). You perceive, then, how utterly unfounded is the assertion (which we have just quoted from the Biblical Repository), that it was "several hundred years after the Apostolic age," before deacons began to preach, or, as it is there expressed, "to invade the province of preachers." Deacons also baptized. Philip "*baptized*" those at Samaria, "who believed, both men and women" (viii. 12). He baptized Simon Magus (viii. 13), and afterwards the Eunuch of Ethiopia (viii. 38). Here, then, we find them preaching and baptizing. Are these the duties of a layman?*

* We consider the above examples amply sufficient to refute the objection advanced against the ministerial character of deacons, and as the lecture is intended to prove our positions from Scripture, we have drawn our evidence from this source alone. We add, however, in this note a few extracts from the early fathers, showing the view of

Now, it is precisely on this model—to discharge the duties of the primitive deacons—that these ministers are ordained in our Church at this day. Let us see the statement made in the ordinal to the Prayer Book, and compare it with the record of the early Church. We are told—“It appertaineth to the office of a Deacon, in the Church where he shall be appointed to serve, to assist the priest in divine service, and specially when he ministereth the Holy Communion, and to help him in the distribution thereof.” This, Bingham tells us, was anciently their duty, as he shows from the Apostolical Constitutions and Jerome, that they should read parts of the

the Church in that day. Polycarp says, that Deacons are “ministers of God, not of men” (sect. 5). Ignatius, in his epistle to the Magnesians, says—“Deacons are entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ” (sect. 6). In the Epist. to the Trallians, he says, “Deacons are the ministers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ . . . for they are not the ministers of meat and drink [that is, of this only], but of the Church of God” (sect. 2). The following passage is his Epist. to Philad. is conclusive. Speaking of his bereaved Church at Antioch, he says—“It will become you, as the Church of God, to ordain some deacon to go to them thither as the ambassador of God; that he may rejoice with them when they meet together, and glorify God’s name. Blessed be that man in Jesus Christ, who shall be found worthy of such a ministry” (sect. 10).

Tertullian declares—“The highest priest, who is the bishop, has the right of baptizing. After him, the presbyters and deacons, not however, without the permission of the bishop, on account of the honor of the Church.”—*Cooke’s Inval. of Pres. Ord.* § 183.

The 74th Apostolic Canon says—“Let a bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, engaged in war be deposed.” But if a deacon was merely a layman, to discharge duties like our churchwardens, why might he not engage in war? This canon evidently shows that there was a sacredness in his office which had a ministerial character.

Bingham, in his *Orig. Eccles.* lib. ii. ch. 20, has given a full discussion of this subject, with an account of the duties discharged by deacons in the early church.

service.* They were not allowed to consecrate the Eucharist,† but only to assist in its distribution.‡ And in the Constitutions there is one passage which declares it to be the office of the Bishop to deliver the bread to each communicant, and that of the Deacon to deliver the cup.§ The same rule which we now have.

The ordinal continues—"and to read Holy Scriptures and Homilies in the Church." In early times, it was the Deacon's duty always to read the Gospel, and, in some churches, other parts of Scripture; and the Council of Vaison authorized Deacons to read the Homilies of the ancient Fathers in the absence of a Presbyter, assigning this reason for it: "If the Deacons be worthy to read the Discourses of Christ in the Gospel, why should they not be thought worthy to read the expositions of the ancient Fathers?"||

"And to instruct the youth in the Catechism." In the early Church there was a distinct office of Catechist, the duty appertaining to which was, that of instructing the Catechumens in the first principles of religion, and preparing them for the reception of baptism. This office was, however, sometimes filled by a Deacon. Thus, St. Augustine wrote his book *De Catechizandis Rudibus*, at the request of Deogratias, Deacon of Carthage, who was a Catechist there, to assist him in the performance of his duties.¶

"In the absence of the priest, to baptize infants." We have already seen that Philip the Deacon baptized

* Orig. Eccles. lib. ii. ch. 20. sec. 6.

† Ibid. sec. 8.

‡ Ibid. sec. 7.

§ Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 13.

|| Bing. lib. ii. ch. 20.

¶ Ibid. lib. iii. ch. 10, sec. 1.

at Samaria, and elsewhere. Tertullian too, in the passage we quoted in the note, shows that they have the right, "but not without the permission of the Bishop." Bingham proves the same thing from St. Cyril and Jerome.*

And "to preach, if he be admitted thereto by the Bishop." We have also shown our warrant for this from Scripture. "They had power to preach," says Bingham, by license and authority from the Bishop, but not without it." Many proofs of which he records.†

"And furthermore it is his office, where provision is so made, to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish, to intimate their estates, names, and places where they dwell, unto the Curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved by the alms of the parishioners." Here also we closely follow Scripture. We find too in the Apostolical Constitutions it is mentioned as part of the duty of a Deacon—"That he should inform his Bishop, when he knows any one to be in distress, and then distribute to their necessities by the directions of the Bishop."‡

Such were the deacons of Scripture and the Primitive Church. From the view given, we must leave it to our readers to decide, whether or not they were admitted to the ministry, and which bear the closest resemblance to the deacons of Apostolic times—those ordained to the office in our Church, by the form from which we have just quoted—or the laymen called by that name in the different denominations around us.

* *Ibid.* lib. ii. ch. 20, sec. 9.

† *Ibid.* sec. 11.

‡ *Constit. Apos. lib. iii. c. 19.*

IV. Another objection is—*that the proof of Episcopacy which we derive from Scripture is incidental in its character.* This is true; but in reply, we would say, there are two reasons why the testimony is of this nature. The first is because we find it principally in Epistles, where things are not generally so formally stated, but much is left to be supplied by the previous knowledge of the one who receives the Epistle. Mr. Locke, when referring to another subject, has well stated this point—"The nature of Epistolary writings in general, disposes the writer to pass by the mentioning many things, as well known to him to whom his letter is addressed, which are necessary to be laid open to a stranger, to make him comprehend what is said; and it not seldom falls out, that a well-penned letter, which is very easy and intelligible to the receiver, is very obscure to a stranger, who hardly knows what to make of it. The matters St. Paul wrote about, were certainly things well known to those he wrote to, and which they had a peculiar concern in; which made them easily apprehend his meaning, and see the tendency and force of his discourse. But we, having now, at this distance of time, no information of the occasion of his writing, little or no knowledge of the temper and circumstances those were in he wrote to, but what is to be gathered out of the Epistles themselves; it is not strange that many things in them lie concealed to us; which, no doubt, they who were concerned in the letter, understood at first sight."*

**Essay for the understanding of St. Paul's Epistles, Works, v. iii. p. 102.* We find the following excellent familiar illustration of this point in *Chapin's Prim. Church.* "We will suppose a man, born and educated in one of the South Sea Islands, who has grown up

The second reason for our gleanings this merely from incidental allusions, arises from the fact, that all the instructions of our Lord and His Apostles were of course not fully written out. The inspired men to whom this work was committed, recorded only great general truths. Had they pursued a different course, "even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."* And it is evident why this particular truth—the Apostolic succession—is only mentioned incidentally. It is because at that time it was not controverted. There is therefore only an occasional allusion to it as an established regulation. It is precisely in the same way that we learn, females are to be admitted to the Eucharist, or that the observance of the Sabbath is changed from the seventh day to the first. Many who receive and believe the latter truth, profess to trace it to Scripture, without any communication with, or knowledge of, any civilized nation. Put into the hands of such a man, *the Military Correspondence of General Washington, during the American Revolution*, and require him, from that alone, to determine the organization of the American army; and you would certainly impose upon him a task of no small magnitude. . . . Yet such a man, under such circumstances, would be situated very much as we are when attempting to determine the entire constitution of the Apostolic Church, from Scripture only. This will be evident upon slight reflection; for it will not be believed for a moment, that General Washington, when writing to men who were as familiar with the organization of the army as himself, would enter into a detail of facts, with which he knew them to be perfectly conversant; nor is there any greater reason for believing that the Apostles would give a detailed account of the organization and order of the Churches they had established, when writing to the members of those very Churches. The nature of the evidence in the two cases is therefore similar; and what would be proof of the constitution of the American army, to a South Sea Islander situated as we have supposed, must be proof to us of the constitution of the Apostolic Church."—pp. 20, 21.

* John xxi. 25.

and yet reject the doctrine of the Apostolic succession, which is established there with double the evidence.

V. Another objection is—*that the first Apostles only were appointed to their office by the extraordinary designation of the Son of God.* We are told that obedience was for this reason due to them, but even if they had handed down their office, their successors would not have the same claim from the want of this miraculous sanction to their authority. In reply, we would ask, what there is which is not at its commencement miraculous, and yet in its continuance loses this character? Would not this objection have applied with equal force to the Jewish High Priest? The first who held that office was miraculously appointed, but afterwards it was left to be handed down by the succession of human instruments. Yet who doubts that the last who ministered at the altar had every claim to reverence which Aaron himself possessed fifteen centuries before? On this point we will quote the striking analogy used to illustrate it, by one of our own Bishops.

“The beginning of the grass in the field was miraculous—by the instant and immediate mandate of God. It was created in full maturity. But its succession was provided for by no such measure. The grass, and the herb, and the fruit tree were furnished with the means of a succession, by ordinary laws, each having ‘seed in itself after its kind.’ Thus also with man. The head of the human race was created by the immediate hand of God; but the succession from that moment to the end of time, was provided for by laws of ordinary nature. But we

hold it to be no arrogance to say of any man, though the lowest of his kind, that he has succeeded to the nature of the miraculously created first man ; nor to say of the herb of the field, that though it be but the offspring of the little, familiar seed in the ground, which sprang and grew by an ordinary law, and a human planting and rearing, it is, nevertheless, in all the essentials of its nature, the successor, in an unbroken line of descent, of the herb which on the third day of the world sprang into maturity at the wonderful fiat of the Almighty. I know not that the man or the herb is any less a man or an herb, or any less descended from the miraculous beginnings of the creation, because the laws of growth were but ordinary, and the intermediate agency of production was but human. And so I know not that a minister of the Gospel is any the less a successor of the first Apostles, because, instead of receiving his authority, like them, immediately from Christ, it has come to him by the intermediate communication of a chain, fastened at its beginning upon the throne of God, and preserved as inviolate as the line of the descent of Adam, or the succession of seed-time and harvest, of day and night, of summer and winter. I know not that this day is not a true day, and strictly a successor of that very day when first the sun appeared ; though that, you know, was made by the sudden act of God suspending the sun in the skies, and this arose by the ordinary succession of the evening and the morning. The beginning of every institution of God must of necessity be extraordinary ; its regular continuance, ordinary. So with the course of Providence, in all its branches. What is now an ordinary Prov-

idence was once an extraordinary. What began with miracle, is continued by laws of familiar nature. And so it is with the ministry of the Gospel. What was created by the direct ordination of God, is propagated and continued by the authorized ordination of men. Its 'seed is in itself, after its kind,' and at every step of the succession it is precisely the same ministry, and just as much of God, sanctioned by His authority, and sustained by His power, as if it had been received from the laying on of the hands of Christ Himself. And so with the office of the Apostles. It was the promise of Christ the Lord that it should continue to the end of the world. It is not more sure that sun and moon, seed-time and harvest, will continue to the end of the world; and though its succession be now in the hands of very feeble and fallible men—of men unspeakably inferior to the Apostles in every personal and official qualification; yea, though many Iscariots be found under its awful responsibilities, the integrity of *the office*, as essentially identical with that of the Apostles, is in no wise affected."*

Here then is a brief view of the argument for Episcopacy as derived from Scripture. We contend, indeed, that the whole tenor of the Acts and the Epistles sustains the fact of there being three orders in the ministry, and a degree of authority committed to those of the first rank—whether you call them Apostles or Bishops, is immaterial—which those of the other two grades did not possess. Thus then the early Church was constituted. Our Lord left not

* Bishop McIlvaine's Sermon, at the consecration of Bishop Polk, p. 17.

His flock without its Chief-Shepherds. While ordinary priests and teachers were appointed, there were also leaders in "the Sacramental host of God's elect." And in that day the office of a Bishop was often but a passport to the flames and the stake. It obliged those who bore it to stand in the very first rank, where trials were to be encountered, and to endure a double portion of painful sacrifices. They were to be "examples of suffering, affliction, and of patience." And nobly did they fulfil the high duties imposed upon them, treading in the footsteps of their Master, even to prison and to death. The blood of her martyred Bishops was the seed of the Church. They were the first marks at which the enemy aimed, and therefore the record of their cruel sufferings contains often the history of those early persecutions which fell upon the fold. In bearing the Cross loftily before the Christian host, they were worthy successors of those Apostles whose office they had inherited.

When, therefore, these had passed away, bequeathing their authority to others, have we a right to set it aside, as no longer binding? If the Episcopal form of government was thus established in Apostolic days, can we depart from it? Are we not justified in cleaving to it, and insisting on it as it has been handed down to us for eighteen centuries? Yes—nothing can change the order of the ministry but a new and direct revelation from Heaven. It can be done by no human authority. We are contented then not to try experiments in things which God hath settled. The well-worn path is before us, and we will not wander from it. If the Rechabites

were blessed because they **r**everenced antiquity, and walked in the way which **h**ad been marked out for them in distant ages,* is it not well for us, as a Christian Church, to imbibe their steadfast and unchanging spirit.

Two voices are striving to enlist our attention. The one rises up from those around us—the voice of this present age, as, “emulous of change,” it invites us to novelties, and points out unnumbered paths, untried and unknown, in which we are exhorted to walk. It is a fitful voice, ever varying, ever altering its tones. The other falls calmly, yet solemnly, upon the ear. It comes down from the years of a dim and distant antiquity, and every generation has heard it, from the first founding of the Church until now. It bids us cleave to the faith of the Apostles and martyrs. Its accents are unchanged from age to age. The former, is the voice of erring, fickle man. The latter is the voice of God. Which shall we heed?

*Jer. xxxv.

III.

EPISCOPACY PROVED FROM HISTORY.

Throughout the older world, story and rite—
 Throughout the new, skirting all clouds with gold—
 Through rise and fall, and destinies manifold
Of pagan empires—through the dreams and night
Of nature, and the darkness and the light,
 Still young in hope, in disappointment old—
 Through mists which fall'n humanity unfold,
Into the vast and viewless infinite,
 Rises th' Eternal City of our God.

The Cathedral.

IN the Preface to our Form for the ordaining of Deacons is this declaration—"It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."—In the last Lecture I took up the former of these points—the argument derived from Holy Scripture—and endeavored to show you, as well as the narrow limits of a single discourse would admit, that every allusion there made to the form of Church Government, proves that it must have been Episcopal in its nature. On the present occasion, I propose to bring forward the second argument here set forth in the declaration of the Church—that derived from the testimony of ANCIENT AUTHORS.

Let us unroll then the records of the past, and looking away from the strifes and vain assertions of

“this ignorant present time,” read the words of those who wrote in the early years of our faith—who stood up within that circle of light which shed its radiance over the Apostolic days—and whose works have been bequeathed to us as a precious legacy, to tell how these things were in the golden days when schism was unknown. In the dim twilight then of our knowledge, we would repeat that counsel which Bildad gave to Job—“Inquire, I pray thee, of the former age, and prepare thyself to the search of their fathers: (For we are but as yesterday, and know nothing, because our days upon earth are a shadow): shall not they teach thee, and tell thee, and utter words out of their heart?”*

The argument, then, to be presented is this: That all writers of the first three centuries, who describe in any way the condition of the Church, in every hint they give, and every fact they state, show most plainly, that no ministry was known or recognized in that day, but the same three-fold orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, which have continued down even to us, in uninterrupted succession. And who are these writers? Men who were the companions and immediate successors of the Apostles—confessors and martyrs, who poured forth their blood freely for that faith in which they had lived—men, whose voices were heard proclaiming the doctrines of the Cross in every strange land—whose motto and principle of action was, that their Master must inherit the earth—men, whose virtues were too heroic, and their aims too lofty, to be fully comprehended in these degenerate days—and on the record of whose

* Chap. viii. 8, 9, 10.

self-denying labors we now look back as upon a vision of past beauty which has faded from the earth, and for whose return we scarcely dare even to hope. Are their words, then, as they come down to us from those holy days, to be received only with doubts and carping questions ?

And we think, too, that the very manner in which they gave their testimony, increases its force. They wrote no arguments to prove the nature of the Apostolic ministry. They set forth no elaborate proofs of the constitution of the Church. These were truths which in that day none disputed, and no formal defence was therefore necessary. We learn all these things incidentally, as they are brought forward in connection with other features of the Church, or the ordinary instructions by which they sought to train up in holiness the people of their charge. No writer in that age thought of proving that the Church was governed by Bishops, any more than he did of establishing by argument the fact that Rome was governed by an emperor, and the provinces by governors who were under him. Both are merely alluded to as established historical facts. If then they who were cotemporary with the Apostles, and they who for three centuries followed them, all speak of the three orders of the ministry as being defined and established in their day, may we not—adding this to the testimony of Scripture—believe that it was the divinely constituted form which our Lord prescribed to His Church ?

Our first witness, then, is St. Clement. He was a fellow-laborer of St. Paul, who had bestowed upon him the noblest commendation language can frame.

When writing to the Philippians, the Apostle says—“Clement also, and other my fellow-laborers, whose names are in the Book of Life.” Having been appointed Bishop of Rome, he held that office nearly ten years, until his martyrdom.* The single Epistle of his which is still extant, was written to the Corinthians, and so highly was it esteemed in the early Church, that Eusebius (the Ecclesiastical Historian who wrote in the beginning of the fourth century) assures us, “it was universally received by all,” and indeed revered by them next to the Holy Scriptures, and therefore “publicly read in most of the Churches for common benefit, both in times past and also in his memory.”† The object of this Epistle is, to promote a spirit of subordination among those to whom he wrote, that no one should intrude upon the office of such as were above him, but each in his own station discharge his appropriate duties. The very language which he uses, and the comparisons by which he illustrates his meaning, prove most fully that in that day “God in His wise providence had appointed divers Orders in His Church.”‡

For instance, he says—“Let us therefore march on, men and brethren, with all earnestness, in His holy laws. Let us consider those who fight under our earthly governors: how orderly, how readily, and with what exact obedience they perform those things that are commanded them! *All are not prefects, nor tribunes, nor centurions, nor inferior officers*; but every one *in his respective rank* does what is commanded him by the king, and *those who*

* Cave's Lives of the Fathers, vol. i. p. 157. † Lib. iii. c. 16, 38.

‡ Prayer in Office of Institution.

have the authority over him. They who are great cannot subsist without those who are little, nor the little without the great. But there must be a mixture in all things, and then there will be use and profit too. Let us, for example, take our body (1. Cor. xii. 13): the head without the feet is nothing, neither the feet without the head. And even the smallest members of our body are yet both necessary and useful to the whole body. But all conspire together, and are subject to one common life, namely, the preservation of the whole body. Let, therefore, our whole body be saved in Jesus Christ; and let every one be subject to his neighbor, according to the order in which he is placed by the gift of God." (§ 37, 38.)

Again—he uses that comparison to the Jewish priesthood, which was so common among the early writers—"God has ordained, by His supreme will and authority, both where and by what persons they [that is, His services] are to be performed. For the *Chief Priest* has his proper services; and to the *Priests* their proper place is appointed; and to the *Levites* appertain their proper ministries; and the Layman is confined within the bounds of what is commanded to Laymen. Let every one of you, therefore, brethren, bless God in his proper station, with a good conscience, and with all gravity, not exceeding the rule of his service that is appointed to him." (§ 40, 41.) By this illustration he clearly points out a three-fold ministry.

Again—he declares most plainly that the Apostolic office was not to cease with those who first held it, but to descend to others also. "So likewise our Apostles knew by our Lord Jesus Christ that there

should contentions arise about the name of the Bishopric. And therefore having a perfect foreknowledge of this, they appointed persons, as we before said, and then gave direction how, when they should die, other chosen and approved men should succeed in the ministry." (§ 44.)

Our next witness is St. Ignatius. He, as St. Chrysostom tells us, was intimately conversant with the Apostles, educated and nursed up by them, and made partaker both of their familiar discourses, and more secret and uncommon mysteries.* He was more particularly the disciple of St. John, and when fully instructed in the doctrines of Christianity, was consecrated Bishop of Antioch, the metropolis of Syria, and the most famous and renowned city of the East. To this office he was ordained by the Apostles who were then living, and continued to guide the Church through the stormy period which followed, for the space of forty years, thirty of which were passed in the first century, the age of the inspired Apostles.† At length, at the age of 80, he was arrested as a Christian, and refusing to deny the Lord in whose service he had lived, was sent to Rome to be devoured by wild beasts in the amphitheatre. On his way thither, he stopped at Smyrna, and was thus allowed to see once more his ancient fellow-disciple, St. Polycarp, the Bishop of that city.

Touching indeed must have been the meeting of these aged Christians, as thus, for the last time on earth, they beheld each other face to face. What hallowed recollections of the past must have come

* Homil. in S. Ignat. v. ii. p. 593.

† Cave's Lives of the Fathers, v. i. p. 179.

thronging back upon them—thoughts of the early friends who had already entered into rest—memories of days when together they sat at the feet of the last surviving Apostle, and learned those lessons of love for a fallen race, which since they had acted out in their long and toilsome ministry! Had they been faithful to the lofty trust which he bestowed upon them? And were they prepared for that dread account, which, fearful to any of our Lord's ministers, must be doubly so to those who are the overseers of all? Solemnly, too, must the future have opened its vista before them, as these aged disciples of the Cross communed with each other. They were men "appointed to death." With both, this dream of life was about to vanish into eternity. One was rapidly approaching a death of agony; while the other, bowed down with years, felt that the shadows of the grave must soon be gathering about his path.

Did no regrets, then, in this hour, mingle with the musings of Ignatius, as the past, with its long array of trials, rushed back upon his mind, while coming days held out no promise but the pains of martyrdom? Was there no shrinking from "the bitter cup"—no clinging still to this decaying life? Did not nature's feebleness wring from the aged man the prayer—"Spare me yet a little longer, that I may recover my strength, before I go hence, and be no more seen?" No—his lofty faith could triumph over all earthly evils. His courage rose to a nobler elevation, as the day drew nigh, and he could write to his sorrowing friends—"Now I begin to be a disciple; nor shall anything move me, whether visible or invisible, that I may attain to Jesus Christ. Let fire and

the Cross—let the companies of wild beasts—let breakings of bones and tearing of members—let the shattering in pieces of the whole body—and all the wicked torments of the Devil come upon me; only let me enjoy Jesus Christ. All the ends of the world, and the kingdoms of it, will profit me nothing: I would rather die for Jesus Christ, than rule to the utmost ends of the earth. . . . Suffer me to enter into pure light, where being come, I shall be indeed the servant of God. Permit me to imitate the passion of Christ, my God.”*

It was while in this situation, and filled with such emotions, that Ignatius, when at Smyrna, wrote four epistles—one to the Ephesians, one to the Magnesians, one to the Trallians, and one to the Romans. Having once more resumed his journey, while stopping at Troas on his way, he added three other Epistles—to Polycarp, to the Philadelphians, and to the Smyrnians. These seven Epistles were collected by St. Polycarp, and being highly prized in all ages of the Church, have been carefully preserved, until they have come down to our day. Here then is a witness who well knew the divinely appointed form of Church government. What then does he say on this point? Why his Epistles are filled with incidental allusions to the Episcopal office and the three orders of the ministry. We will select a few of these as examples.

In his Epistle to the Ephesians, he testifies that in his day—that is from the year 70 to the year 107—Bishops were established in all parts of the world, in accordance with our Lord’s will. His words are—“ For

* Epist. ad Rom. § 5, 6.

even Jesus Christ, our insuperable life, is sent by the will of the Father: *as the Bishops, appointed unto the utmost bounds of the earth*, are by the will of Jesus Christ." (§ 3.)

And again—"Wherefore it will become you to run together according to the will of your *Bishop*, as also ye do. For your famous *Presbytery*, worthy of God, is fitted as exactly to the *Bishop*, as the strings are to the harp." (§ 4.)

And in enforcing the duty of obedience, he says—"Whomsoever the Master of the house sends to be over His own household, we ought in like manner to receive him, as we would do Him that sent him. It is therefore evident, that we ought to look upon the *Bishop* even as we would do upon the Lord Himself." (§ 6.)

In his Epistle to the Magnesians are these passages: "Seeing then I have been judged worthy to see you, by Damas, your most excellent *Bishop*; and by your very worthy *Presbyters*, Bassus and Apollonius; and by my fellow servant, Sotio the *Deacon*, in whom I rejoice, forasmuch as he is subject unto his *Bishop*, as to the grace of God, and to the *Presbytery*, as to the law of Jesus Christ." (§ 2.)

"I exhort you, that ye study to do all things in a divine concord: your *Bishop* presiding in the place of God; your *Presbyters* in the place of the council of the Apostles; and your *Deacons*, most dear to me, being entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ; who was with the Father before all ages, and appeared in the end to us." (§ 6.)

"Study therefore to be confirmed in the doctrine of our Lord, and of his Apostles, that so whatsoever

ye do, ye may prosper both in body and spirit; in faith and charity; in the Son, and in the Father, and in the Holy Spirit; in the beginning, and in the end; together with your most worthy *Bishop*, and the well-wrought spiritual crown of your *Presbytery*; and your *Deacons*, which are according to God. Be subject to your *Bishop*." (§ 13.)

In the beginning of his Epistle to the Philadelphians, he says that he salutes them, especially if they are at unity with the *Bishop*, and *Presbyters*, who are with him, and the *Deacons*, appointed according to the mind of Jesus Christ, whom he hath settled according to His own will in all firmness, by His Holy Spirit."

In the body of the Epistle, he utters a fearful sentence against those who violate the unity of the Church. After calling them "wolves who seem worthy of belief, that with a false pleasure lead captive those that run in the course of God," and "herbs which Jesus Christ does not dress," he adds—"Be not deceived, brethren; if any one follows him that makes a schism in the Church, he shall not inherit the kingdom of God. If any one walks after any other opinion, he agrees not with the passion of Christ." (§ 3.)

And again—"I cried while I was among you; I spake with a loud voice—attend to the *Bishop*, and to the *Presbytery*, and to the *Deacons* Do nothing without the *Bishop*." (§ 7.)

To the Smyrnians, he wrote—"See that ye all follow your *Bishop*, as Jesus Christ, the Father; and the *Presbytery*, as the Apostles; and reverence the *Deacons*, as the command of God. Let no man do

anything of what belongs to the Church separately from the *Bishop*. Let that Eucharist be looked upon as well established, which is either offered by the *Bishop*, or by him to whom the *Bishop* has given his consent. Wheresoever the *Bishop* shall appear, there let the people also be ; as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church." (§ 8.)

And in conclusion, he says—"I salute your very worthy *Bishop*, and your venerable *Presbytery*, and your *Deacons*." (§ 12.)

In his Epistle to Polycarp, also, he thus through him addresses the Church of Smyrna—"Hearken unto the *Bishop*, that God also may hearken unto you. My soul be security for them that submit to their *Bishop*, with their *Presbyters* and *Deacons*." (§ 6.)

Again—he exhorts the Trallians—"He that is within the altar, is pure ; but he that is without, that is, that does any thing without the *Bishop*, and *Presbyters*, and *Deacons*, is not pure in his conscience." (§ 7.)

Such then is the character of all the allusions made by Ignatius, and testimony like this to the existence of the three orders of the ministry might be much increased from his Epistles. We will give, however, but one more extract. It is from the Epistle to the Trallians, where he says—"In like manner, let all reverence the *Deacons*, as Jesus Christ ; and the *Bishop*, as the Father ; and the *Presbyters*, as the Sanhedrim of God, and the College of the Apostles. Without these there is no Church." (§ 3.) Now, mark this expression. St. Ignatius, who personally knew the Apostles, after mentioning the three orders

of the ministry, declares—WITHOUT THESE THERE IS NO CHURCH. And he was one cotemporary with the immediate disciples of our Lord. Yet in this day we are told, that it is not necessary to retain the Apostolic Constitution of the ministry, and are ridiculed because we cleave steadfastly to it, following in the steps of these ancient martyrs. But who—we appeal to your reason—who was most likely to know what was necessary to the constitution of a Church—Ignatius, who had been a disciple of St. John, and gathered instruction from his holy lips, or those who in the nineteenth century, having separated from the Church, hesitate not to pronounce its Apostolical ministry “a cunningly devised fable?” If, indeed, instead of the mass of testimony before us, we had nothing but the Epistles of this single writer, they would be amply sufficient to prove the existence of Episcopacy in the days of the Apostles.*

* With regard to the genuineness and authenticity of these Epistles, we would observe, that several ancient writers—such as Irenæus, a disciple of Polycarp, Origen, who was born in the latter part of the second century, and Eusebius, the Ecclesiastical historian—all possessed copies of the works of Ignatius, and the quotations they made agree with passages now found in our versions of them. Bishop Pearson, in his *Vindicia Epistolarum Ignatii*, and John Daille, in his *De Scriptis quæ sub Dionysii Arcop. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumferuntur*, have fully asserted their claims. Grotius, a Presbyterian (as quoted by Pearson, chap. v.), writing to Vossius, says—“The Epistles of Ignatius, which your son brought out of Italy, pure from all those things which the learned have hitherto suspected, Blondel will not admit, because they afford a clear testimony to the antiquity of Episcopacy.” Even Mosheim allows—“Perhaps there would be no contention with most persons about the Epistles of Ignatius, if those who contend for the divine origin and antiquity of Episcopal government had not been enabled to support their cause with them.”—*De Rebus Christianis ante Constantinum*, p. 160.

Presbyterians always endorse Ignatius, except when he proves

The next testimony we shall cite is that of St. Polycarp, who has been already mentioned as the fellow disciple of Ignatius. After having been contemporary with the Apostles for forty years, and filled the office of Bishop of Smyrna (to which he was ordained by St. John) for more than half a century, he suffered martyrdom in the year 147, being then eighty-six years old. We have but one letter of his remaining. The Philippians had requested him to send them the Epistles of Ignatius, which he did, adding to them an Epistle of his own, beginning with these words—"Polycarp and the Presbyters that are with him, to the Church of God which is at Philippi." This Epistle is chiefly valuable, because it contains an entire endorsement of all that Ignatius had asserted. His words are—"The Epistles of Ignatius,

Episcopacy. Thus, Dr. Miller of Princeton, when arguing on the ministry, finds Ignatius to be unworthy of any credit. When wishing, however, to prove the belief of the Early Church in the divinity of our Lord, he discovers that the disciple of St. John is excellent authority. His recorded testimony therefore stands thus :—

LETTERS ON THE MINISTRY.

"That even the 'Shorter Epistles' of Ignatius are unworthy of confidence, as the genuine works of the Father whose name they bear, is the opinion of many of the ablest and best judges in the Protestant world."—p. 150.

"Intelligent readers are no doubt aware, that the genuineness of the Epistles of Ignatius has been called in question by a great majority of Protestant divines, and is not only really but deeply questionable."—*Essay on the office of Ruling Elder.*

LETTERS ON UNITARIANISM.

"The great body of learned men consider the *smaller* Epistles of Ignatius as, in the main, the real works of the writer whose name they bear."—p. 122.

"I do not admit that the most learned and able of the critics reject as spurious the seven *shorter* Epistles of this Father." *Letter on the Eternal Sonship of Christ.*

which he wrote unto us, together with what others of his have come into our hands, we have sent unto you, according to your order, which are subjoined to this Epistle; by which ye may be greatly profited, for they treat of faith and patience, and of all things that pertain to edification in the Lord Jesus." (§ 13.) Did not then St. Polycarp believe Episcopacy to be a divine institution? Unless such had been his views, no earthly consideration would have induced him thus openly and decidedly to have recorded his approval of Epistles which so plainly set forth as binding upon all men, the three orders of the ministry.

The next witness from whom we shall quote is St. Irenæus. He was a disciple of Polycarp, and born about the time of St. John's death. Mosheim speaks of his works as being "a splendid monument of antiquity."* Listen to his plain declaration with regard to this historical fact—"We can reckon up those whom the Apostles ordained to be *Bishops* in the several Churches, and who they were that succeeded them, down to our own times. . . . For the Apostles desired to have those in all things perfect and unreprouable, whom they left to be their *successors*, and to whom *they committed their own Apostolic authority*. We have the *successions of Bishops*, to whom the Apostolic Church in every place was committed. All these [viz. the heretics] are much later than *the Bishops to whom the Apostles did deliver the Churches*."†

"The true knowledge is the doctrine of the Apostles, and the ancient state of the Church throughout

* Eccles. Hist. v. i. p. 146.

† Adv. Hæres. l. iii. c. 4.

the whole world, and the character of the body of Christ according to *the succession of Bishops to whom they committed the Church that is in every place, and which has descended even unto us.*"*

And he afterwards adds, with regard to those who inherited the Apostolic office—" *With the succession of their Episcopacy, they have the sure gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father.*"

We will bring forward the testimony of but one more witness. It is that of Tertullian—the most eminent Latin scholar of his day—who lived at the end of the second century. In his work, *De Præscrip. Hæreticorum*, when arguing against those who had wandered from the faith, he says—" *Let them produce the original of their Churches; let them show the order of their Bishops, that by their succession, deduced from the beginning, we may see whether their first Bishop had any of the Apostles, or Apostolical men, who did likewise persevere with the Apostles, for his ordainer and predecessor: for thus the Apostolical Churches do derive their succession; as the Church of Smyrna from Polycarp, whom John the Apostle placed there; the Church of Rome from Clement, who was in like manner ordained by Peter; and so the other Churches can produce those constituted in their Bishoprics by the Apostles.*" (c. 32.)†

* Adv. Hæres. l. iv. c. 6.

† We can show from two early writers how carefully the Church in that day preserved—as Tertullian here states—the succession of the Bishops in the different sees. Thus Irenæus says, "seeing that it is very long, in such a volume as this to enumerate *the succession of Bishops in all the Churches,*" he will give, as an example, that of Rome, which he does in these words:—

"The blessed Apostles, therefore, founding and instructing the Church, [of Rome,] delivered to Linus the administration of its Bish-

And thus we might go on, age after age, and multiply our witnesses to this truth. The writings of Hegesippus, Polycrates, Dionysius of Corinth,*

opric : Paul makes mention of this Linus in his Epistles to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus; after whom, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement had the Bishopric allotted to him. He had seen the blessed Apostles, and was conversant with them; and as yet he had the preaching of the Apostles sounding in his ears, and their tradition before his eyes : and not he alone, for at that time there were many yet remaining alive, who had been taught by the Apostles. To this Clement succeeded Evarestus, and to Evarestus, Alexander ; and then Xystus was appointed the sixth from the Apostles ; and after him Telesphorus, who suffered a glorious martyrdom ; after him Hyginus ; then Pius ; after him, Anicetus. And Soter having succeeded Anicetus, Eleutherus now has the Bishopric, in the twelfth place from the Apostles. By this order and succession, that tradition which is from the Apostles, and the preaching of the truth, is descended unto us." *Adv. Heres.* lib. iii. ch. 3.

In the same way, Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian, in his Church History, written about the time of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, gives the successions of the four patriarchal Sees, of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch, from the beginning down to the year 305. These he copied from the archives and records of the different Churches, which were extant in his day, but have since been lost. We are told, indeed, that by the express command of the Emperor, all these public registers throughout the Roman empire were laid open to him, "and out of these materials he principally compiled his Ecclesiastic History."—(*Cave's Lives of the Fathers*, v. ii. p. 135.) The same lists are given by other writers, so as to render the facts with regard to the succession in the primitive Church, indisputable.

There was also in that day a library at Ælia, which was founded by Alexander the Bishop there, which has since been destroyed. "From this"—says Eusebius—"we have also been able to collect materials for our present work."—(*Eccles. Hist.* lib. vi. chap. 20.)

* The writings of these three authors have perished, and must be included among those ancient records used by Eusebius, which are now lost to the world. We receive, however, their testimony on the subject of the government of the early Church, from the extracts he has incorporated in his own history. Hegesippus in the second century wrote a history of the Church from the beginning to his own day, and having travelled extensively, speaks of the Bishops presiding in the different countries he had visited.—(*Euseb.* l. iv. c. 8. 22.)

Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, Optatus, Ephren. Syrus, and that code of laws called "The Apostolical Canons," are all equally clear and distinct in their assertion of the truth, that through all those ages the Episcopal form of government was the only one existing in the Church.* So evident, indeed, was the pre-eminence of the Bishops, that even the heathen were well aware of the fact. Thus, when the Emperor Maximinus commenced his persecution against the Christians, we are told by Eusebius, that "he commanded at first only the *Archontes*, or chief rulers of the Churches to be slain."† And St. Cyprian tells Antoninus, that so great was the hatred of the Emperor Decius against the Christians, that "he could have heard with greater patience that another prince had set himself up as a rival in the empire, than that a Bishop should have been settled in the city of Rome."‡ The historian Gibbon is forced to admit the existence of Episcopacy even in the apostolic days. His words are—"The Episcopal form of government . . . appears to have been introduced *before the close of the first century*." "It had acquired in a very early period the sanction of antiquity." "*Nulla ecclesia sine Episcopo*, (no Church without a Bishop,) has been a fact as well as a maxim since the time of Tertullian and Irenæus." He acknowledged, that, "after we have passed the difficul-

For the testimony of Polycrates, see *Euseb.* l. v. c. 24.—and for that of Dionysius, *Euseb.* l. iv. c. 23.

* And yet with all this array of testimony before him, (for we have only given a mere specimen,) Dr. Miller of Princeton can say, they refer us to *some vague suggestions and allusions of a few of the early fathers*.—*Letters on the Ministry*, p. 50.

† *Eccles. Hist.* l. vi. c. 28.

‡ *Epist.* 55.

ties of *the first century*”—which would be before the death of St. John—“*we find the Episcopal government universally established, until it was interrupted by the republican genius of the Swiss and German reformers.*”* The skeptical historian found in truth, when he sat down to sketch the progress of our faith in that early day, that the history of Christianity was the history of Episcopacy. To have drawn the picture of our religion in the first three centuries, yet without admitting the government of Bishops, would have been as easy as to have given a view of *Imperia!* Rome in the ages of her “*Decline and Fall,*” without making any mention of her Emperors. The Church with her three-fold ministry met him at every step. From the very first they were inseparable, and could not be dissevered. God had “*joined them together,*” and man could not “*put them asunder.*” Regarding them simply as historical facts, we have the same evidence of the existence of Episcopacy throughout the Church in primitive times, that we have of the use of baptism, or the weekly reception of the Eucharist.†

* *Decline and Fall*, ch. xv.

† Palmer in his *Treatise on the Church* (v. i. pp. 392–4) shows the uniform practice with respect to ordination by Bishops only, and the decision which was at once made with regard to the invalidity of this rite by Presbyters only. “We find several instances in which such ordinations were declared null, but not a single case has been adduced in which they were really allowed. In 324, the council of all the Egyptian Bishops assembled at Alexandria under Hosius, declared null and void the ordinations performed by Colluthus, a Presbyter of Alexandria, who had separated from his Bishop, and pretended to act as a Bishop himself. (*Athanas. Oper. t. i. p. 193.*) In 340, the Egyptian Bishops, in their defence of St. Athanasius, alluding to Ischyras, who pretended to be a priest, said, ‘Whence, then, was Ischyras a Presbyter? Who was his ordainer? Colluthus? For this

And this continued to be the case for fifteen hundred years: for until the Reformation in the sixteenth century there is no evidence of the existence of any religious community, without a Bishop and Episcopal government. At this time it was, when old customs and rites were broken up, and the restless desire was created to make all things new, that the many parties which we see in the Christian world took their rise. The Church at that period being deformed by the corruptions which had gradually gathered around her as the Middle Ages went by, there was a natural wish in the minds of men to restore her to Apostolic purity. Yet in this, as is often the case in other things, they ran to the opposite extreme. Among the reformers on the continent, the reason let loose from its thralldom, indulged in the strangest extravagances. The followers of Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, and Calvin, differed widely, but looked only to their own private views as their guides. And the result was, that only remains. But it is known to all and doubted by no one, that Colluthus died a Presbyter; that his hands were without authority; and that all who were ordained by him in time of the schism, were reduced to the state of laymen, and as such attend the Church assemblies."—(*Ibid* p. 134.) Epiphanius refutes the doctrine of Aërius, observing, that Bishops beget fathers of the Church by ordination, Presbyters beget sons only by baptism, and concludes, 'How can he constitute a Presbyter who has no right to ordain him by imposition of hands?' (*Epiph. Hæres.* 75. *Oper.* t. i. p. 908.) No difficulties induced the Church to break through this rule. Never do we read, even in the height of the Arian persecutions, of an attempt to supply the necessities of the Churches by means of Presbyterian ordinations; no, not though it was held that in a time of such necessity, all the ordinary rules might be dispensed with. Even when the Vandals exiled the whole body of the African Bishops to the number of nearly 500, (*Fleury. Hist. Eccl.* lib. xxx. § 7,) we read of no attempt to deviate from the universal rule."

instead of retaining what was primitive and apostolic in the Church—~~retaining~~ in fact the Church herself, relieved from all corruptions—they abandoned every ancient landmark. Thus the expedient was at last resorted to, of forming a new Church and a new ministry of their own; and their followers, to defend its validity, have been obliged since that time to take the ground that Episcopal ordination is not necessary, and that but one order of ministers is required. The door being thus thrown widely open, unnumbered sects arose, each modelled after its particular leader, as he happened to give a prominence to some single doctrine of his creed; and these, or their offspring, form that “mixed multitude” which encircle the camp of the true Israel as it journeys through the wilderness.

That the Reformers at first intended to separate from the Church we do not believe. This step grew out of occurrences which they could not have foreseen. The storm they had raised was indeed beyond all human control, and the whirlwind swept them along with it in its course. They had called forth the passions of men, and taken off every restraint from spiritual freedom, and who had power to say—“Thus far and no farther shalt thou go?” The successive steps too taken by the court of Rome, at last rendered an accommodation impossible, and placed the Lutherans under the ban of interdict, as heretics, whose company the faithful were commanded to avoid. “It would be, therefore, a great mistake to suppose that Luther or his party *designed* to effect a reformation in the Church; they were driven entirely by the force of circumstances to adopt the

course they did. It was not premeditated or desired by them. They would have *widely* altered the Lutheran system, which was a merely temporary arrangement, if by so doing they could have recovered the communion of the Church. But the opposition of the Roman See thwarted these designs; the Council of Trent rendered them still more difficult; and, in time, the Lutherans forgot that their system was merely provisional, pretended to justify it as ordinary and sufficient, and lost their desire for accommodation with the Roman and German Churches.”*

The Reformers fully realized the difficulty of their position, and the necessity of Episcopacy to constitute a Church or a valid ministry. We accordingly find in their writings, repeated declarations in favor of this form of government, and even the distinct acknowledgment of its divine authority. They arrayed themselves, not against this power itself, but against the abuse of it in the Romish Church.

* *Palmer's Treatise on the Church*, v. i. p. 341. See this point proved in Part. i. ch. 12, sec. 1, 2.—It was a favorite remark of Napoleon, that “no man who commenced a revolution, knew where he was going”—and the statement is as true of moral and religious, as of political changes. It is, we think, an error to regard Luther so entirely as creating and moulding the opinions of his age, or by any means contemplating the extent to which he himself would be carried. He was the living development—the speaking voice—of that deep feeling which pervaded all classes of society, and which would eventually have found utterance and produced a reformation, had Luther never existed. The opposition to the Romish Church in France, commenced before the name of Luther had been heard in that country. Of course, after he had taken the bold stand into which he was driven, his reaction upon the people was as great as their action upon him. He presented a centre of unity, and gave direction and aim to their efforts. But no one can thoughtfully read his life, without perceiving, that instead of leading his generation, he was himself borne forward by the heavings of the mighty mass beneath him.

Thus in the Confession of Augsburg, (pars. i. art. 22,) "which Melancthon drew up, holding consultation all the while with LUTHER,"* it says of Bishops—"The Churches ought, necessarily, and *jure divino*, to obey them." "The Bishops might easily retain their *legitimate obedience*, if they would not urge us to observe traditions which cannot be kept with a good conscience. . . . There is no design to deprive the Bishops of their authority, but this only is sought, that the Gospel be permitted to be purely taught, and a few observances be relaxed." And in the Articles of Smalcand, "drawn up in German by Luther, in his own acrimonious style,"† in denouncing the supremacy assumed by the Pope, he says—"The Church can never be better governed and preserved, than when we all live under one Head, Jesus Christ, and all *Bishops*, equal in office, though unequal in gifts, are most perfectly united in diligence, concord of doctrine, &c. . . . The Apostles were equal, and afterwards *the Bishops in all Christendom*, until the Pope raised his head above all."—(pars. ii. art. 4.)

In the same strain MELANCTHON always wrote. In the *Apology for the Augsburg Confession*, which he drew up, he says—"We have oft protested, that we do greatly approve the ecclesiastical polity and degrees in the Church, and as much as lieth in us, do desire to conserve them. We do not mislike the authority of Bishops—we do here protest that we would willingly preserve the ecclesiastical polity—that it may not be imputed to us, that the authority of Bishops is overthrown by us."

* Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. v. iii. p. 49.

† Ibid. p. 64.

Again he says—"I would to God it lay in me to restore the government of Bishops. For I see what manner of Church we shall have, the ecclesiastical polity being dissolved. I do see that hereafter will grow up a greater tyranny in the Church, than there ever was before."

Once more he asks—"By what right or law may we dissolve the ecclesiastical polity, if the Bishops will grant us that which in reason they ought to grant? And if it were lawful for us so to do, yet surely it were not expedient. *Luther was ever of this opinion.*"

BEZA, in his treatise against Saravia, says—"If there are any, (which you shall hardly persuade me to believe,) who reject the whole order of Episcopacy, God forbid that any man of a sound mind should assent to the madness of such men."

We will quote the opinions of but one other of that age. Among those who are now revered by the opposers of Episcopacy, there is no name stands higher than that of CALVIN. Yet listen to his testimony. In his commentary on Titus (chap. i. v. 5) he says—"At this time" (that is, in the time of Titus) "*there was no equality among the ministers of the Church, but some one in authority and council had the pre-eminence.*"

Again, he declares—"To every *Bishop* was committed the government of *his own clergy*, that they should rule their clergy according to the Canons, and hold them to their duty."*

"In the solemn assembly, the Bishops had a certain apparel whereby they might be distinctly known

* Instit. lib. 4. ch. 12.

from other Priests. They ordered all Priests and Deacons with only laying on of hands. But every *Bishop*, with the company of Priests, *ordained his own Priests.*"*

In his Book, *De Necess. reformatand. Eccles.* he has these words—"Let them give us such an hierarchy, in which Bishops may be so above the rest, as they refuse not to be under Christ, and depend upon Him as their only Head; that they maintain a brotherly society, &c. If there be any that do not behave themselves with all reverence and obedience towards them, there is no *anathema*, but I confess them worthy of it."† But especially is his opinion of Episcopacy shown by a letter, which he and Bullinger, and other learned men, wrote in 1549 to King Edward VI., offering to make him their Defender, and to have Bishops in their Churches as there were in England. Unfortunately, this letter fell into the hands of the Romish Bishops. The following account of it was found among the papers of Archbishop Parker—"And whereas John Calvin had sent a letter in King Edward the VIth's reign, to have conferred with the clergy of England about some things to this effect, two Bishops, viz. Gardiner and Bonner, intercepted the same; whereby Mr. Calvin's overture perished. And he received an answer, as if it had been from the reformed Divines of those times, wherein they checked him and slighted his proposals: from which time John Calvin and the Church of England were at variance in several points; which otherwise through God's mercy had been qualified, if those papers of his proposals had been

* *Ibid.* ch. 4.

† Stryne's *Life of Archbishop Parker*, p. 140.

discovered unto the Queen's Majesty during John Calvin's life. But being not discovered until or about the sixth year of her Majesty's reign, her Majesty much lamented they were not found sooner: which she expressed before her Council at the same time, in the presence of her great friends, Sir Henry Sidney, and Sir William Cecil.*

Such then were the opinions of the Reformers on the Continent—the fathers of Presbyterianism. But borne along by the current, they at length violated their own declared principles and clear convictions of duty. Like John Wesley in modern times, impatient of the movings of Providence, they could not wait God's time, and therefore rushed into open schism, and cut themselves off from the Church. And now, for three hundred years, the world has been reaping the bitter fruits of the harvest which they sowed. Strife and dissension, and every form of error, prevail among their followers, and in the lands where once they preached scarcely a trace of their spirit remains. "The first loss drew all others after it. Although the full declension was not seen at once, the mystical, moral, and doctrinal systems perished together. They lingered on as bodies of which the organic frame is maimed; and they died rather by a natural than by a mysterious law. Even after their virtual extinction as Christian Churches, there was, as in the corpse of the dead, a lingering warmth, which made a mocking promise of life; till that too fled, and they were left in the cold torpor of heresy or unbelief."†

From this melancholy picture of inconsistency, and

* *Ibid.* p. 141.

† Manning's *Unity of the Church*, p. 285.

spiritual desolation, we turn with gratitude to England, where the principles by which they were guided, and the end attained, were all so widely different. There, the Reformation left the whole Church, with its three-fold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, unimpaired. Bowing to no mere human opinions, when the views of Luther, Calvin, and Arminius, were quoted to turn her from the truth, she had a ready answer at hand, and a higher authority to quote—"Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are these?" With a careful hand the errors of doctrine and practice which had crept in, were removed, but nothing was touched which could injure the integrity of the Church. The venerable edifice itself was left unaltered. The dust which had settled upon it, obscuring the beauty of its architecture, was swept away—the deforming additions which the hand of man had made, were cut off—and then, it stood forth as it was in primitive times, in its ancient freshness and beauty. The order of her ministry was not interfered with—all that was pure and ancient in her Liturgy was retained—and from her we have derived the succession of Bishops and the Apostolic ministry. Through her, therefore, we can trace back our orders to the days of the Apostles, and feel that we receive from them that authority by which we minister at the altar.

This, then, is the simple historical account of the Reformation of our branch of the Church, and the origin of those who now declare, that but one order of ministers is necessary, and that Presbyters have power to ordain. They date back only for the last three hundred years. It was in 1594—before the

changes produced by the Reformation had subsided into quietness—that the learned Hooker, while he rejoiced at the happy lot of his own Church in England, as he heard the assertions made by those on the Continent who discarded Episcopal government, that their own form was primitive, issued to them this challenge—“A very strange thing sure it were, that such a discipline as ye speak of should be taught by Christ and His Apostles, in the word of God, and no Church ever have found it out, nor received it till this present time; contrariwise, the government against which ye bend yourselves be observed everywhere throughout all generations and ages of the Christian world, no Church ever perceiving the word of God to be against it. *We require you to find out but one Church upon the face of the whole earth, that hath been ordered by your discipline, or hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say, by Episcopal regiment, sithence the time that the blessed Apostles were here conversant.*”*

This challenge has never yet been answered, and it is on this point that we rest our argument. If for the first 1500 years no Church can be shown without Episcopal government, then what authority had any, at the end of that time, to form a new ministry of their own, setting aside that derived in uninterrupted succession from the Apostles?†

* Preface to Eccles. Polity, sect. 4.

† There are two excuses generally made by the followers of the Continental Reformers for this step. The first is that of *necessity*—their inability to procure orders from regularly ordained Bishops. We will answer this plea in the words of Bishop Whittingham:—

“It will not be denied that Luther was virtually in possession of Episcopal *jurisdiction*, at Wittemberg, after 1526; and Calvin, at

We will briefly mention one fact more. The reply commonly made to us is, that our evidence comes Geneva, after 1541. They needed but to obtain the *order*, to secure the Apostolical succession at least. . . . Could they have obtained the order?

“I. As to LUTHER. Several Bishops are known to have been favorable to ‘the new learning,’ and to its founder personally: e. g., George Polentius, Bishop of Sambia, in 1524; his successor, Paul Speratus, 1530; (Wernsdorf. *Program. de Anhaltinorum in Ref. meritis. p. 1. s.*); Matthew, Bishop of Bantzig, who wrote to Luther in terms of strong affection, and sent him a present, in 1529; (Luther’s *Briefe. Ep. 1110, ed. De Wette. III. 462*); Matthew Jagov’us, Bishop of Bradenburg; (the Diocesan of Wittemberg); the Archbishop of Salzburgh, who preceded Ernest; (accessit, 1540); and Herman, the famous reforming Archbishop of Cologne, of whose liturgical labors so much use has been made in some of the offices of the English Church. It is hard to believe, that if due anxiety had been felt, and proper measures taken, the Episcopal succession might not have been obtained for the Lutheran communion from some one or more of these prelates.

“II. As to CALVIN. Peter Paul Vergerio, Bishop of Capo d’Istria, and more than once Papal nuncio, went over to the Reformed about 1546. His brother, also a Bishop, followed him. Spifame, Bishop of Nevers, became a Protestant in 1557. He was employed in important negotiations, and was *in Geneva* about that time. He was called to be ‘ministre’ at Lyons, in 1561. (Bayle, *Art. Spifame.*) Jo. Anth. Caraccioli, Bishop of Troyes, publicly embraced Protestantism in 1561. He offered to resign to the people, but was re-elected and *re-ordained*. (Bayle, *Art. Caraccioli.*)” *Note to Palmer’s Treatise on the Church, v. i. p. 355.*

The probability is, that Calvin, being disheartened by the repulse he supposed he had received from the Church of England, resigned himself to circumstances, without making any further effort.

The second excuse made for the Reformers is, *the corruption of the Church*. But was it not rather their duty—as was done in England—to labor *in* the Church for its reform? When the ancient prophets were forced to cry, “Help, Lord, for the godly man ceaseth!” did they ever think of *go’ng out* from their people, and establishing a new nation, to serve God in greater purity? The Reformers, indeed, have given a mournful illustration of that declaration made by Irenæus, with regard to the heretics of his time—“No correction can be made by them so great as is the mischief of schism.” *Adv. Hæres. lib. iv. c.*

through the Church of Rome, and that this form of government is one of the corruptions introduced by her. We have, however, shown you, we think, most fully, that it existed in the earliest age, when the Bishop of Rome had no more authority than any other Bishop in Catholic Christendom. But suppose that a Church should now be discovered in some secluded corner of the world, which had been founded by the Apostles, and since their day remained cut off from other Churches, and without ever having heard of the Church of Rome; would you not consider their evidence as to the form of government handed down to them from the Apostles, to be a conclusive argument on this point? Yet precisely such an instance we have. When, in the sixteenth century, the Portuguese visited Southern India, they were agreeably surprised to find, on the coast of Malabar, a Christian nation, with upwards of a hundred Churches. But when they became acquainted with the simplicity and purity of their worship, they were offended. "These Churches," said they, "belong to the Pope." "*Who is the Pope?*" said the natives: "*we never heard of him.*" The tradition handed down among them was, that their Church had been founded by St. Thomas. They had always maintained the order and discipline of Episcopal jurisdiction, and for 1300 years past had enjoyed a succession of Bishops, appointed by the Patriarch of Antioch. "We"—said they—"are of the true faith, whatever you from the west may be; for we come from the place where the followers of Christ were first called Christians."

Refusing to subscribe to the tenets of the Church

of Rome, or to exchange for her form of service the pure liturgy they had inherited, persecution was commenced, and some of their clergy seized, and devoted to death as heretics. They were accused of the following practices and opinions,—which are, in truth, some of the points on which we also differ from the Church of Rome—“that they had married wives; that they owned but two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper; that they neither invoked Saints, nor worshipped Images, nor believed in Purgatory; and that they had no other orders or names of dignity in the Church, than Bishop, Priest, and Deacon.” The Churches on the sea-coast were thus compelled to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope; but they still refused to pray in Latin, and insisted on retaining their own language and liturgy. “This point”—they said—“they would only give up with their lives.” The Pope therefore compromised with them: Menezes altered their liturgy, but they retained their Syriac language, and have a Syriac college unto this day. These are called the Syro-Roman Churches, and are principally situated on the sea-coast. Not so, however, with those in the interior. They refused to yield to Rome—proclaimed eternal war against the Inquisition—hid their books—fled to the mountains, and sought the protection of the Native Princes, who had always been proud of their alliance.

Two centuries then elapsed without any definite information being received of their situation, and it even began to be doubted whether they were still in existence. In 1806, however, Dr. Buchanan, in his missionary travels, again found them in the interior, there in poverty and purity maintaining their faith in

the seclusion of the wilderness. The chain of their Episcopal ministry was still unbroken, their discipline was orderly, and their Scriptural liturgy pure from the corruptions of Rome. He thus relates part of a conversation which he had with one of their Bishops. "The Bishop was desirous to know something of the other Churches which had separated from Rome. I was ashamed to tell him how many they were. I mentioned, that there was a *Kasheesha* or Presbyter Church in our own Kingdom, in which every *Kasheesha* was equal to another. 'Are there no *Shumshanas*?' (Deacons in holy orders.) None. 'And what, is there nobody to overlook the *Kasheeshas*?' Not one. 'There must be something imperfect there,' said he."* It was, you perceive, a matter of surprise to him, that a Church could exist without a Bishop, and he justly considered it as wanting the marks of its Apostolicity. Here then, is an argument coming down from primitive days in a different channel.

Such then, brethren, is the historical evidence. We ask, therefore, if these three orders have not been in the Church from the very beginning, when were they introduced? This is a question which those opposed to us have never yet answered. We are told, in general terms, that at first all ministers were of equal rank and power in the Church, but at some period—when they know not—some managed to usurp authority, and thus arose the order of Bishops, and the Episcopal government.† And yet on the

* Buchanan's *Christian Researches in Asia*, pp. 69-71, 84. Edit. New-York, 1812.

† The only writer to whom they can pretend to refer, is Jerome, a few sentences from whose works they endeavor to construe in their

page of Ecclesiastical history it is impossible to point to a single trace of this great change. And would

favor. In his *Epistle to Evagrius*, he says—"I hear that one was so impudent as to rank Deacons before Presbyters, that is, Bishops. Now the Apostle plainly declares the same to be Presbyters, who also are Bishops." In his *Comment on Titus*, i. 7, he writes—"The same therefore is a Presbyter, who also is a Bishop: for before by the instigation of the Devil, parties were formed in religion, and it was said by the people, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, the Churches were governed by the council of Presbyters. But after some began to consider those which he had baptized to be his own, not Christ's, it was decreed throughout the whole world, that one be elected who should be put over the rest of the Presbyters. . . . By degrees, (*paulatim*,) that every sprout of dissension might be rooted out, all the authority was conferred upon one alone."

I. Let us, then, examine this passage, and we shall find it proves nothing against us. He says—1st. "The same were Presbyters, who also were Bishops." This he himself afterwards explains when he adds—"Because in the Bishop the Presbyter is contained. We are advanced from the less to the greater." 2d. When does he say the change took place? "When people said, I am of Paul, &c."—that is, in the very days of the Apostles. 3d. He asserts, that fixed Bishops were introduced "by degrees"—this is exactly in accordance with the Episcopal theory. As the Church extended, the Apostles could not personally superintend it, and therefore, "by degrees" placed others over the Churches with the same power they had themselves exercised, as increasing dissensions rendered it necessary. Such in brief is his testimony.

II. He has here a particular object in view, to oppose those who exalted Deacons to a level with Presbyters. He naturally, therefore, uses strong language, exalting Presbyters above measure. He says—"I hear that one was so impudent as to rank Deacons above Presbyters, &c."

III. In every other place, he distinctly upholds Episcopacy. In this very Epistle, in elevating Presbyters, he says—"What can a Bishop do, that a Presbyter may not do, EXCEPT ORDINATION?" This is all we ask. And again—"James, after the passion of our Lord, was immediately, by the Apostles, ordained Bishop of Jerusalem." (*Oper.* t. IV. pars. ii. p. 102.) Again—"The power of wealth, or the lowliness of poverty, renders a Bishop neither more nor less exalted; but *all are successors of the Apostles.*" (*Ibid.* p. 802.) On the 45th Psalm, he says—"Christ hath constituted Bishops to be the chiefs or

the Church, which contended so earnestly with regard to the day of celebrating Easter, or the reiteration of the baptism of heretics, have passed it over in total silence? Every minute heresy—every varying shade of opinion which arose, is fully dwelt upon by the early writers, and yet—except those two misinterpreted sentences in Jerome—the advocates of parity can find not one word—not the most distant hint, of this revolution which they say has taken place, and which in that case would have entirely remodelled the government of the whole Christian Church throughout the world. We ask you, then, whether this is probable? “When I shall see”—says Chillingworth—“all the fables in the metamorphosis acted, and prove true stories; when I shall see all the democracies and aristocracies in the world lie down and sleep, and awake into monarchies; then will I begin to believe, that presbyterial government, having continued in the Church during the Apostles’ times, should presently after, (against the Apostles’ doctrine, and the will of Christ,) be whirled about like a scene in a mask, and transformed into Episcopacy.”*

princes of the Church, in all parts of the world.” If, therefore, he ever writes against Episcopacy, he contradicts himself.

IV. Jerome personally could know nothing of the matter, not living until nearly three hundred years after the death of the Apostles. We have the record of history through all the long interval between the apostles’ and his day, testifying with one voice to the existence of Episcopacy.

Here then is the sole hope of the Presbyterians. It is, of course, impossible in this note to do more than glance at this passage. The reader will find it fully analyzed and discussed in *Dr. Bowden’s Letters to Dr. Miller—Letter 1st of 1st Series*, and *Letter 5th of 2d Series*. Also in *Slater’s Original Draught*.

* Works, p. 525.

Again—Is it in accordance with human nature, that all the clergy of the Church, in every country throughout the world, should simultaneously have given up their rights, and submitted themselves to some among their number, thus creating the Episcopal authority; and that all this should have been acquiesced in by each one so quietly, and performed so silently, that history nowhere notices the change? “Imagine,”—says Chillingworth again—“that the spirit of Diotrephes had entered into some, or a great many of the Presbyters, and possessed them with an ambitious desire of a forbidden superiority, was it possible they should attempt and achieve it at once without any opposition or contradiction? And besides, that the contagion of this ambition should spread itself and prevail without stop or control; nay, without any noise or notice taken of it, through all the Churches in the world: all the watchmen in the mean time being so fast asleep, and all the dogs so dumb, that not so much as one should open his mouth against it?”*

Why, try this argument by what would happen under like circumstances in this day. Suppose that in a single widely extended denomination of those around us, now holding to an equality in the ministry, it should be proposed to make this change—that a few should be invested with the authority of Bishops, and all the rest yield to them in obedience—how long, do you think, it would take to produce this alteration? And how quietly would it be done? Why protest after protest would be entered against it—their fold would be rent asunder with dissensions

* *Ibid.* p. 524.

—and it would be found recorded upon the page of their history, that this was for years the absorbing topic of debate. And yet they tell us, that such a change *did* once actually take place in ancient times, and history has preserved no evidence of it. No, brethren, such arguments bear with them their own refutation. Human nature then was precisely what it is now, and in similar circumstances would have acted as it now does. We know, therefore, that this power of the Episcopate must have been from the very beginning—must have been sanctioned by Apostolical, nay, by Divine authority or it never would have been acquiesced in during any later age.

And now, I submit the truth of Episcopacy to your judgment, as a matter of fact. I appeal away from your passions and your prejudices, and resting this subject on its historical evidence, I bring it to the bar of your reason. And think not that this is a doctrine held only by a small minority. Nine-tenths of those who bear the Christian name, cling to it, and avow their belief in the three-fold ministry as handed down from the Apostles' days.* Our own Church,

* Malte-brun, in his *Geography* (vol. i. p. 273), has the following estimate of the Christian population of the world :—

The Church of Rome,	{	in Europe, 88 millions,	}	116 millions.
		out of Europe, 28 “		
The Greek Church	-	-	-	70 “
The Protestant Churches	-	-	-	42 “

Total, 228

Now, out of the 42 millions of Protestants, we may safely set down one-half as belonging to these branches of the Church—such as the Church in England and its colonies, Denmark, this country, and among the Moravians—which acknowledge Episcopal government. This leaves, therefore, 21 millions of Dissenters, out of 228 millions—less than *one-tenth*. “They,” says Manning, “that are concerned to

with her 21 Bishops and her 1200 clergy, scattered through the length and breadth of the land, everywhere maintains it. So does the Church of England, planted as she is in every clime and on every shore.* The Church of Rome, amidst all the corruptions she has admitted, has in this point remained steadfast to ancient truth. The many millions of the Greek Church, spread through the East, have never doubted it; while the decayed Oriental Churches of Syria, Asia Minor, and Ethiopia, have, even in their fallen state, found in their government the sole preservative for the little spark of life which yet remains. Only a small portion of the Christian world therefore dissents.†

establish a looser theory than that of the Catholic Church, how numerous soever when taken by themselves, are a small fraction of the Christendom of to-day, and as a handful compared with the multitudes of Christians who from the beginning have lived, hoped, suffered, and died, in another trust."—*Unity of the Church*, p. 288.

* "The Church of England, in the preface to the Ordination Services, has these express words: 'It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, &c.' . . . And it is on this account that, if a clergyman of the Roman Communion does in this country join himself to the English Church, his ordination is accounted good and valid, because the Roman Church has Episcopal ordination, and an Apostolical Ministry. He is not ordained over again, but simply licensed by a Bishop to teach and preach in his Diocese. Whereas, if a Protestant dissenter, who has been accustomed to call himself a minister of the Gospel, repents of his schism, and is anxious to become a clergyman, the English Church considers him merely as a layman, and not as a minister of the Gospel; and makes him a clergyman by Episcopal ordination."—*Fabers' Tract on 'The one Catholic and Apostolic Church,'* p. 18.

† There is a body of Christians, called "Methodist *Episcopal*," which we have not included in this list; because, although they have the office of Bishop, yet it is in name only, and without any legitimate authority. This sect, it is well known, was founded about 1730, by

Let us cling then to this, as a precious inheritance which has come down to us through 1800 years.

John Wesley, who was only a *Presbyter* in the Church of England. After professing through his whole life that he did not intend to abandon the Church, or create a schism, when 82 years old, he was induced to lay hands on Dr. Coke, and thus pretend to consecrate him a Bishop for America. On this act, his brother, Charles Wesley, makes these remarks—"How was he surprised into so rash an action? *He has renounced the principles and practices of his whole life, acted contrary to all his declarations, protestations, and writings, robbed his friends of their boasting, realized the Nag's Head ordination, and left an indelible blot on his name as long as it shall be remembered. . . .* What will become of these poor sheep in the wilderness, the American Methodists? How have they been betrayed into a separation from the Church of England, which their preachers and they no more intended than the Methodists here! Had they had patience a little longer, they would have seen A REAL PRIMITIVE BISHOP in America, duly consecrated by three Scotch Bishops [referring to Bishop Seabury." *His ordination would be indeed genuine, valid, and Episcopal.*"

Dr. Coke himself felt his ordination to be invalid, and often by his acts admitted it. For instance, in 1791, he applied to Bishop White, for the Methodist Society to be received into the Church, and *their preachers re-ordained*, thus acknowledging the invalidity of their ordination received from him. (See his letter in *Bp. White's Memoirs of the Church*, p. 345.) In a subsequent interview he suggested that *he himself should be elevated to the Episcopate* (p. 170). Still later in the same year, he made a similar proposal to Bishop Seabury. Eight years afterwards, he made written application to the Bishop of London, to ordain some travelling preachers in England, to administer the Sacraments to their people. Again, in 1813, he made the greatest efforts to procure consecration for himself as a Bishop of the Church, to be sent to India, writing a most extraordinary letter to Wilberforce, setting forth his own good qualities. (See this in *Wilberforce's Correspondence*, v. i., date April 14, 1813.) He offers to return most fully and faithfully into the bosom of the Established Church, and do everything in his power to promote its interests, and submit to all such restrictions in the fulfilment of his office as the government and the bench of Bishops at home should think necessary." Failing in this, he was obliged to settle down for life with the conviction that his office was a pretence, and his *Episcopal* shield deformed by the *bend sinister*.

Everything else has altered, but the government which our Lord instituted in His Church is still unchanged. Century after century, the dark and troublous stream of Time has swept by, its waters choked with the wrecks of all that earth admires. Nations and peoples, courts and dynasties, have played their part, and then been seen no more. The mighty monarchies of the Elder World have long since passed away—the kingdoms which were the early cotemporaries of the Church—those which beheld the dawn of her youth—now live only on the page of History—yet she still rides the waves, and as she passed along, has made all tributaries to herself, gathering from each spoils to enrich her Master—jewels to gleam in His unfading diadem. With her hopes now just as bright and glorious as ever, she remains in her organization what she was in the Apostles' days. The same Episcopal government which Timothy then exercised at Ephesus, and Titus in Crete, and which they “committed to faithful men,” is now with us in this distant land, of whose very existence they were ignorant.

We feel, then, that as members of this Church we belong to a cause which in the end must triumph. “The heathen may rage, and the people imagine a vain thing—the kings of the earth may stand up, and the rulers take counsel together”—yet the Church

Thus, then, stands the case. Wesley attempted to invest Dr. Coke with an office which he had no authority to confer. Coke ordained Asbury, and from him all the Methodist preachers in this country derive their ordination. But Asbury was of course nothing but a layman through life, and therefore those on whom he laid hands are in the same condition. Such, then, is Methodism in this country—*without a Church or a Ministry.*

they cannot overcome. "There shall no divination prosper against Israel." He who is its Protector "shall laugh them to scorn, and its Lord shall have them in derision." Yes, brethren, the past may be with us a pledge for the future. If for eighteen centuries the Apostolic Church has breasted the storm, and uninjured, unchanged, come down to us—if now we trace in every lineament, that here is the same Church which existed in "our fathers' days, and in the old time before them"—then we may believe that thus she shall continue to go on in the greatness of her strength, until the trumpet of the Archangel proclaims that her warfare on earth is accomplished. Her ancient ministry shall never be wanting. Her holy succession of Bishops shall be uninterrupted, till the last who bears that sacred office stands amidst the ruins of a crumbling world.* Unless it shall be so, what meant our Lord's parting promise to His Apostles—"Lo, I am with you *always*, even unto *the end of the world*"? It could not have been restricted to those only who heard it, for they have long since passed away. Unless, then, they left their successors, who are to keep up the unbroken chain "even unto the end of the world," we know not who are to inherit the benefits which our Master's words seem to promise.

Are we then united with this Church—not only

* "Remarkable and positive promises clearly establish the perpetuity of the Church; and it may also be inferred easily from the promise made to the faithful servant, whom the Lord should set over His household: 'Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, *when He cometh*, shall find so doing.' In which words it is intimated, that when Christ shall come in the latter day, He shall, even then, find faithful servants presiding over His own household, still existing upon the earth."—*Palmer's Treatise on the Church*, v. i. p. 31.

outwardly, but also in heart and spirit? Are we sharing in her trials here, that we may partake of her triumph hereafter? Shall we, in the hour of her glory, stand with her upon the holy mountain, and help to upraise that anthem which the redeemed shall sing forever? Christian warrior! the conflict is raging around you—the Church is summoning you to her aid—the voices of Apostles, and martyrs, and confessors, come down to you from the ages of a distant antiquity, urging you to live for this cause for which they were willing even to die. Will you turn away from this appeal? Will you prove recreant to this high trust? Your daily, hourly life is furnishing the answer.

IV.

ANTIQUITY OF FORMS OF PRAYER.

Then, fainting soul, arise and sing,
Mount, but be sober on the wing ;
Mount up, for Heaven is won by prayer,
Be sober, for thou art not there.

Keble.

THE foundation of all true devotion is reverence. Remembering the lowliness of our own state, and the awful majesty of Him in whose presence our petitions are uttered, our spirits should be bowed within us, and we realize, while in His sanctuary, that "this is none other but the House of God, and this is the gate of Heaven." The question then involuntarily rises to our lips—"Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God?"* And the answer which Scripture gives us, is in these words of caution—"Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter anything before God; for God is in Heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few."†

In the spirit of this exhortation the Church has always acted, when she prescribed a Liturgy, by which her members, in their public assemblies, were commanded to worship God, instead of trusting to the extemporaneous effusions of the moment. And this is a peculiarity which still marks her services, and which, perhaps, more forcibly than anything

* Micah vi. 6.

† Eccles. v. 2.

else, would strike a casual observer. In her public devotions, he finds everything definitely arranged and settled; while in the different denominations around her the prayers are left to be composed as they are uttered by him who may happen to minister to them. As, therefore, the charge is often made, that to have an established ritual for public worship leads necessarily to coldness and formality, an examination of this subject is one which is interesting to us as Churchmen.

The first and most natural inquiry is, as to the authority for a Liturgy. Is it sanctioned by Scripture—by the example of our Lord, and the custom of the early Church? If so, surely none can now object to it as wrong or even inexpedient. What our Lord authorized by his own example, and the Church in her first and purest ages continued to practise, it may be safe for us to follow. We certainly cannot do better than tread in their footsteps.

Our first argument then is—*that the entire worship of the Jewish Church, as commanded by God, and as practised for ages, was in prescribed forms.* On every occasion in which the people were required with one voice to offer their praises to God, or to entreat His forgiveness, we find them doing so in the words of a previously written form.

Thus, when the Israelites had passed the Red Sea in safety, and paused awhile upon their march to chant their song of victory, we find their leader composing for them that noble ode, which the Holy Ghost compares with the Heavenly song of those who have obtained the last great triumph over all spiritual enemies—the once suffering, now ransomed followers

of the Lamb.* “It was fitted for alternate recitation, with musical accompaniments.”† Moses begins the song, and in the first two hemistichs states its object—

‘Sing ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously ;
The horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea.’”

And we learn from v. 21, that these two lines became the grand chorus of the piece, and were probably repeated at intervals, after the people had recited each mercy bestowed upon their nation. “And Miriam answered them—

‘Sing ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously ;
The horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea.’”‡

This song was, therefore, used responsively, in the same way in which we now recite the Psalter in our service.

When, again, in the wilderness, their public worship was arranged by the express commands of God, we find that forms were provided for every occasion. Thus, Aaron and his sons are enjoined to use these words, in blessing the people—“On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel: The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; the Lord make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.” This was the authorized form of benediction, and the declaration is added—“They shall

* “And I saw as it were a sea of glass, mingled with fire : and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing *the song of Moses the servant of God*, and the song of the Lamb.” Rev. xv. 2, 3.

† Bishop Jebb's Sacred Literature, p. 10.

‡ This is the view given by Dr. Kennicott, in his arrangement of this song, and also by Bishop Lowth. *Prælect* 19. They show th different intervals at which the chorus probably came in.

put my name, saith the Lord, upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them." (Num. vi. 24, 27.)

In the book of Deuteronomy are recorded various forms to be used by the people on different public solemnities. Such is the confession the Israelite was to make when offering the basket of first-fruits—"And thou shalt speak and say before the Lord thy God—A Syrian ready to perish was my father," &c. (xxvi. 5-11.) Such also is the prayer he was to use when offering his third year's tithes—"Then thou shalt say before the Lord thy God," &c. (v. 12-15.) With equal accuracy is prescribed the form of deprecation to be uttered by the elders of a city near which a murder had been committed, in protesting their own innocence—"Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Be merciful, O Lord, unto thy people Israel, whom thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood to thy people of Israel's charge." (xxi. v. 7.)

Thus, by examining the ancient books of the law, we could show that provision was made for every portion of their regular services. And on extraordinary occasions it is evident that something was in like manner written for their use, to meet the exigency. Such was the case with the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple, a copy of which was preserved among the records of the nation. "The regular construction of the whole prayer, the formal division of the subject, together with the continued series and almost poetical arrangement of the versicles in the original, scarcely seem

compatible with extemporaneous devotion, and obviously suggests the idea of previous composition."*

But let us look at the usual worship of the Temple, and of what did it consist? From the minute accounts of the Hebrew Rabbis which have come down to us, we learn that it was composed of the Sacrifices, Liturgical Compositions, and Psalms.† But it is evident that the Psalms are nothing but forms of prayer, and are in most cases direct and solemn addresses to the Supreme Being. In this way they were used in the Jewish Church, and we can often learn from their titles alone, that they were appointed to be recited by the congregation on particular days. This collection was probably first arranged definitely by King David, who added so much as to gain for himself the title of "the sweet singer of Israel." It was afterwards remodelled by Hezekiah, of whom it is said—"Moreover, Hezekiah the king, and the princes, commanded the Levites to sing praises unto the Lord, *with the words of David and of Asaph the seer*; and they sang praises with gladness, and they bowed their heads and worshipped."‡ The last changes in the Psalmody of the nation were made by Ezra, after the captivity. Did then the adoption of these devotional services lead to mere formality? If so, why is not the same effect produced upon those who now can address the Deity in metrical hymns, yet whose scruples prevent them from using a form, if it be in prose?§

* Sinclair's Dissertations, p. 8.

† The reader will find the whole service, with its prayers and arrangement of Psalms, accurately given by Lightfoot, in his *Temple Service*, ch. 7. p. 59.

‡ 2 Chron. xxix. 30.

§ "Unless it can be proved that the fault and evil which is es-

But this is not all. We have direct evidence that at various periods during the existence of the Jewish nation, their prophets and holy men composed prayers to be used in their public worship. Thus, after the return from Babylon, Ezra prepared eighteen collects, for confession, supplication, thanksgiving, and intercession. These, under the title of *Ezra's Benedictions*, are still found in the Prayer Books of the Jews. Maimonides, a learned Rabbi, says—“Ezra composed these eighteen forms of prayer, which were enjoined by the great council: that every man might have them in his mouth, and be perfect in them, and that thereby the prayers of the rude and ignorant might be as complete as those of a more eloquent tongue.” And then, after stating the custom which prevailed, that the people should say “Amen” at the conclusion, he adds—“This is only in those cases where the people are not perfect in the prayers, and cannot say the same by heart; for they who can repeat the prayers, do not discharge their duty as they ought, in case they themselves do not pray with the public minister.”* These prayers have all been translated by Dr. Prideaux, and are to be found in his *Connection of Scripture History*.†

sential to a form in prose, is entirely removed if the substance of the obnoxious form be expressed in metre and chime—

Crito freely will rehearse
Forms of prayer and praise in verse :
Why should Crito then suppose
Forms are sinful when in prose ?
Must my form be deemed a crime,
Merely for the want of rhyme ?”

Newton's Apologia, p. 14.

* Maimon. apud Seld. in Eutyech. Alex. p. 43.

† Part I, book vi. p. 375.

And so it was also in the worship of the Synagogue. The service there differed somewhat from that of the Temple, for no sacrifices were offered up. It consisted of three parts: prayers, reading of the Scriptures, and preaching from them. Here also the prayers were by stated forms, the most solemn and ancient of which were the prayers of Ezra.* To these—as we learn from Justin Martyr—they added, just before the destruction of Jerusalem, a nineteenth collect, praying against the new sect of the Nazarenes, whom they denominated apostates and heretics.†

In addition, as we are informed by Jewish writers, their Ritual provided for all those occurrences which mark the changes in domestic life—for those solemnities of their religion which were performed at home—for times of joy and sorrow—for the Passover—the marriage, and the burial.‡ And many of these had been handed down from a remote antiquity. The Samaritan Chronicle speaks of a book of prayers used by the Jews at their sacrifices, “from the time of their legate Moses until that day;”§ and Josephus asserts, that at the period in which he lived, the sect of the Essenes made use of prayers “received traditionally from their fathers.”|| Nor has the lapse of eighteen centuries entirely changed their customs. Could you now meet with the feeble, dispersed remnant of Israel, scattered as they are throughout all the world, yet everywhere cleaving to their forefathers’ rites—could you see them in their private services, or when on the Seventh Day they have

* Bingham’s *Orig. Eccles.* lib. xiii. chap. 5, sect. 4.

† *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 335.

‡ Sinclair’s *Dissertation*, p. 10.

§ Sinclair’s *Dissertation*, p. 11

|| *De Bello Jud.* lib. ii. chap. 12.

gathered in their Synagogues—you would hear the same words of the Hebrew Psalter chanted forth, and the same ancient prayers of their Liturgy offered up, with which two thousand years ago their fathers worshipped, in the days of their pride and power.* We perceive then how fully established under the Old Dispensation, and how entirely authorized by God—nay, especially commanded by Him—was the use of forms of prayer. If, then, these were enjoined upon the Jew, is it wrong in the Christian in this way to worship the same God?

But the Old Dispensation, we are answered, was a day of rites and ceremonies—a day when the human mind was in bondage, “subject to ordinances.” We are directed to look to the coming of our Lord for that spiritual freedom which was then bestowed upon the world. He was indeed our Great Exemplar, and we may well mark His course, as He travelled on in His earthly pilgrimage, and in all respects humbly walk in His footsteps. Can we then gather anything from His life to aid us in this investigation? We can, and therefore we set forth the argument *that the use of forms of prayer in public worship was sanctioned by our Lord while on earth, both by precept and example.*

We have already shown you that the worship of the Jews, both in the Temple and the Synagogue, was according to a prescribed Liturgy. And yet our Lord always attended these services, and scrupulously joined in their public devotions. On all the great Feasts He went up to Jerusalem with His

* See the Prayers of the Jews as they are now used, translated in *Horne's Introd. to Scrip.* v. iii. p. 250-3.

disciples, while Sabbath after Sabbath He appeared so regularly in the Synagogue, that His watchful enemies, while seeking every occasion to charge Him with opposition to the Law, never brought forward the accusation of neglecting their appointed worship. But had there been anything wrong in the manner in which this was performed—had the Liturgical Service been merely a corruption introduced by the Scribes and Pharisees—would He, think you, have been backward in denouncing the innovation, and restoring the service to its ancient simplicity? No, brethren; had there been coldness or formality in this custom, the same zeal which led our Master to drive from the Temple “the money-changers, and those that sold doves,” would have impelled Him also to rebuke the priests for the want of spirituality in their worship. But He did not: on the contrary, He fully countenanced it; and therefore it cannot be wrong or inexpedient.

In that solemn hour, too, when the Paschal Supper was just closing, and our Lord “sang a hymn” with His disciples, before He went forth to the last scene of His trial and agony, we know from the voice of tradition, and the concurrence of all antiquity, that He adopted, as was natural, the particular form always made use of by the Jews at the end of the Passover. It was called the *Great Hallel*, or hymn of praise, and consisted of Psalms cxv. to cxviii. inclusive.* So was it also amid the fearful sufferings

* *Lightfoot's Temple Service*, ch. xiii. *Fahn's Bib. Archaeology*, p. 449. *Horne's Introd. to Script.*, vol. iii. p. 306. Dr. Adam Clark, in his Commentary on Matt. xxvi. 30, makes it begin with Ps. cxiii. He says, “As to the Hymn itself, we know from the universal consent of Jewish antiquity that it was composed of Psalms cxiii. to

of the Cross. When His human nature was, as it were, crushed by the sorrows heaped upon Him, the words which seemed naturally to rise to His lips were those of the Psalter. The inquiry—"My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" is the commencement of the 22d Psalm; and the words which last he uttered—"Into thy hands I commend my spirit," compose the 5th verse of the 31st Psalm. Thus, in the language of the divines of Leyden—"Christ, while suspended from the Cross, used that golden form of prayer which David, as His prototype, had composed."*

Another strong proof of our Lord's sanction is derived from that model of devotion which He Himself gave to His disciples. John the Baptist had taught his followers to pray by a set form, and the little household of believers who had gathered around our Master, and composed the Early Church, requested Him also to do the same. Their petition was—"Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught cxviii., termed by the Jews, *Hallel*. . . These six Psalms were always sung at every Paschal solemnity."

Jacob Abbott, in his *Corner-Stone*, ends his description of the last Passover with a pathetic appeal to St. John. "'And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives.' What could have been their hymn? Its sentiments and feelings, they who can appreciate the occasion may perhaps conceive; but what were its words? *Beloved disciple! why didst thou not record them?* They should have been sung in every nation, and language, and clime. We should have fixed them in our hearts, and taught them to our children, and when we came together to commemorate our Redeemer's sufferings, we should never have separated without singing *his* parting hymn." (p. 219.)

A very slight knowledge of Jewish antiquities might have pointed out to Mr. Abbott what was probably *the form* which he wishes to have so extensively adopted.

* Sinclair's Dissertation, p. 12.

his disciples." And what did He answer? Did He tell them, in all cases to trust to the passing feelings of the moment, and to shun as coldness everything which is not extemporaneous? No; He at once prescribed that form now known by the name of the *Lord's Prayer*, and which the Church has since in all ages continued to use in her worship. It is a most striking fact, too, that every single sentence in this prayer is taken from the Jewish Liturgies, with which the disciples were already familiar.* "So far," says Grotius, "was the Lord Himself of the Christian Church from all affectation of unnecessary novelty." What stronger confirmation, then, could He give of His approval? And should we not be contented to follow in the steps of our Divine Master—to worship as He did—and in accordance with the example which He sets, to "hold fast the form of sound words," when we approach our God?

Our next argument is derived from the *uniform practice of the Primitive Church*. The early disciples followed the example of the Jewish Church, which their Lord had thus sanctioned, and adopted forms of prayer suited to the wants of the Church under

* Abundant proof of this can be found in Lightfoot (on Matt. ix. 9–13) and the works of several other learned men. Mr. Gregory has collected the expressions out of the different Jewish Euchologies, and thus translated them:—

"Our Father, which art in Heaven, be gracious unto us! O Lord our God, hallowed be Thy name, and let the remembrance of Thee be glorified in Heaven above, and upon earth here below. Let thy kingdom reign over us, now and for ever. The holy men of old said, remit and forgive unto all men whatsoever they have done against me. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil thing. For thine is the kingdom, and thou shalt reign in glory for ever and for evermore." *Horne's Introd. to Scrip.* v. iii. p. 296.

the new dispensation. In the fourth chapter of the Acts is an Apostolic form of Prayer. It was delivered on the return of Peter and John from the Jewish council, when, in the assembly of their brethren, they "reported all that the chief priests and elders had said unto them." We are told, "when they heard that, they lifted up their voices to God with one accord," and in (what Bishop Jebb calls) "this noble supplicatory hymn; poured forth at once by the whole Christian people," they returned thanks for the past, and begged strength for the future. We give the same distinguished writer's version of the parallels—*

1. O Lord, thou art the God,
Who didst make Heaven and earth,
And the sea, and all things that are in them;
Who, by the mouth of thy servant David, didst say:
2. "Why did the heathen rage,
And the people imagine vain things,
The kings of the earth stand up,
And the rulers combine together
Against the Lord and against his anointed?"
3. For of a truth there have combined
Against thine holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed,
Both Herod and Pontius Pilate,
With the heathen and the peoples of Israel,
To do whatsoever things thy hand
And thy counsel predetermined to be done.
4. And now, Lord, look down upon their threatenings,
And give unto thy servants
With all boldness to speak thy word:
While thou art stretching forth thine hand for healing,
And while signs and wonders are performed
Through the name of thine holy child Jesus.

The manner in which this prayer was uttered—the whole people "lifting up their voices to God with

* Jebb's Sacred Literature, p. 132-142.

one accord"—together with the regular poetical measure in which it is written, prove, we think, that it must have been a pre-composed form, with which all were familiar. To use again the words of Bishop Jebb—"The same sacred vein of poetry animates the whole; and yet, amidst all this poetic fervor, we may discern much technical nicety of construction." The view, therefore, taken of it by Mr. Chapin, is one which would commend itself to the reason of any person not biased by prejudice. "The occasion upon which the use of this prayer is recorded, was the extraordinary escape of Peter and John from the hands of the Jews. And yet there is no allusion to the circumstance. It is just such a prayer as they would be likely to use on every occasion of meeting together—one that would be applicable to their case at all times. Hence, as this *general* prayer was used upon an *especial* occasion, it is but reasonable to infer that it had been pre-composed, and formed a part of their daily worship."*

Occasionally, in the Epistles, we find an incidental allusion to their service, which strengthens the view we have given. Thus, the Colossians are directed "to teach and admonish one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs." These, of course, must have been previously prepared. And to what, unless one of these—probably an Easter Hymn—could the Apostle refer in his Epistle to the Ephesians (v. 14), when he writes—"Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light?" Where is this said in Scripture? The words are nowhere else to be found. Since therefore $\Delta 10$

* Prim. Church, p. 130.

λέγει, rendered in our version “*he saith,*” might as well be translated “*it saith,*” we may believe this to be a quotation from some now forgotten anthem of the Early Church. Such is the view of Bishop Jebb,* and the lines certainly form a triplet of constructive parallelisms—

εγειραι ὁ καθευδων,
 και αναβτα εκ των νεκρων,
 και επιφανσει σοι ὁ Χριστος.

Awake, thou who sleepest,
 And arise from the dead,
 And Christ will shine upon thee.

St. Paul, also, in writing to the Corinthians, mentions the custom of saying AMEN, at the close of the prayer. (1 Cor. xiv. 16.) This, Justin Martyr, in the middle of the second century, says, was the universal practice of the Church.†

We now turn to the Primitive Church in the age immediately following that of the Apostles. The form most frequently used was the Lord’s Prayer, endeared to them by so many associations connecting it with Him from whose lips they first learned its holy words. Tertullian calls it “not only a rule prescribing the method and matter of prayer, but a form to be used in the words in which Christ delivered it, and to be added to all other prayers, as the founda-

* “Wolfius, *Cur. Philol.* ; and Rosenmüller, cite Henmann (*Pœciles*, tom. ii. p. 390), as conjecturing these three lines to have been borrowed from one of those ‘hymns, or spiritual songs,’ which, even in the Apostles’ days, were used in the Christian Church, and which are immediately noticed by St. Paul, in the same chapter of the same Epistle, verse 19. The conjecture has been approved and adopted by Professors Stow and Michaelis, nor is it opposed by Rosenmüller.”

Jebb’s Sacred Literature, p. 150.

† *Apol.* i. c. 87.

tion of a superstructure.”* St. Chrysostom, in two volumes of his works—the third and the fifth—makes the declaration more than twenty times, “that the Lord’s Prayer was a common form in use among them, by the express command of Christ.” And St. Augustine, in his *Retractations*, confirms this, asserting that “the whole Church will continue to use it to the end of the world.”†

“Evident is it, beyond dispute,” says the learned Bingham, “that the whole Primitive Church constantly used it in all her holy offices, out of consciousness and regard to Christ’s command. . . . For there was no considerable Divine office, in the celebration of which this prayer did not always make a solemn part.”‡ This was the case in Baptism, when each person was enjoined to repeat it as soon as the rite was administered. “Immediately after this”—say the *Apostolical Constitutions*—“let him stand and pray the prayer which the Lord hath taught us.”§ And St. Chrysostom in like manner informs us, that as soon as he leaves the water, “he says these words, ‘Our Father which art in Heaven,’” &c.¶ This was done in the same manner at the celebration of the Eucharist. St. Cyril says—“After the oblation prayer, we say that prayer which our Saviour delivered to His disciples, calling God our Father with a pure conscience, and saying, ‘Our Father, which art in Heaven.’”¶ And St. Augustine informs us—“The whole Church concludes the prayer of benediction and sanctification with the Lord’s Prayer.”**

* De Orat. cap. 9.

† Lib. i. cap. 19.

‡ Orig. Eccles. lib. xiii. chap. 7, sect. 2.

§ Lib. vi. cap. 44.

|| Hom. 6, in Coloss.

¶ Catech. Myst. v. p. 298.

** Epist. 59, ad. Paulin.

It also made a part of their daily Morning and Evening Prayers, distinct from the Communion office,* as well as of the private devotions of individuals. Thus St. Chrysostom says—"Christ, to induce us to unanimity and charity, enjoins us to make common prayer, and obliges the whole Church, as if it were but one person, to say, 'Our Father,' and 'Give us this day our daily bread,' &c., always using a word of the plural number, and commanding every one, whether he pray alone by himself, or in company with others, still to make prayer for his brethren."† Therefore it had the name of *Oratio Quotidiana*, the Christian's Daily Prayer, and was used alike by heretics and schismatics, as by the Catholics.‡

We have so particularly brought forward the use of this prayer in the early ages, not only as showing the attachment of Christians to it as a form, but also because it will be evident, from an examination of the passages quoted, that it often thus formed one portion of a precomposed service. There were indeed certain forms which were in all Churches substantially the same, and were used in connection with the ordinary Liturgy. These were, the form for Baptism,§ that for the consecration of the Eucharist,|| and the Doxologies.¶ This Bingham has most fully shown. And the reason for uniformity in these particular services is evident. They included the grand cardinal points of our faith, and therefore,

* 3 Bing. Orig. Eccles. lib. xiii. ch. 7, sect. 4.

† Com. in Ps. cxii.

‡ Orig. Eccles. lib. xiii. ch. 7, sect. 7.

§ Ibid. lib. xi. ch. 3, and ch. 7. See also *Chapin's Prim. Church*, p. 127.

|| Ibid. lib. xv. ch. 3.

¶ Ibid. lib. xiv. ch. 2.

while they agreed, there was—to use Bingham's own words—"but one form of worship throughout the whole Church, as to what concerned the substance of Christian worship."

With respect to the other parts of the Liturgy—the ordinary prayers—it is evident that each Bishop was at liberty to form his own in what method and words he thought proper, only keeping to the analogy of faith and sound doctrine. Thus, we are told that St. Basil, among other good services which he did for the Church at Cæsarea, while he was but a Presbyter in it, composed forms of prayer, which, by the consent and authority of the Bishop, Eusebius, were regularly used there. And this is thought by many to be the first draught of that Liturgy which bears his name to this day. The Church of Neo-Cæsarea, in Pontus, where St. Basil was born, had a Liturgy peculiar to itself, of which he speaks in one of his Epistles. St. Chrysostom's Liturgy, which he composed for the Church of Constantinople, differed from these. The Ambrosian, Roman, and African forms, all varied in some particulars.* When also any new Church was founded, it did not feel itself obliged to follow, except in spirit, the model and words of the Church from which it came, but altered the old Liturgy to suit its own peculiar circumstances and condition, in the same way that we adapted the Liturgy of the Church in England to our situation in this country. Of this, the historian Sozomen gives an example in the instance of Maiuma, in Palestine, which once belonged to the diocese of Gaza. For, as soon as it was erected into a distinct Episco-

* Orig. Eccles. lib. iii. ch. 6.

pal See, it was no longer obliged to observe precisely the rules and forms of the Church of Gaza, but had, as he particularly remarks, a calendar for the festivals of its own martyrs, and commemorations of the Bishops and Presbyters who had lived among them.*

After, however, a Liturgy was adopted in each Church, and so modelled in minor points as to meet its peculiar wants, we have reason to believe that it remained with but little alteration. Mr. Palmer says —“ That each Church preserved continually the same Liturgy is certain. It is impossible to peruse the notices supplied by the Fathers, without perceiving that the baptized Christians were supposed to be familiar with every part of the service ; and continual allusions are made to various particulars as well known, which it would be impossible to explain, except by referring to the Liturgies still extant. The order of the parts was always preserved, the same rites and ceremonies continually repeated, the same ideas and language, without material variation, transmitted from generation to generation. The people always knew the precise points at which they were to repeat their responses, chant their sacred hymn, or join in the well known prayer.”† We can give an example of this by a comparison of the works of Justin Martyr and Cyril of Jerusalem. The former in the middle of the second century gives an account of the order of worship in the Syrian Churches in his day.‡ The latter, 150 years later, describes the solemn Liturgy which was celebrated after the dis-

* *Ibid.* lib. xiii. ch. 5.

† *Antiq. of English Ritual*, v. i. p. 9.

‡ *Apol.* i. p. 96.

missal of the Catechumens.* These two writers lived in different parts of the Patriarchate of Antioch, but it is evident they are referring to a Liturgy essentially the same, and which, during the interval of time which separated them, had not substantially changed. It is that which we now have under the name of the Liturgy of St. James.

From the prevalence of this spirit of hostility to change, we should naturally expect that, after the lapse of some centuries, a substantial uniformity would be found in the ritual of the different Churches. And such is the case. All the Primitive Liturgies may plainly be reduced to four, which were undoubtedly the original forms from which they were modelled. These are, first, *the Oriental Liturgy*, which prevailed through the entire East, and was ascribed by tradition to St. James. Second, *the Liturgy of St. Peter*, which was used through Italy, Sicily, and the North of Africa. Third, *St. Mark's Liturgy*, adopted by the Christians throughout Egypt, Ethiopia, and the neighboring countries on the Mediterranean Sea. And fourth, *St. John's Liturgy*, which prevailed through Gaul, Spain, and the exarchate of Ephesus, until the fifth century. Now upon examining these, we find that the principal ideas are the same. The principal rites are identical, and there is a general uniformity of arrangement among them all. These facts prove, therefore, that at a distant antiquity they must have had a common origin, or been at least written by men who shared in the same feelings; while there is also sufficient diversity to show the remoteness of the period at which they had

* Cyr. Op. 296.

their rise.* Their use was indeed so extensive in those ages, when Bishops were most independent,

* We here give the arrangement. The striking resemblance to our Communion Service will be at once perceived :—

ST. PETER'S LITURGY.

Italy, Sicily, and Africa.

1. Lift up your hearts, &c.
2. Therefore with Angels, &c.
3. Prayer for the Church militant.
4. Consecration Prayer.
5. Commemoration of our Lord's words.
6. The Oblation.
7. Prayers for the dead.
8. Breaking of Bread.
9. The Lord's Prayer.
10. The kiss of peace.
11. Communion.

ST. MARK'S LITURGY.

Egypt and Ethiopia.

10. The kiss of peace.
1. Lift up your hearts, &c.
3. Prayer for the Church militant.
7. Prayers for the dead.
2. Therefore with Angels, &c.
5. Commemoration of our Lord's words.
6. The Oblation.
4. Consecration Prayer.
8. Breaking of bread.
9. The Lord's Prayer.
11. Communion.

ST. JAMES' LITURGY.

Oriental.

10. The kiss of peace.
1. Lift up your hearts, &c.
2. Therefore with Angels, &c.
5. Commemoration of our Lord's words.
6. The Oblation.
4. Consecration Prayer.
3. Prayer for the Church militant.
7. Prayers for the dead.
9. The Lord's Prayer.
8. Breaking of bread.
11. Communion.

ST. JOHN'S LITURGY.

Gaul, Spain, and Ephesus.

3. Prayer for the Church militant.
7. Prayers for the dead.
10. The kiss of peace.
1. Lift up your hearts, &c.
2. Therefore with Angels, &c.
5. Commemoration of our Lord's words.
6. The Oblation.
4. Consecration Prayer.
8. Breaking of bread.
9. The Lord's Prayer.
11. Communion.

The order in our Church is somewhat different :—

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 3. Prayer for the Church militant. | 8. Breaking of bread. |
| 1. Lift up your hearts, &c. | 6. The Oblation. |
| 2. Therefore with Angels, &c. | 4. Consecration Prayer. |
| 5. Commemoration of our Lord's words. | 11. Communion. |
| | 9. The Lord's Prayer. |

For the benefit of those who are not familiar with this subject, we would remark, that the *Prayers for the Dead* in the Primitive Liturgies bear no resemblance whatever to those now used in the Romish Church.

that it is difficult to assign their origin to a lower period than the Apostolic age. "The liberty," says Mr. Palmer, "which every Christian Church plainly had and exercised, in the way of improving its formularies, confirms the antiquity of the four great Liturgies; for where this liberty existed, it could have been scarcely anything else but reverence for the Apostolical source from which the original Liturgies were derived, that prevented an infinite variety of formularies, and preserved the substantial uniformity which we find to have prevailed in vast districts of the Primitive Church."* They form, therefore, four distinct channels, by which the faith and practice of the early Church have been handed down to us.

To one of these, indeed—the Liturgy of St. James—we can assign a very great antiquity, from the manner in which it has been kept separate from all others. Nearly fourteen centuries ago, at the Council of Chalcedon, which met A. D. 451, a sect of Christians, called Monophysites, were anathematized for heresy. Since that time they have been of course entirely separated from the orthodox, and no com-

They were rather an *affectionate remembrance* of those who had slept in the faith—"a commemoration of the departed faithful," as Mr. Palmer calls them,—and were in these words:—"We commend unto Thy mercy, O Lord, all other Thy servants which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace; grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we, and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set at His right hand, and hear that His most joyful voice, 'Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world!' Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate."

* Antiq. of English Ritual, v. i. p. 8.

munion subsisted between the two parties. For a time, they each had their establishments in the different dioceses, and their own patriarch in the Metropolitan City. At the time of the Mahometan invasion, the orthodox were driven out, and the Monophysites, patronized by the invaders, remained in undisturbed possession of their sees, and represented the ancient Patriarchate of Antioch. At this day, the members of this sect are still scattered through Judea, Mesopotamia, Syria, and the southern part of Asia Minor, and use a Liturgy in the Syriac Language, which they ascribe to St. James. The singular fact about this Liturgy is, that a great part of it coincides, expression for expression, with the Greek Liturgy used by the Orthodox Church at Jerusalem; so that one must evidently be a translation of the other.* When, then, was this done? It must have been prior to the Council of Chalcedon, for since that time these two parties have shunned each other. This coincidence, therefore, between their most solemn religious rites proves their services to be at least more than 1400 years old. Such, then, is the authority we have for this practice—from the custom of the Jewish Church—the sanction and example of our Lord—and its universal prevalence in the early Church. “No doubt”—says Hooker—“from God it hath proceeded, and by us it must be acknowledged as a work of singular care and providence, that the Church *hath evermore held a prescript form of prayer*, although not in all things everywhere the same, yet for the most part retaining still the same analogy. So that if the Liturgies

* The Antiquity of the Existing Liturgies, Oxford, 1838.

of all the ancient Churches throughout the world be compared among themselves, it may be easily perceived they had all *one original mould*, and that the public prayers of the people of God in Churches thoroughly settled, *did never use to be voluntary dictates proceeding from any man's extemporal wit.*"* It would not indeed be possible, during the whole course of the 1500 years which preceded the Reformation, to find any Church, the public worship of which was conducted without a prescribed form. Not only the ancient Greek and Latin Churches, but all the other Christian Societies in Europe, Asia, and Africa, conformed to this rule. The Abyssinians and Egyptians—the Jacobites, Maronites, and Nestorians of Asia—and the Christians of St. Thomas, in India †—all had their Liturgies.

Strictly considered, all public prayer is a form to those who unite with the speaker. Whether his petitions have been previously composed, or arise

* Eccles. Polity, lib. v. sect. 25.

† Dr. Buchanan, speaking about these Indian Christians, says—“They have the Bible and a *Scriptural Liturgy*; and these will save a Church in the worst of times. And as there were but few copies of the Bible among the Syrians (for every copy was transcribed with the pen), it is highly probable, that if they had not enjoyed the advantage of the *daily prayers, and daily portions of Scripture, in their Liturgy*, there would have been, in the revolution of ages, no vestige of Christianity left among them. . . . In a nation like ours, overflowing with knowledge, men are not always in circumstances to perceive the value of a *Scriptural Liturgy*. When Christians are well taught, they think they want something better. But the young and the ignorant, who form a great proportion of the community, are edified by a little plain instruction, frequently repeated. A small Church or sect may do without a form for a while. But a national Liturgy is that which preserves a relic of the true faith among the people in a large empire, when the priests leave their Articles, and their Confessions of Faith.” *Researches in Asia*, p. 80.

from the impulse of the moment, it is the same to his hearers. His extemporaneous prayer must be to them *a form of prayer*. We come then to the simple question—whether it is better to have this arranged beforehand, or to trust to the passing feelings of him who happens to be the minister? As far as the spiritual benefit of the hearers is concerned, we should say that the former would be the wiser course. Otherwise, the effect produced will be that so admirably described by an eminent prelate of the Church of England—“If there should be nothing absurd or unbecoming in the prayers, yet the audience must first endeavor to understand the words; and then they must weigh and consider the sense and meaning; and then they must deliberate whether such requests are proper for persons in their condition, before they can lawfully join them; and by that time, the minister is passed on to some other subject which requires the like attention and consideration; and so their *curiosity* may be raised, and they may exercise their *judgment*, but there can scarce be any room left for *devotion*.”*

Equally important is the influence of a Liturgy upon a Church collectively. It preserves its orthodoxy unimpaired. Without a prescribed form of prayer, each individual teacher is left to inculcate such doctrines as best suit his own private views. He may preach error, and then pray in accordance with it. There is no standard to which his people can at all times direct their attention, and judge of his doctrines. He may become a disbeliever in one of the cardinal articles of the Christian faith, but if he omit

* Bishop Newton's Sermons, vol. ii.

all mention of it, both in his sermons and prayers, it may not be brought before the attention of his people for years, and thus insensibly, yet gradually, they fall into his errors.

Such, however, can never be the case where there is a Liturgy like that of our Church. Let one who ministers at our altars become heretical, and he cannot lead his people with him. He may for a time *preach* his views, but each *prayer* he reads in the service will contradict him, and proclaim most unequivocally that he is faithless to the Church. Thus he will be placed in a false position, until at last he is compelled to go out from us, showing that he is not of us.

Now see how this has always been exemplified. What religious society without a Liturgy has ever subsisted for any length of time, and yet not wandered from its early faith? Look at those on the continent of Europe, which, after the Reformation, while they abandoned the Apostolical ministry, give up the ancient Liturgy also. To what result have those in Germany been led? Why, we see them wandering in all the mazes of rationalism, each year tending downward to a darker, more hopeless infidelity.* What is the faith which now prevails at

* Henry Dwight thus describes their progress—"The genuineness and authenticity of the Old Testament was first attacked, and outwork after outwork was gained, until all belief in it as a revelation, was almost literally exploded from Germany. The Epistles of the New Testament were afterwards assailed with the same weapons. The inspiration of one writer after another ceased to be believed, until by an almost equally large proportion of the theologians, they were also viewed as unworthy of regard, except so far as they contain a beautiful system of morality, and so far as they are historically interesting from their instrumentality in spreading Christianity. At a subsequent

Geneva, where once John Calvin inculcated his stern and rigid creed? There, all is changed, and in place of the strictness of his views, we have the latitude and coldness of those who scoff at the Divinity of our Lord.* We are compelled then to regard the reformation on the continent, as a thing that has passed away. "Lutheranism and Calvinism are indeed now little more than matters of history; for the feeble and lifeless relics which they have left behind, and which still bear their name, are but painful memorials of systems whose imperfections and faults, whatever they might be, were dignified by a holy ardor and zeal for God and for God's revelation. Now, when the confessions of faith for which Luther, and Zuinglius, and Calvin would have laid down their lives, are thrown aside as obsolete; or subscribed with salvos and declarations which render the act of subscription a mere mockery; how can we recognize

period, the Gospels were attacked in a similar manner. The character of Christ was soon generally believed, by the clergy, to have no more claim to our respect than those of Plato and Aristotle, unless from the greater purity of his example and his code of morals, and from his exhibition of powers of intellect, which most of them would have probably admitted to be much superior to those of the Greek philosophers. So universal was this disbelief, that there were not, in the year 1808, as one of the most distinguished orthodox professors informed me, five clergymen, who dared to come forth and declare themselves to the world, as belonging to the orthodox party." *Travels in Germany in 1825-6.* See, too, *Hugh James Rose's 'State of Protestantism in Germany.'*

* Dr. Sprague of Albany says—"The Protestant Church of Geneva has greatly departed from the faith of the early reformers. Most of their present ministers are unquestionably Unitarians of the German School, though it is believed there are a few whose religious views are, in the main, evangelical. Here, as in most places in France, I understand there is very little that charity herself can believe to be vital piety."—*Letters from Europe in 1828.*

the existence of their faith?* Overrun by the audacious impiety of Neologism, an infidelity which cloaks itself under the name of Christianity in order to inflict a more grievous wound on faith, or sunk into the deadly slumbers of Socinian and Arian apostacy, Lutheranism and Calvinism, as religious systems, seem to have nearly perished in the countries where they arose."†

So it is, too, among the dissenters in England, and the same pulpits in which, during the last century, their ablest divines preached, are now held by Socinians.‡ And is not this the case in our own land,

* One of our own clergy has thus recorded the result of his observations, during a visit to Geneva, in 1819:—

“And thrives pure faith there now with roots wide spread?

Is Calvin's name revered—it's master dead?

I too an exile, but for health, around

That Lake, whose mirror yields the raptured eye

Scenes of transcendent grace and majesty,

Have strolled, and in Geneva's streets have trod.

‘Where's Calvin's tomb?’ I asked;—the sole reply,

‘Who knows?’—‘Is Christ still worshipped here as God?’

‘In private by dull fools, who yet in darkness plod.’”

† Palmer's Treatise on the Church, v. i. p. 358.

‡ The most fearful picture we have seen of the English Dissenters is given by two of their own authors, Bogue and Bennet. They say—“Many, who drank the cup of Arianism first, and then of Socinianism to the very dregs, ceased to be members of the dissenting congregation By the operation of these causes, many a Presbyterian congregation dwindled from a giant into a dwarf. Aged people who remember their respectable condition in the metropolis, at the commencement of this period, must be convinced that heresy has acted like an enchantress, in silently, by her fatal spells, accomplishing their destruction. They are, in general, now but the shadow of what they formerly were, and many of them have ceased to exist. Devonshire, the cradle of Arianism, has been the grave of the Arian dissenters, and there is not left in that populous county, a twentieth part of the Presbyterians which were to be found at her birth. More than twenty of their meeting-houses, it is said, have been shut up, and in those

where even the descendants of the New England puritans have abandoned their faith, and substituted in its place the most fearful heresies, "denying the Lord that bought them!" There is reason, therefore, for that exclamation, uttered by Buchanan, the apostle of the East—"Woe to the declining Church which hath not a Gospel Liturgy!"*

But where could this melancholy history be written of any who adhered faithfully to a prescribed form in their public devotions? Take our own Church, for example. Investigate the doctrines which are embodied in her formularies, and you will find that they are now what they were eighteen centuries ago. Faithless and unworthy men have indeed at times been the teachers of the Church, but their errors passed away with them, and the great body of her members, by looking to the Liturgy for instruction, still held to their steadfastness. Its holy language, bearing the impress, and breathing forth the spirit of the purest days, is stamped upon the memory of each one of her true children, and wrought into the very texture of his mind. Her beautiful services, adapted to every change and circumstance of life, from the

which remain open, there are to be seen the skeletons only of congregations which were full and flourishing before error had banished prosperity."

"Like the devouring pestilence, Arianism and Socinianism have, with few exceptions, carried desolation with them into every congregation where they have obtained an entrance; and some scores more of their meeting-houses would have been shut up, but for the pious benevolence of persons of a different creed, in the former generation. By their endowments, many of the Presbyterian ministers have been enabled to retain their office, and to preach to what deserves not the name of a congregation."—*History of Dissenters*, vol. iv. p. 319.

* *Researches in Asia*, p. 80.

cradle to the grave, speak to his heart with a power which no extemporaneous prayer can have. In these words his fathers have worshipped. These prayers, perhaps, have trembled upon the lips of some whom he has loved, but who long since have passed away to their reward. By the chain of association they unite him to the departed. They recall them to his memory, and thus, by means of these petitions, he lives again in scenes which have long since gone. Oh, solemnly and sweetly do these words and these services come home to the Churchman's heart! He would not part with them—so rich in hallowed recollections—for all the eloquence that modern wisdom could devise. He clings to them through life, and trusts that the last sound which shall fall upon his dying ear, will be that solemn prayer by which the Church commends the departing spirit to the mercy of its God.*

Thus it is, that a thousand remembrances gather around our time-honored Ritual and commend it to our affection. We have seen, that in this manner the followers of our Master worshipped, even in the Apostolic age. When, therefore, we are called to abandon it, and adopt in its place the extemporaneous effusions of man in our public worship, may we not reply in the words of Scripture—"We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God." We will not fear to walk in our Lord's footsteps and to follow

* When George Herbert was on his death-bed, he said to Mr. Duncan, who had come to visit him—"Sir, I see by your habit that you are a priest, and desire you to pray with me." Which being granted, Mr. Duncan asked him—"What prayers?" To which Mr. Herbert's answer was—"O, sir, the prayers of my mother, the Church of England: no other prayers are equal to them."—*Walton's Lives*, p. 339.

those ancient confessors and martyrs, who, in the earliest, purest days of our faith, amidst sufferings and trials won their way to Heaven. Did they lack spirituality, or find their devotion cramped and narrowed down by the words of a Liturgy? Has the whole Christian Church been in a grievous error on this subject, until within the last three hundred years? No, brethren; and the best we can do in our feebleness is, to tread in the old paths, and "hold fast to the form of sound words" which was used "in our fathers' days, and in the old time before them." Our venerable Liturgy speaks to us in the language of God's own word. Let us strive to imbibe its holy spirit, and we shall need no better preparation for death. And when at last the worship of the earthly sanctuary is over, we shall be admitted to join in that service which the redeemed in glory use, as ever, day without night, they circle the throne rejoicing, and raise the lofty anthem—"Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing."

V.

HISTORY OF OUR LITURGY.

Mine is no solitary choice,
See *here* the seals of saints impress'd ;
The prayer of millions swells my voice,
The mind of ages fills my breast.

Cunningham.

THE sixteenth century opened upon a scene unequalled in the history of the world. The power of the Church of Rome was dominant through Europe. The opposition of the Albigenses had been extinguished in their blood, and all was apparently peace in Western Christendom. The institution of the Orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic had added a new element of strength to the Romish See. The members of these fraternities wandered through every land, mingling with the mighty masses of the great city, or diligently in each lonely valley seeking out "the few sheep in the wilderness," and every where they were the sworn servants of the Vatican—ready to teach its doctrines, and to do its bidding. The Pontiffs acted in the spirit of their loftiest pretensions, deposing princes, and bestowing kingdoms at their will, yet every where they seemed to be obeyed.

But this universal peace, was hollow and deceptive. A day of awakening for the human mind was at hand. Learning had begun to come down from its high places, to enlighten the multitude. The re-

mains of that literature, which ages before had called forth the plaudits of assembled Greece, or awakened the genius of Rome's noblest orators, was again taken down from the dusty shelves of monasteries; and thus "in this setting part of Time," a new audience was created to listen to the strains of Homer, or to muse over the glorious reveries of Plato. Communing with the mighty dead, and dwelling upon the noble works which they had bequeathed to us—those forms of antique beauty, which were for ever the bloom of an imperishable youth—the intellect of man was quickened into action, and reason once more asserted her claims. The moral sense, too, of that generation was outraged by the sight of a pontiff like Julius, emulating the fame of a warrior, and embroiling kingdoms in his mad ambition; or one like Leo, passing life in an unbroken dream of graceful voluptuousness, and scoffing at the mysteries of our faith as long-since refuted fables. Beneath this quiet surface, therefore, the public mind was stirred up to its lowest depths. A restless, eager spirit of inquiry was abroad. The question, "What is truth?" was earnestly asked. A craving after spiritual freedom and purity was deeply felt. The successor of St. Peter stood upon a volcano, though the landscape was smiling around him, and he perceived not the beginning of its heavings.

Is it wonderful, then, when the storm at last came, and the human intellect burst the fetters by which Rome would bind it down, that a scene of wild confusion ensued? Was it not natural, that men should pass at once to the opposite extreme, and, rejoicing in their newly acquired freedom, indulge in the

strangest eccentricities? It was; and therefore we are prepared to behold in that an age “emulous of change”—an age whose motto was—“old things have passed away—all things have become new.” In less than fifty years from the first controversy between Luther and Tetzl, Protestantism had attained to its highest ascendancy on the Continent. For the first time the love of novelty could be indulged, and this liberty was used to the utmost.

The first half of the sixteenth century was the age of experiments, the fruits of which, in weal or woe, this generation has inherited. Among the other changes made—as we showed you in the last lecture—was that which related to the manner of public worship. Those societies which had abandoned the Church with her Apostolic ministry, in many cases gave up her ancient Ritual also, and trusted to have their devotions led by the extemporaneous effusions of those who might minister to them.*

* The early Reformers themselves were often too clear-sighted not to perceive the evil of this step, but it was taken by their followers, and, in truth, naturally grew out of the state of feeling we have described. We will give some of their recorded opinions in favor of a Liturgy.

“For so much as concerneth the form of prayer and ecclesiastical rites, I much approve that it be determined so that it may not be lawful for the ministers in their administration to vary from it; as well to help the simplicity and unskilfulness of some, as that the uniformity of all the several congregations may better appear; and, finally, that the desultory and capricious lightness of such as affect novelties may be encountered and stopped.”—*Calvin's Letter to Protector Somerset.*

“We account it grievous to contemn all those holy Churches which, from the times of the Apostles, and of the primitive Church, unto this day, have celebrated the public worship of God out of prescribed forms—wherefore, we blame the over-nice singularity of those men who would cast out all prescribed forms from divine worship.”—*Let-*

In this respect, as in all others in this great crisis of her history, the Church in England was enabled to act more wisely. As she had retained the Apostolic ministry which had been handed down for 1500 years, so she preserved her Ritual, only throwing out those things which were not primitive, but were corruptions which had gradually crept in during the darkness of the few preceding centuries. Thus our service was merely restored to its ancient purity. Each view, therefore, which we gain of the true state of feeling in those times of excitement and change, deepens our gratitude to that kind Providence which so plainly led our Mother Church "in the way wherein she should go,"—overruled every thing for good—and prepared her to be in all ages "the Witness and Keeper" of the Truth.

This evening, then, we will endeavor to go back to the early ages of the Church, and show you the origin of our Liturgy—the different changes through which it passed, as it was gradually compiled in the course of centuries, until it finally assumed the form in which it now is in our Prayer Book. It will surely be interesting to us as Churchmen, to know from

ter from the Walachrian Classis of Zealand to the assembly of Divines in London, 1646.

"Any one may satisfy himself, from a view of all the particulars, that in the ancient Church, the whole of divine worship was administered by prescribed forms. The question is, whether every minister should have liberty of obtruding private prayers, which he has himself composed, with which no one else is acquainted, and to which the Church is unaccustomed, instead of forms matured with grave deliberation by the servants of Christ, revised by the higher officers of the Church, and approved by the Synod. This liberty we do not grant." *Preface to the Agenda or Book of Common Prayer in the Reformed Churches of Poland and Lithuania.* Dated at Thorn, A. D., 1636.

whence came this precious legacy, which, while it ministers to the spirituality of those who now unite in its services, has performed also the same holy office for many generations of the saints who have gone before us. There is another object, also, to be answered by this investigation. We are often told that the Church in England, from which our own is derived, was founded by the Romish Church, and has merely seceded from her, while our Prayer Book is nothing but an alteration of the Romish Breviary. I trust that the historical inquiries into which we shall be led in this Lecture, will demonstrate to your satisfaction, that neither of these charges is correct—that the British Church existed, pure and independent, centuries before the Bishop of Rome had any authority in that land, and that her Ritual is derived from the Primitive Liturgies which were in existence during those early ages, in which corruption had not yet begun to invade the Church of Rome.

Let us look, then, at the origin of the Church in that island. Is she indebted to Rome for her existence? So far from this being the case, we know that the Christian faith was professed in Britain even in the Apostles' days, and when the Church of Rome herself was but in the feebleness of her infancy. While the Pantheon was yet filled with its multitude of gods, and day by day there ascended the smoke of sacrifice to the Capitoline Jupiter—when Christianity in Rome was only recognized as a “pernicious superstition,”* the adherents of which were doomed to the fire and the stake, even then, the name of Christ was honored on the banks of the Thames, and prayers

* Tacitus, *Annal.* xv. 44.

went up to Him in the strange tongue of those on whom Cicero poured his contempt when he wrote to Atticus,* and who formed the subject of his jest with Trebatius, as he warned him against a horde of Celtic barbarians.† This fact is fully proved by the testimony of ancient writers. Gildas, a native of Britain, and Abbot of Bangor, speaking of the birth of our Lord in the days of Tiberius, and the fatal victory of the Romans over Boadicea, which took place about the middle of the reign of Nero, says—"In the mean time"—that is, in the interval between these two events—"Christ, the true Sun, afforded his rays—that is, the knowledge of his precepts—to this island, shivering with icy cold."‡ Eusebius, when showing that the Apostles "preached their doctrine in the remotest cities and countries," adds particularly, "that some passed over the ocean, ἐπὶ τὰς καλομένους Βρετανικὰς νήσους, those which are called the British islands."§ Tertullian, A. D. 190, says—"There are places in Britain inaccessible to Roman arms, which were subdued to Christ."|| Origen, A. D. 230, writes, "When did Britain, before the coming of Christ, unite in the worship of one God?"¶ and again, "The power of God our Saviour is ever with them in Britain, who are divided from our world."** And, to give one more authority, St.

* Ep. ad Att. iv. 16.

† Ep. Fam. vii. 7. 11.

‡ Stillingfleet's Orig. Brit. p. 4. According to Usher, (*Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 278,) Gildas wrote his history about A. D. 564. To this Du Pin agrees, (*Eccles. Hist.* Cent. vi.) and also Collier, (*Eccles. Hist.* lib. i. p. 61.)

§ Dem. Evang. lib. iii. cap. 7. p. 112. Paris, 1628.

|| Adv. Jud. c. 7.

¶ In Ezek. Rom. iv.

** Luke c. i.; Rom. vi.

Chrysostom says—"The British Islands, situated beyond our sea, and lying in the very ocean, have felt the power of the word, for even there churches are built and altars erected."*

The unvarying tradition of the early Church points out the Apostle Paul as the one by whom the doctrines of the Cross were preached in that land. Clemens Romanus and Jerome speak of his travelling "to the utmost bounds of the West"—of his "preaching as far as the extremity of the earth"—and preaching the Gospel in the western parts"—expressions which Stillingfleet has fully shown from other writers were always used in that age with reference to the British isles.† He has also classified the evidence on this subject by showing—1st. From St. Paul's circumstances, that he had leisure and opportunity enough to have gone to Britain. 2d. From the circumstances of Britain, there was encouragement and invitation enough for him to have gone. 3d. From the circumstances of the rest of the Apostles, that he was the most likely to have gone of any. The most direct proof on this point, however, is derived from an assertion by Theodoret, which shows the belief in his day. He says—"Our fishermen and publicans, and *he who was a tent-maker*, carried the Evangelical precepts to all nations; not only to those who lived under the Roman jurisdiction, but also to the Scythians and the Huns; besides to the Indians, *Britains*, and Germans."‡ We have, therefore, no hesitation in agreeing with the learned Camden, when he says—"From these

* Tom. vi. p. 635.

† Orig. Brit. p. 39.

‡ Theod. Sermon. ix. de legibus, tom. iv. p. 610. Paris, 1642.

authorities it follows, not only that the Gospel was preached in Britain in the times of the Apostles, but that St. Paul himself was the preacher of it.”*

Such then is the historical evidence of the early establishment of the Church in that island, and in every succeeding age we can clearly trace its progress. The old historian Bede tells us of Kings who gloried in the Cross, and sought to aid its triumphs, while it is to this cause we must ascribe the gradual dying out of the superstition of the Druids, which after the second century of Christianity is no longer to be met with in the history of the country. Neither did her remote situation shield this Church from the rage of persecution, but in the reign of Diocletian she was called to give up also her witnesses for the truth. There, too, “the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church.” Foremost in that glorious band who “counted not their lives dear unto themselves,” the annals of the day tell us of St. Alban, whose name still remains in the scene of his simple faith, when more than fifteen centuries have passed away. Her Bishops were present and assisting at the Council of Arles, convened in 314 by the Emperor Constantine from all the Western Churches, to take cognizance of the Donatist controversy.”† Again, in the year

* Britannia, Intro. p. 86.

† Their subscriptions stand in this way—

EBORIUS Episcopus, de civitate Eboracensi Provincia Britannia.

RESTITUTUS Episcopus, de civitate Londinensi.

ADELSIUS Episcopus, de civitate colonia Londinensium.

The Diocese of this last Bishop has been the subject of much dispute, since it is evidently a mistake as it here stands. Archbishop Usher supposes it to be *Cair-Colun*, (Prim. 60, 195,) which means the city of Chester. Selden (in Eutch. 118) and Sir H. Spelman (*Conc.* i. p. 39) both refer it to the *Old Colony of Camalodunum*. The supposition

325, we find the British Bishops at the Council of Nice; also in 347 at Sardica; and in 359 at the Synod of Aminium, where Bishops from all parts of the West had assembled.*

This, then, is the first historical fact to which I would call your attention. You perceive that the British Church was not derived originally from that of Rome. She subsisted entirely independent of the Church in Italy until the close of the sixth century, bound to her only by friendship and amity, as she was to all other Churches throughout the world.

of Stillingfleet (*Orig. Brit.* 77) is, that he was from the third province of Britannia Secunda, where there was a colony of the Eleventh Legion. Therefore, this Bishop Adelsius came *ex Civit. Col. Leg. II*, which an ignorant transcriber might easily turn to *ex Civit. Col. Londin*. Stillingfleet also says, "There being but three bishops present at the Council of Arles, is so far from being an argument that there were no more in Britain, that it is rather an argument to the contrary, since it was the custom to send but one or two out of a province where they were most numerous." (p. 78.) This is confirmed by the Emperor's summons to Chrestus, Bishop of Syracuse, which is the only imperial summons to this council extant, (*Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* lib. x. cap. 5,) and which Baronius believes was in the same form with the rest. In this summons, Chrestus is required to come out of that province and bring two priests with him. And St. Hilary, in speaking of the councils in his day, says—"That one or two Bishops were sent for out of a Province." (*Collier's Eccles. Hist.* v. i. p. 26.)

It is worth while to observe the conduct of this council to the Bishop of Rome, who was not present, that we may see how little in that day they dreamed of his supremacy. They send their decrees to him only "to make them more public." They call him "Dear Brother," and express their regret that he had not been there, as they would have been glad of his vote and company. Or, as it is in the Latin—"Et utinam, Frater Dilectissime, ad hoc tantum Spectaculum interesset, et te pariter nobiscum judicante, cœtus noster majore latitia exultasset." (*Collier*, v. i. p. 28, and *Stillingfleet's Orig. Brit.* p. 86.)

There were also present with the British Bishops, Sacerdos, a Presbyter, and Arminius, a deacon of the Church.

* Collier's Eccl. Hist. v. i. p. 28, 37.

She owed no subjection to any foreign power, nor is there a record of any Romish ecclesiastic in that island until the year 596.*

What, then, during these six centuries, was the Liturgy used in our Mother Church? We mentioned to you in the last Lecture, that there were still existing four great Liturgies, which had come down to us from Primitive times, and were the original sources from which all others were derived. These were called after the names of St. James, St. John, St. Peter, and St. Mark, and from their origin in the first age of our faith, were of course similar in their general features. The Liturgy of St. John was used not only in the East by the Ephesian Church, but also in Western Europe, and from the Gallican Church the Christians in Britain received it. Such, at all events, was the testimony of tradition among those by whom it had been adopted. The ancient author, whose tract has been published by Spelman, and who is allowed by all critics to have written not later than the beginning of the eighth century, thus positively affirms it—"John the Evangelist first chanted the Gallican course; then afterwards, the blessed Poly-

* It was a Church ancient and glorious many hundred years before Popery began, being planted by the hands of the Apostles, as some affirm upon no improbable conjecture; but we are assured from history, very near those days. . . . And this British Church was renowned throughout the world, flourishing under Bishops and a glorious priesthood till about the seventh century; when the Bishop of Rome claiming a supremacy over other Bishops, the Church of Rome claimed the same over other Churches, and from the precedence of an elder sister leaped into the authority of a parent. . . . Under her corruptions, this Church, like her other sisters, sate down a contented captive many hundred years, till the great release of the Reformation." *Bisse on "The beauty of holiness in the Common Prayer,"* p. 11, 12.

carp, disciple of St. John; then afterwards, thirdly, Irenæus, who was Bishop of Lyons in Gaul, chanted the same course in Gaul.”*

The Church of Rome during this period was using the Liturgy of St. Peter, which varied in some particulars from that of St. John, which the Western Church had adopted. We learn this from the interrogation which St. Augustine addressed to Pope Gregory, at the close of the sixth century. He asked—“Why the customs of Churches are different, when their faith is the same, and one custom of Liturgy prevails in the Church of Rome, another in those of Gaul?”† And again, in his effort to bring the British Church under the dominion of Rome, he addressed her Bishops in the following terms—“In many respects you act in a manner contrary to our customs, and indeed to those of the universal Church; and yet if you will obey me in these three things, to celebrate Easter at the proper time; to perform the office of Baptism, in which we are born again to God, according to the custom of the Holy Roman and Apostolical Church; and with us to preach the Word of God to the English nation; we will tolerate *all your other customs, though contrary to our own.*”‡ It is evident, therefore, that in her early day the British Church did not receive her Ritual from Rome.

When, then, first commenced the intercourse between these two Churches? It was in the year 596 that Gregory, Bishop of Rome, carried into

* Spelman, *Concilia*, tom. i. p. 176.

† Bede, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. i. c. 21.

‡ *Ibid.* lib. ii. c. 2. Collier in his *Eccles. Hist.* lib. i. p. 49-51, has given the points of difference between the Roman Ritual, and that of the Gallican and Anglican churches.

execution a plan he had long cherished of sending missionaries to aid in the conversion of the Saxons. For this purpose St. Augustine was selected, with forty monks from his own monastery at Rome. Taking with him interpreters from France, he landed at the island of Thanet with his company, in the month of August of that year. He found the Church in Britain regularly established, although weakened by the opposition of the Pagan Saxons, who had in some parts of the country driven out her Bishops and caused them to take refuge in Wales; "for the Saxons," as the old English Chronicles tell us, "left not the face of Christianity wherever they did prevail."* The worship of the Church was, as we have shown, with their own ancient Liturgy, while their Episcopal organization is proved by the correspondence which took place between Augustine and Gregory. When Augustine, in asking instructions, inquires—"How he ought to manage with respect to the Bishops of Britain?" the Pope replied, "As to the Bishops of Britain, he put them all under his jurisdiction."† From whence he derived his right thus to give Augustine authority over an independent Church, it would be difficult to show.

In accordance with these directions, when firmly established in the island, Augustine invited the British Bishops to a conference. The meeting took place on the banks of the Severn, at a place long afterwards called Augustine's Oak. There were seven English Bishops present,—probably from St. David's, Llandaff, Llanbadarn, Bangor, St. Asaph, Somerset, and

* Stillingfleet's *Orig. Brit.* p. 366.

† Collier's *Eccles. Hist.* i. ii. p. 68.

Cornwall — besides the most learned men from Bangor-Iscoed, with Dinoth, their abbot.* No efforts of Augustine, however, could induce them to submit to the jurisdiction of Rome. His proposals were at once rejected, and the reply of Dinoth, which is still preserved, gives most fully the views of his Church. Speaking in the name of his brethren, he said—"That the British Churches owe the deference of brotherly kindness and charity to the Church of God, and to the Pope of Rome, and to all Christians. But other obedience than this, they did not know to be due to him whom they called Pope: and for their parts, they were under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Caerleon upon Usk, who, under God, was their spiritual overseer and director."† Thus it was that the free spirit of our old Mother Church spake out.

But power was on the side of Rome, and all the weight of her influence was put forth to bring the Church in that distant island under subjection. The Saxons, too, weakened her ranks by their assaults, and on one occasion 1200 priests and monks were slaughtered together, when they had posted themselves on an eminence near the field of battle, to pray for the success of their countrymen.‡ Often therefore must the members of that stricken and suffering Church have been forced to recall as prophetic the

* Bede, l. ii. c. 2.

† Collier tells us, (*Eccles. Hist.* l. ii. p. 76,) that this passage, first published by Spelman, (*Concilia*, v. i. p. 108, 109,) was copied by him "from an old manuscript, which had also been transcribed from an older." The Romanists have attacked its genuineness, but the reader will see their arguments and objections answered, in *Collier*, as above. *Stillingfleet's Orig. Brit.* p. 371, and *Bingham's Antiq. Eccl.* ii. 9.

‡ Bede, l. ii. c. 2.

parting threat which Augustine had addressed to them at the close of his conference—"I foresee that if you will not have peace with brethren, you will have war with foes; and if you will not preach the way of life to the English, you will suffer deadly vengeance at their hands." Yet even thus depressed—with the savage cruelty of the Pagans on the one side, and the opposition of their Christian Brethren on the other—the old British Church struggled on, maintaining her rightful and dignified position, and only yielding, at last, when reduced by the strong arm of secular force. It took therefore five centuries of conflict to compel her into submission to the Romish See, nor was it until the Norman conquest that the authority of the Pope can be considered as firmly settled.*

* "There doth not appear much of the Pope's power in this realm before the Conquest. But the Pope having favored and supported King William I. in his invasion of this kingdom, took that opportunity of enlarging his encroachments, and in this King's reign began to send his legates hither; and prevailed with Henry I. to give up the donation of Bishoprics; and in the time of King Stephen gained the prerogative of appeals; and in the time of Henry II. exempted all clerks from the secular power.

"And not long after this, by a general excommunication of kings and people for several years, because they would not suffer an Archbishop to be imposed upon them, King John was reduced to such straits, that he was obliged to surrender his kingdoms to the Pope, and to receive them again, to hold of him at a rent of a thousand marks.

"And in the following reign of Henry III., partly from the profit of our best Church benefices, which were generally given to Italians and others residing at the Court of Rome, and partly by the taxes imposed by the Pope, there went yearly out of the kingdom, seventy thousand pounds—an immense sum in those days." *Burns' Ecclesiastical Law*, v. iii. p. 108.

Such was the gradual progress of Papal encroachments in England. It will be observed, that the reign of William the Conqueror

Then, for four centuries and a half, the same darkness which had settled upon the rest of Western Christendom, seemed to have gathered over Britain also. The spirit of Popery everywhere prevailed, and the Church of England was bowed down at the feet of a foreign Bishop. Yet the breath and pulse of life had not yet ceased. Scattered through the land during all these years were those who saw her fall, and mourned over it in secret. Occasionally, too, they spake out, and boldly bore witness against this corruption, although it was at the peril of their lives. The page of Ecclesiastical History in this way records the names of Grostete—whose best encomium is that exulting exclamation of Pope Innocent, on hearing of his death, “I rejoice, and let every true son of the Church rejoice with me, that my great enemy is removed”—and Fitzralph, and Wiclif, who in succession entered their protest against the evils of Romish dominion. These were men who knew the right, and having solemnly counted the cost, shrunk not from an open conflict with the crushing power of Rome. Alone, uncheered by the loud voice of popular sympathy, supported only by the purity of their intentions and the goodness of their cause, they stepped forth from their cloistered retirement, and endured “the dust and heat” of this battle, which was waged for the best interests of man. For them, persecution had no perils by which it could terrify; but, receiving the torch of truth from each other’s hands, they bore it steadily onward, and thus acted

commenced in 1066, and that of Henry VIII. in 1509. The period between embraces only 443 years.

as the heralds of the coming reformation.* In this way it was that the faith had ever some to witness for it in that land. But the Church, even with these seeds of truth within her breast—these germs of future purity and life—like the PILGRIMS in their PROGRESS to the Celestial City, slumbered on the enchanted ground. For a time, she bowed to the witchery of that spell which Rome had cast over her, and suffered her senses to be overpowered by the incantations of that oppressor who had led her into

* It would be easy to show, that during this whole period there were leading men in the English Church who made bold stand not only against the usurpations, but also against the corruptions of the Romish Church. Even Archbishop Dunstan, in many things subservient to the Pope, did not hesitate to set at defiance the Papal mandate, when he deemed it unjust or improper, A. D. 961. And Alfric Puttock, Archbishop of York, from 1023 to 1050, openly impugned the doctrine of transubstantiation. In his 'Sermon to be spoken to the people at Easter, before they receive the holy housel,' (the communion,) he teaches doctrines that would now be considered orthodox by sound theologians. In the next century, Gilbert Foliath consecrated Bishop of Hereford 1148, translated to London 1163, died 1187, set at defiance the Papal authority, and though twice excommunicated by the Pope, paid no regard to the thunders of the Vatican. Cotemporary with Foliath, was Ormin the poet, whose works present us with the purest English, and the purest doctrines of that age. The next century was rendered famous by Robert Grossete, or Greathead, Bishop of Lincoln, from 1234 to 1258. In 1247, a demand was made by the Pope for 6000 marks, (about £50,000,) and he had the courage to refuse to levy it until he had the sense of the nation upon it. He visited Rome, and protested against its corruptions, before the Pope and Cardinals. After his return, the Pope again tried his courage by collating an Italian youth to a vacant Canonry in the Cathedral of Lincoln. But Grossete was inflexible. He set at nought the Pope's commands, for which he was excommunicated. But the thunderbolt fell harmless at his feet, and he died in peaceful possession of his See. Other examples of a similar nature occur, but these are amply sufficient to show that many of the clergy asserted that in their writings to which they assented in their legislative capacities.—*Chapin's Prim. Church*, p. 380.

captivity. But at length the hour of her redemption came, and a voice broke in upon her, crying—"Sleep no more." Then her dream was dispelled, and shaking from her garments the dust of ages, she came forth in her ancient strength. She had discerned a vision of the Truth, which, while it made her free, enabled her also to proclaim spiritual freedom to the world.

You perceive, then, how groundless is the charge that the Church of England, and of course our own Church, are only seceders from that of Rome. The whole statement of the case is briefly this—that the Italian Bishops invaded the British branch of the Catholic or Universal Church, which, after a long struggle, was for a time reduced to submission; yet ultimately her rights were recovered, and this foreign jurisdiction thrown off. Successive councils of the Church had declared the independence of each particular branch, and the Bishops of Rome therefore had no authority in that island. The sixth canon of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, commanded that the "ancient customs should prevail," and the "privileges of Churches be preserved." In like manner, the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 430, forbade Bishops to assume jurisdiction over provinces which had not from the beginning been subject to their predecessors. It enjoined on all who might have taken such provinces, an immediate restitution, and decreed "that *every province* should preserve pure and inviolate the rights which it had from the beginning; that"—as the Council added, with a degree of prophetic wisdom—"the Canons of the Fathers may not be transgressed, nor *the pride of worldly dominion*

enter, under the pretence of the sacred ministry.”* At that time, the Church in Britain was independent of the Roman patriarch; what right, then, had he afterwards to assume and enforce jurisdiction? Mr. Dodsworth has thus briefly summed up the whole question—“I repeat, what is so essential in these days for every Churchman to remember, that the CHURCH OF ENGLAND NEVER SEPARATED FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME. It was originally an independent Church, founded—not by emissaries from Rome—but at a period not far removed from Apostolic times, and perhaps even by an Apostle himself. . . . It was not till the period of the Conquest, in the middle of the eleventh century, that Rome assumed anything like an ascendancy over our Church, and then it was not without a long and arduous struggle that she established it. So that the real fact of the case is this, that out of EIGHTEEN CENTURIES, during which the Church of England has existed, somewhat less than FOUR CENTURIES AND A HALF were passed under the usurped domination of the See of Rome: so great is the absurdity, and palpable ignorance of historical facts, evinced by those who represent the Church of England, as a separated branch from the Romish communion.”†

* Palmer's *Orig. Liturgicæ*, v. ii. p. 263.

† *Discourses on Romanism and Dissent*, p. 168. Dr. Hook, of Leeds, Chaplain to the Queen, in a sermon preached in the Chapel Royal, also thus finely illustrates this point—“About two years ago the very Chapel in which we are now assembled, was repaired, certain disfigurements removed, certain improvements made; would it not be absurd on that account to contend that it is no longer the Chapel Royal? Would it not be still more absurd if some one were to build a new Chapel in the neighborhood, imitating closely what this Chapel was five years ago, and carefully piling up all the dust and rubbish which

Now, among the changes which took place during this long period of bondage, the ancient and primitive Liturgy of the English Church suffered also ; for the overshadowing power of Rome was too great to allow the continuance in use of this precious legacy from former ages. It necessarily became more and more assimilated to that of Italy. The tide of Romish priests was poured in from the continent — their Bishops gradually usurped the Sees of the English prelates—foreign rites and ceremonies were taught to the people—new doctrines, such as the worship of saints, the adoration of the Cross, transubstantiation, indulgences, and purgatory, were introduced—and thus these corruptions, which their invaders had brought with them, were gradually ingrafted upon the Ritual of the British Church. At length that uniformity was produced which it is ever the object of Rome to attain, and so the Liturgy remained until the reign of Henry VIII.

At this time the spirit of reformation commenced in England, and the Church, having first thrown off her allegiance to the Romish See, proceeded to purify

was at that time swept from hence, and then pronounce that, not this, to be the ancient Chapel of the Sovereigns of England? The absurdity is at once apparent ; but this is precisely what has been done by the Roman Catholic or Papist. The present Church of England is the old Catholic Church of England, reformed in the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, of certain superstitious errors ; it is the same Church which came down from our British and Saxon ancestors, and, as such, it possesses its original endowments, which were never, as ignorant persons foolishly suppose, taken from one Church and given to another. The Church remained the same after it was reformed as it was before, just as a man remains the same man after he has washed his face, as he was before ; just as Naaman, the leper, remained the same Naaman after he was cured of his leprosy, as he was before.”

her service, and restore it to its ancient form.* This, however, was not done hastily. Time was taken, and each step made the subject of careful deliberation, and profound learning called in to aid, and a thorough investigation of the past resorted to, during every stage of the compilation. The questions were often asked—"What is to be retained, because it is Scriptural, Primitive, and Catholic?" and—"What is to be stricken out, because it is modern and Romish?" Their own ancient existing missals, the "Uses," and other ritual books of York, Sarum, Hereford, Bangor, and Lincoln,† were sought out, and also the Primitive Oriental forms of worship examined, and from these materials, the service was restored to its origi-

* It may be well here to notice a usual objection, that Henry VIII. commenced the Reformation and separated from Rome, to serve his own licentious passions. But has this anything to do with the question? Does not God often make "the wrath of man to praise Him?" In this instance we behold Him bringing good out of evil, raising up holy men to complete in purity what was begun in passion, and thus even the vices of an unholy king were made to minister to the success of His Church. The truth of a cause, and the personal characters of its promoters, are very different considerations. Some of the Jewish kings, whom God employed as reformers, to restore His worship—Jehu, for example (2 Kings x. 29)—were by no means saints. Constantine established Christianity in the Roman Empire, and Napoleon restored it in France. Yet who cavils at either of these great changes, on account of the want of personal sanctity in their authors?

† These were, in the main, transcripts of the Sacramentary of St. Gregory of the sixth century, and of course free from those corruptions of the Romish Church which were most objectionable, as they were prior to the adoption of these errors. As each Bishop had the power of altering the particular Liturgy of his own Church, in process of time different customs arose, and several became so established as to receive the names of their respective Churches. Thus gradually the "Uses," or "Customs" of York, Sarum, Hereford, &c., came to be distinguished from each other.—(*Palmer's Orig. Lit.*, v. 1, p. 186.) An examination of these Uses will therefore often show the faith of the English Church in the seventh century.

nal purity, and that Ritual composed which is now our Book of Common Prayer. More than 120 years, however, passed—from the year 1537, in the reign of Henry VIII., to the year 1662, in the reign of Charles II.—while this church was going through its successive steps, and gradually maturing to the form in which we now have it. Twice indeed it was interrupted—once by the reign of Queen Mary, who of course endeavored to restore the Roman Ritual, and again by the rule of the Puritans, when all ancient forms were rejected as the remains of Popery—but during the remainder of this period, it was a subject of frequent study with the Prelates of the English Church, assisted by the learned of the land, to return to a purer mode of worship.

The first step was in the reign of Henry VIII., when a committee, appointed for that purpose, translated certain portions of the Service into English, which were published under the title of “The Institution of a Christian Man.” It was known also by the name of “The Bishop’s Book.” Six years afterwards, this was revised and republished under the title of “A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man.” Again, in 1545, the King’s Primer was published.*

* These works have all been reprinted in England during the last few years. To show the gradual progress of feeling during the reign of Henry VIII. we will give the contents of these three Books.

I. *The Institution of a Christian Man.*

“This book, called The Institution of a Christian Man, containeth four special parts, whereof

The first part containeth the Exposition of the Creed, called the Apostles’ Creed.

The second part containeth the Exposition or Declaration of the

In the reign of Edward VI., when the ancient custom of administering the Communion in both kinds was restored, it was of course found necessary to have a Service giving the true view of this Sacrament. The King therefore appointed "certain Bishops and other learned Divines, to draw an office in English to be used for that purpose; which being finished, was called, *The Communion.*"* In May, 1548, the greatest step in this series of changes was taken. The same Bishops and Divines were again selected by the King "to draw up a general public office in Seven Sacraments, viz., Matrimony, Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, Holy Eucharist, Orders, Extreme Unction.

The third part containeth the Exposition of the Ten Commandments.

The fourth part containeth the Exposition of the Pater Noster and the Ave, with the Articles of Justification and Purgatory."

II. *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man.*

The Declaration of Faith.

The Articles of our Belief, called the Creed.

The Seven Sacraments.

The Ten Commandments of Almighty God.

Our Lord's Prayer, called the Pater Noster.

The Salutation of the Angel, called the Ave Maria.

An Article of Free Will.

An Article of Justification.

An Article of Good Works.

Of prayer for souls departed.

III. *The Primer*, set forth by the King's Majesty, and his Clergy, to be taught, learned, and read; and none other to be used throughout all his dominions, 1545.

The Calendar.

The King's Highness Injunction.

The Prayer of our Lord.

The Salutation of the Angel.

The Creed, or Articles of Faith.

The Ten Commandments.

The Matins.

The Even Song.

The Compline.

The Seven Psalms.

The Litany.

The Dirge.

The Commendations.

The Psalms of the Passions.

The passion of our Lord.

Certain godly prayers for sundry purposes.

* Strype's Mem. Eccles. v. ii. part. i. p. 96.

English, in the room of the Latin mass-book." This having been done, and the whole Liturgy with its public offices having been compiled, it was confirmed by Parliament, in the latter end of the same year, and set forth under the title of "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England." Upon this Strype remarks—"The rule they went by in this work was, the having an eye and respect unto the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the Holy Scriptures, and also to the usage of the Primitive Church. . . . As for the work itself, as it is said to be done by one uniform agreement, so also 'by the aid of the Holy Ghost,' such was the high and venerable esteem then had of it."* A few slight alterations having been made in 1552, together with some useful additions, such as the introductory Sentences, Exhortations, Confession and Absolution, and the forms for ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, it was again confirmed by Parliament, and this is the book known by the name of "The Second Book of Edward VI."

Under Elizabeth and James I., Committees were at different times appointed to see what further revision of the Prayer Book was expedient. The changes however were trifling, generally referring merely to the form of expression, except the insertion of some prayers for Thanksgiving, and a few Questions and Answers in the Catechism.

At last, in the reign of Charles II., the final alterations were made. Some of the Collects were remodelled, the Epistles and Gospels were taken

* Ibid. p. 135.

from King James's translation of the Bible, the office for the Baptism of adults, together with a few prayers for particular occasions, were added, and thus the Prayer Book was finally adopted as it is now used by the Church in England.

Thus it is that we have given the History of our Liturgy, from its rise in primitive times down to its present form in our Mother Church abroad. You perceive therefore that it is no modern production, nor is it a set of forms which grew up amid the corruptions of the Middle Ages.* It is a Ritual which, in all its principal features, can be traced back to the Apostolic age. And so close is this resemblance, that in very many parts it extends even to the expressions and the words.

To effect this was the avowed object of the English Reformers. Unlike those on the Continent, they made no attempt to found a new Church, nor did they desire to introduce a new order of worship. They knew that "the old was better," and therefore their work was simply one of Restoration. Thus, in

* Ingram, in his *True Character of the Church of England*, thus shows that our Prayer Book is older than the Roman Missal now used—"Our Common Prayer was compiled in 1548, received a revision in 1552, and was established in its present form in 1569. Whereas the Roman Missal was drawn up by certain fathers chosen for that purpose towards the close of the Council of Trent, in 1562, and was not sanctioned and promulgated until 1570, by a bull of Pope Pius V. bearing date the 12th of January in that year. It is therefore impossible that the *later* Roman could have been the source whence the *earlier* English Ritual was derived. The Reformed Church of England might, with much greater appearance of reason, charge the Italian Church with having copied from her Liturgy all that is Scriptural and Primitive in the Roman Mass Book. But the fact is, both Churches had one common fountain from which to draw; namely, *Scripture and Primitive usage*. The Church of Rome chose to corrupt the pure waters of this fountain."—p. 95.

the answer of the Council to the Princess Mary, afterwards Queen, when she wished Mass performed in her house, they say—"That the Christian faith professed is the same *in substance* as before that the English Reformation had recovered *the worship* to the directions of Scripture, and *the usage of the Primitive Church.*"* And Bishop Collier adds—"That part of the letter which relates to religion, was penned in all likelihood by Cranmer and Ridley, who were then of the Privy Council." When again, in the reign of Queen Mary, Archbishop Cranmer drew up "A Manifesto in Defence of the Reformation," he has the same appeal to antiquity. He says, "And with the Queen's leave he offers to justify the English Communion Service, both from the authority of the Scriptures, and *the practice of the Primitive Church.* And on the other side, that the Mass is not only without foundation in both these respects, but likewise discovers *a plain contradiction to antiquity.* He will maintain the Reformation made in the late reign, with respect to Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship, to be more orthodox and defensible, more agreeable to the true standard, *and Primitive Plan,* than the belief and practice of the Church of Rome."† In the same way, Queen Elizabeth, in reply to the Roman Catholic Princes on the Continent, who desired favor to be shown to the Romish Bishops, gives as a reason why they should conform to the established Church, that "there was no new faith propagated in England; no new religion set up, but that which was commanded by our Saviour, *practiced by the Primitive Church, and ap-*

* Collier's Eccl. Hist. v. ii. p. 311.

† Ibid. p. 347.

proved by the Fathers of the best antiquity."* When therefore the Prayer Book was published in its present form, it was recommended to the Clergy and Laity in these words—"Here you have an order of Prayer, and for the reading of Scripture, *much agreeable to the mind and purposes of the old fathers.*"† In the "Act of Uniformity," the Parliament of England declared that thus they received it, and it was authorized as "A very godly Book, agreeable to the word of God *and the Primitive Church*, very comfortable to all good people, desiring to live in Christian conversation."‡

We have thus brought before you the history of our Liturgy, through all ages, from Primitive times until it assumed its present form, that you may see how much it retains the spirit and even the words derived from the days of ancient purity. To impress this however still more—to show how fully we have the sanction of antiquity for our manner of worship—we will briefly take up the principal parts of our Ritual, and state their derivation.

With respect to the COMMUNION SERVICE, we showed in the last Lecture, when referring to the four Original Liturgies, how entirely our form for the administration of this solemn Sacrament is taken from them. It was the object of the compilers of our Prayer Book—says Wheatley—"out of them all to extract an office for themselves; and which indeed they performed with so exact a judgment and happy success, that it is hard to determine, whether they more endeavored the advancement of doctrine, or

* Ibid. p. 346.

† Preface to the Prayer Book. ‡ Collier's Eccl. Hist. v. ii. p. 320.

the imitation of pure antiquity.”* For example, all these ancient Liturgies have a prayer answering in substance to ours, “For the whole state of Christ’s Church Militant.” All contain that portion beginning, “Lift up your hearts,” with the responses which follow, as well as that noble anthem, “Therefore with angels and archangels.” In each one of them also we find the commemoration of our Lord’s words—the Breaking of Bread—the Oblation—the Prayer of Consecration—the administration of the Elements—and the Lord’s Prayer.

Other parts of this service, although not taken from these four Primitive Liturgies, are still of great antiquity. Thus, the *Offertory* has been received in the English Church since the end of the sixth century. It is found indeed in Rituals of that period, although it may have been used long before.† The *Exhortation* also has its parallel in the ancient Liturgies. In that of Antioch particularly, which was used for a great length of time by the Syrian Monophysites, there is a similar address from the deacon to the people, which in its position in the service corresponds with our Exhortation. This, if not of greater antiquity than the separation of the Orthodox and Monophysites in A. D. 451, can not be much later than that event.‡ A form of *Confession* was common in the ancient Churches, and in the Liturgy of Jerusalem it occupies exactly this place in the service. There is also extant a *Sacramentary* of the time of Charlemagne, which contains one in substance similar to our own § The same antiquity may be claimed for the

* On Common Prayer, p. 274. † Palmer’s Orig. Lit. v. ii. p. 73.

‡ Palmer’s Orig. Lit. v. ii. p. 100. § Ibid. p. 106.

Absolution, which follows. The *Thanksgiving after Communion* may be traced in several early Liturgies, particularly that of Cæsarea, which is more than 1500 year old, that of Antioch, and the Alexandrian Liturgy of Basil.* The date of the *Gloria in Excelsis* has never been accurately fixed. By some it has been ascribed to Telesphorus, Bishop of Rome, A. D. 150; by others to Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers in the fourth century. We know, however, that it is more than 1500 years old in the Eastern Church, and the Church of England has used it either at the beginning or end of the Liturgy for above 1200 years.† The *Benediction* is found in some form in all ancient services, and the one with which our service concludes is a judicious enlargement of that which was used in the English Church before the year 600.‡

In the same way, did our limits permit, we could go through the BAPTISMAL SERVICE, and point out the origin of its different parts. Some of these—like the vows of renunciation and the profession of faith—are of primitive antiquity, while the remainder can generally be found in the ancient Manuals of Salisbury and York, or in manuscripts which were used more than nine hundred years ago.§

Let us turn to the PSALTER. The manner of reading or singing the Psalms responsively, as we now do, prevailed in very ancient times. We showed in the last Lecture that thus the Song of Moses was used, after the passage of the Red Sea, when the people sang, “and Miriam and all the women answered them.” In this way, too, we know that

* Ibid. p. 156.

† Ibid. p. 159.

‡ Ibid. p. 161.

§ Ibid. p. 173.

many of the Psalms of David were chanted forth in the service of the Temple. Such, for instance, was Psalm cxxxvi., where the first part of each verse was sung by the Levites, while the chorus, "For his mercy endureth forever," was the response of the people.

From them the early followers of our Lord inherited these hymns of praise, and ever since the times of the Apostles, the recitation of Psalms antiphonally has every where formed a principal part of the service of the Church.* Thus the Roman Governor, Pliny, A. D. 110, states that the Christians "met on a certain stated day, and sung *by turns, (invicem,)* a hymn to Christ, as God."† St. Jerome, in describing the devotions of Christians in Egypt, says, "then the Psalms are sung, and the Scriptures are read;" and thus Cassian represents it, that the Psalms were used before the Lessons.‡ In the same way, St. Basil

* Thus St. Chrysostom says—"Christians exercise themselves in David's Psalms oftener than in any part of the Old or New Testament. Moses, the great lawgiver, who saw God face to face, and wrote of the creation of the world, is scarcely read through once a year. The Holy Gospels, where Christ's miracles are preached, where God converses with man, where devils are cast out, lepers are cleansed, and the blind restored to sight, where death is destroyed, where is the food of immortality, the Holy Sacraments, the words of life, holy precepts, precious promises; these we read over once or twice a week. What shall I say of blessed Paul, the preacher of Christ? His Epistles we read twice in the week. We get them not by heart, but attend to them while they are reading. But as to David's Psalms, the grace of the Holy Spirit has so ordered it, that they are repeated night and day. In the vigils of the Church, the first, the midst, the last, are David's Psalms. In the morning, David's Psalms are sought for, and the first, the midst, and the last, is David. At funeral solemnities, the first, the midst, and the last, is David. In private houses, the first, the midst, and the last, is David. Many that know not a letter can say David's Psalms by heart."—*Hom. vi. de Poen.*

† Pliny, Ep. 97. ‡ Bingham, Orig. Eccles. lib. xiv. c. 1. sect. 1.

tells us, that this part of the service was performed in his day, alternately. "After the confession, the people rise from prayer, and proceed to Psalmody, dividing themselves into two parts, and singing by turns."*

The Psalms, too, were always read or sung, as now among us, standing. Thus Cassian, speaking of the Egyptian Christians, says, that when "by reason of their continual fastings and labor day and night, they were unable to stand all the time, while twelve Psalms were reading yet at the last Psalm they all stood up, and *repeated it alternately*, adding the *Gloria Patri* at the end." And we have also the testimony of St. Augustine, who speaks of Psalmody as an act of devotion, which all the people performed standing in the Church.† Cassian, it will be remarked, in the above quotation, refers to the *Gloria Patri* being added to the last Psalm. Such was the custom of the Eastern Church. In the Western Church, the practice was different, and it was used at the end of every Psalm.‡

Such is also the antiquity of our rule of reading LESSONS from Scripture in each service. It was derived from the Jewish Church, where the law was divided into sections, one of which was read on every Sabbath day, so that the whole was completed in a year; and on each of these occasions some portion of the prophets was added also.§ To this St. James referred when he said, "Moses was read in the

* Wheatley on Common Prayer, p. 134.

† Bingham, lib. xiv. c. 1. sect. 14.

‡ Ibid. sect. 8.

§ Horne's Introd. to Scrip. v. iii. p. 244, where the reader will find a table of the different sections from the Law and the Prophets, as used by the Jews throughout the year.

Synagogue every Sabbath day," (Acts xv. 21,) and in the thirteenth chapter mention is made of the same custom, where we are told that St. Paul addressed the people in the synagogue, "after the reading of the law and the prophets." (v. 15.)

The Christian Church, therefore, naturally continued this admirable rule, by which week after week her members are systematically instructed in the word of God. Thus, Justin Martyr, in the second century says, "It was the custom in his time to read lessons out of the Prophets and Apostles in the Assembly of the faithful."* And Cassian tells us—"It was the constant custom of all Christians throughout Egypt, to have two lessons, one out of the Old Testament, and another out of the New, read immediately after the Psalms; a practice so ancient, that it cannot be known whether it was founded upon any human institution."† Tertullian, at the end of the second century, speaks of the reading of Scriptures in the Church, and in one place especially, he tells us that the law and the prophets were read in Africa before the Epistles and Gospels.‡ The early fathers, in their sermons which have come down to us, frequently allude to the lessons for the day. Thus St. Basil, in one of his Homilies on Baptism, takes notice of three of the lessons that were read that day, besides the Psalms, one of which was from Isaiah, another from Acts, and a third from Matthew.§ St. Augustine, in like manner, refers to four lessons which had been read on a particular occasion, one

* Apol. i, cap. 87.

† Wheatley, p. 141.

‡ Tertull. de Præscript, c. 36.

§ Bingham, lib. xiv. chap. 3, sect. 2.

out of Moses, another out of Isaiah, a third out of the Gospel, and the last out of the Epistles.* There were also proper Lessons selected for the different seasons of the Ecclesiastical year; as during the Festival of Easter, for four days successively the History of Christ's Resurrection was read out of the four Gospels, and on the day of His Passion, they read the narrative of His sufferings as related by St. Matthew.† You perceive, then, the great antiquity of this portion of the service, and how faithfully, in this respect, we follow the example of the early Church.

The LITANY next claims our attention. We can trace this kind of prayer back to the third century, in the Eastern Churches. It was introduced into the Western Church during the fifth century. The petitions in our Litany are of very great antiquity in the English Church. "Mabillon has printed a Litany of the Church of England, written probably in the eighth century, which contains a large portion of that which we repeat at the present day, and which preserves exactly the same form of petition and response which is still retained. The still more ancient Litanies of the Abbey of Fulda, of the Ambrosian Missal, and of Gelasius, Patriarch of Rome, together with the Diaconica or Irenica of the Liturgies and Offices of the Churches of Constantinople, Cæsarea, Antioch, Jerusalem, &c., which all preserve the form of the Litany; all these ancient formularies contain very much the same petitions as the English Litany."‡

Look now at the COLLECTS for each day. The

* Ibid. † Bingham, sect. 3. ‡ Palmer's Orig. Lit. v. i. p. 287.

origin of this word is doubtful, so great is the antiquity of its use. By some Ritualists, these prayers are said to derive their name from the priest, thus, as it were, *collecting* the devotions of the people, and offering them at once.* By others, it is asserted they took their rise from the *collecting* of the people, as was usual in the early times of Christianity, on fast days, and especially during a season of public calamity, for devotion in one of the Churches. When the clergy and the people had assembled at the place appointed, the Bishop or the Priest who was to officiate, recited over the collected multitude a short prayer, which from the circumstance, was denominated the Collect or gathering prayer.† We have Cassian's testimony that in his time—that is in the fourth century—Collects were recited amongst the Psalms and lessons of morning and evening prayer by the Egyptians; and Athanasius, in several places, alludes to the existence of the same practice in his time.‡ It has been thought by some writers on this subject, that the Collects were framed by St. Jerome.§ They were certainly arranged by Gelasius, Patriarch of Rome, in A. D. 494, and afterwards by Gregory the Great, A. D. 590, in whose Sacramentary many of them are now found. As he, however, only collected them, they are much older than his day. Yet it will be perceived, that even this revision of them dates back more than 1200 years.||

* Bingham's Orig. Eccles. lib. xix. ch. 1, sect. 4.

† Rock's Hierurgia, vol. i. p. 91.

‡ Palmer's Orig. Lit. v. i. p. 310.

§ Wheatley, p. 212.

|| As it may be interesting to Churchmen to see the date of each Collect, and the changes through which it has passed, we have copied

Let us now examine the selection of the EPISTLE and GOSPEL for each day, which follow these collects, the following tables from *Shepherd's Elucidation of the Prayer of the Church of England*, p. 301-5.

PART. I.

Consisting of such Collects as were retained from ancient Liturgies at the Reformation.

Collects for	Whence taken.
4 Sunday in Advent.	In some old offices for the first Sunday in Advent.
St. John's Day.	St. Greg. Sacr. and Gothic Liturg.
The Epiphany.	St. Greg. Sacr.
1, 2, and 3, Sun. after Epiph.	The same, and St. Ambros. Liturg.
5 Epiphany.	St. Greg. Sacr.
Septuagesima.	The same.
Sexagesima.	The same.
2, 3, 4, 5 Sunday in Lent.	The same.
6 Sunday in Lent.	The same; but in St. Ambros. Liturg. for Good Friday.
Good Friday, the three Collects.	They are in all offices with little variation; but they are left out of the Breviaries of Pius V. and Clem. VIII.
Easter Day.	St. Greg. Sacr. and a Collect almost the same in the Gallic Liturgy.
3 Sunday after Easter.	St. Greg. Sacr. St. Ambros. Liturg.
5 Sunday after Easter.	St. Greg. Sacr.
Ascension Day.	The same.
Whitsunday.	The same.
1 Sunday after Trinity.	The same. This, in some old Offices, is called the second after Pentecost; in others, the first after the octaves of Pentecost.
The 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, after Trinity.	Are all in St. Greg. Sacr.
The Purification.	The same.
St. Michael's Day.	The same.

The reader will observe that the greater part of this class of Collects, is found in Gregory's Sacramentary, which was composed before the year 600. All of these, therefore, are at least 1200 years old, and many of them are much older. For Gregory did not originally form the offices. He only collected and improved them. To waive

“It is certain”—says Wheatley—“that they were very anciently appropriated to the days whereon we all other proof of this, we have his own testimony, given in vindication of his conduct. ‘I have followed,’ says he, ‘a practice common in the Greek Church, and have altered some old Collects, and added some new and useful ones.’ But the generality of the Collects in his Sacramentary, he compiled from Liturgies which in his time were esteemed ancient.

PART II.

Consisting of Collects taken from ancient models, but considerably altered and improved by our Reformers, and the Reviewers of the Liturgy.

Collects for	Time of Improvement.	How it stood before.
St. Stephen's Day.	Beginning 1662.	Grant us, O Lord, to learn to love our enemies, &c.
4 Sunday after Epiph.	End improved 1652.	Grant to us the health of body and soul, that all those things which we suffer for sin, &c.
4 Sunday after Easter.	Improved 1662.	Who makest the minds of all faithful people to be of one will, &c.
Sunday after Ascension.	A little varied 1549.	This had been of old the Collect for Ascension Day, on which our venerable Bede repeated it, as he was dying.
2 Sunday after Trin.	The order inverted 1662.	Lord, make us to have a perpetual fear and love of Thy holy name, for Thou never failest, &c.
8 Sunday after Trin.	Beginning improved 1662.	Whose providence is never deceived, &c.
11 Sunday after Trin.	Improved 1662.	That we, running to thy promises, may be made partakers of thy heavenly treasures, &c.
18 Sunday after Trin.	Improved 1662.	To avoid the infections of the devil, &c.
19 Sunday after Trin.	Improved 1662.	That the working of thy mercy may in all things, &c.
St. Paul's Day	Improved 1559 and 1662.	In the Breviaries a new prayer was added, mentioning St. Paul's intercession; in the year 1549 the old prayer alone out of Greg. Sac. was restored, which had our walking after his example only, which was a little varied in the year 1662.

now read them ; since they were not only of general use throughout the whole Western Church, but are

Collects for	Time of Improvement.	How it stood before.
The Annunciation	Improved 1549.	The Breviaries had put in a new prayer about the B. Virgin's intercession, which was cast out in 1549, and the form in St. Greg. Sacr. restored.
Sts. Philip and James.	Improved 1662.	As thou hast taught St. Philip and the other Apostles, &c.
St. Bartholomew.	Improved 1662.	To preach that which he taught, &c., was altered because there is no writing of his extant.
Trinity Sunday.		This Collect is no older than the Sacramentary ascribed to Alcuinus. The old offices have another Collect for it, and call it the Octave of Pentecost.

PART III.

Consisting of such Collects as are composed anew, and substituted in the place of those which, containing either false or superstitious doctrines, were on this account rejected.

Collects for	Composed in
1 Sunday in Advent.	First Book of Edward VI., 549.
2 Sunday in Advent.	The same time.
3 Sunday in Advent.	1662.
Christmas Day.	1549.
Circumcision.	The same time.
6 Sunday after Epiphany.	1662. Before this time they repeated the Collect for the fifth Sunday.
Quinquagesima.	1549.
Ash Wednesday.	The same time.
1 Sunday in Lent.	The same time.
Easter Even.	1662. No Collect for it ever before then.
Easter Sunday.	The first sentence (1 Cor. v. 7) was added 1662.
1 Sunday after Easter.	1549. Then it was used on Easter Tuesday, and in 1662 was fixed for this Sunday.
2 Sunday after Easter.	1549.
St. Andrew's Day.	1552. Second Book of Edward VI.

also commented upon in the Homilies of several ancient Fathers, which are said to have been preached upon those very days to which these portions of Scripture are now affixed. So that they have most of them belonged to the same Sundays and Holy Days we now use them on, for above 1200 years.”*

We are told by Mr. Palmer, that in the early ages of the Church, *the Epistle* was generally called “the Apostle.” In this way St. Augustine often speaks of it, and in the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great it is said, “the Apostle follows,” meaning the Epistle of the Apostle is then read. Almost all the lessons now read as Epistles, have been used in the Church of England for many ages. They appear in English Liturgies before the invasion of William the Conqueror. We know, indeed, that they are generally as old as the time of Augustine, A. D. 595. In his day a Psalm was sung between the Epistle and Gospel. Thus, in one sermon he says—“We have heard *the Apostle*, we have heard the Psalm, we have heard *the Gospel*; all the divine lessons agree.” In another sermon he says—“We have heard the first lesson from *the Apostle*, then we have sung

Collects for
 St. Thomas's Day. .
 St. Matthias.
 St. Mark.
 St. Barnabas.
 St. John Baptist.
 St. Peter.
 St. James.
 St. Matthew.
 St. Luke.
 St. Simon and St. Jude.
 All Saints.

Composed in

All composed anew in 1549.

* On Common Prayer, p. 213.

a Psalm, . . . after this, came the lesson from *the Gospel*; these three lessons we will discourse upon, as far as time permits."* There is a curious thought in Alcuin—an English writer who lived about A. D. 780—that this arrangement of the Church is "not without a spiritual meaning. For, in causing the writings of God's envoys to be recited previous to the lecture of the Gospel, the Church appears to imitate the example of Jesus Christ, who deputed some among his disciples to go before him into those quarters which he was about to honor with a visit."†

You perceive in these quotations the reference made to *the Gospel* also. Even in the manner in which it is read, our Church continues to follow the example of the early ages. It was a general custom for all the people to stand up, and when it was announced, they uttered the ascription of praise—"Glory be to Thee, O Lord." Thus the author of an ancient Homily, sometimes ascribed to St. Chrysostom, asserts—"When the Deacon goes about to read the Gospel, we all presently rise up and say, 'Glory be to Thee, O Lord.'"‡ We know, indeed, that this custom of rising is certainly as old as the days of St. Chrysostom; for he speaks of it in one of His Homilies on St. Matthew—"If the letters of a king are read in the theatre with great silence, much more ought we to compose ourselves, and *stand up* with attentive ears, when the letters not of an earthly king, but of the Lord of angels are read to us."§ In the same way the author of the Consti-

* Orig. Lit. v. ii. p. 42-7.

† Alcuinus de Divin. offic. (quoted in *Rock's Hierurgia*, v. ii. p. 95.)

‡ Bing. Orig. Eccles. lib. xiv. ch. 3, sect. 10. § Hom. i. in Matt.

tutions says—"When the Gospel is read let the Presbyters and Deacons and all the people *stand* with profound silence."*

These then, are the principal parts of our service, and you perceive not only their great antiquity, but also how carefully the Church now adheres to the rites and customs of early days. From the manner in which our Liturgy was arranged by the English reformers, you can see the object they had in view in the great work to which they were called, and the spirit in which it was accomplished. They wished simply to purify their Church and Ritual from the corruptions of the Middle Ages, and to have them both conformed in every respect to the pattern of primitive times. In this respect they differed widely from those on the Continent. There, antiquity was disregarded—the Church, with her ministry and Ritual, entirely abandoned—and instead of a *Reformation*, the result was a *Revolution*.† Casaubon, therefore, paid but a merited tribute to our Church, when he wrote—"Si me conjectura non fallit, totius reformationis pars integerrima est in Angliâ; ubi, cum studio veritatis, *viget studium antiquitatis*."

* Constit. lib. ii. cap. 57.

† "Thus when the infatuate Council, named of Trent,
Clogg'd up the Catholic course of the true Faith,
Troubling the stream of pure antiquity,
And the wide channel in its bosom took
Crude novelties, scarce known as that of old:
Then many a schism overleaped the banks,
Genevese, Lutheran, Scotch diversities.
Our Church, though straiten'd sore 'tween craggy walls,
Kept her true course, *unchanging and the same*;
Known by that ancient clearness, pure and free,
With which she sprung from 'neath the throne of God."

It remains to say but a few words with regard to the difference between the Prayer Book as used in England and in this country. At the close of that revolution which politically separated us from England, the Church also in this land was, of course, severed from that to which she had been "indebted, under God, for her first foundation, and a long continuance of nursing care and protection."* When, therefore, the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by other English prelates, had consecrated three Bishops for this country, that we might have the Apostolical succession among ourselves,† it became necessary also to make some trifling alterations in the Prayer Book, to adapt it to the circumstances of the Church. These changes were made, and these only; for, as it is expressed in the Preface to that volume—"This Church is far from intending to depart from the Church in England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship, or further than local circumstances require." Our early Bishops, looking to the Church from which their own derived her existence, wished that every one should trace the Mother's line-

* Preface to the Prayer Book.

† The Right Rev. Wm. White, D.D., of Pennsylvania, and the Right Rev. Sam. Provoost, D.D., of New York, consecrated in the Chapel of the Archiepiscopal Palace at Lambeth, in England, on Sunday, Feb. 4th, 1787, by the Most Rev. John Moore, Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by the Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of Bath and Wells, and Peterborough. The Right Rev. James Madison, D.D., of Virginia, consecrated in the same place, on Sunday, Sept. 19th, 1790, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by the Bishops of London and Rochester.

The Right Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D., of Connecticut, had been previously consecrated in Aberdeen, Scotland, Nov. 14th, 1784, by the Bishop of Aberdeen, with his coadjutor, and the Bishop of Ross and Moray assisting.

aments in the features of the child. Thus, then, the Prayer Book was finally arranged, and so we trust it will remain through all ages of our Church here, until her earthly warfare is accomplished, and this service gives place to the anthems of Heaven.

And now, in conclusion, let me ask—have we not reason to bless God for this “form of sound words,” which has thus come down to us from a distant antiquity? May we not say of the Church—“Her clothing is of wrought gold?” Our Ritual contains not the sentiments or thoughts of any one man—or even any one generation of men—but embodies the spirit and the devotion of Universal Catholic Christendom, in its earliest, purest day. It is tinged with no party views. It is not intended to speak the language of any one small section of believers, but it seeks to bring us before the throne of God in the same spirit with which His children were accustomed to approach Him, when warring sects were unknown, and but one united Church was spread everywhere over the earth. Oh, are there not, then, solemn recollections and glorious memories connected with the Liturgy by which now we worship? Is it not something, to realize that in our devotions we are not dependent on the feelings of a mortal like ourselves, for the direction which our thoughts shall take, but that the prayers we utter bear the stamp and breathe the spirit of Apostolic days? Does not this Ritual come to us with new power when we think that, age after age, its solemn, elevating voice has been heard in the Church—that it is now what it was, when Christinity itself, in the dawn of early youth, was contending even for existence with a Pagan world?

Yes—when I stand at this altar, to minister in that holy rite by which with bread and wine we commemorate our Lord's death, I remember that seventeen centuries ago, these emblems were consecrated, with almost the same words, in the distant East where our faith had its birth, and through Northern Africa, where once hundreds of Bishops sat in the councils of the Church. There also that noble ascription—"Therefore with angels and arch-angels, and with all the company of Heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name"—was uplifted in many a strange tongue, as men thus professed their faith even at the peril of their lives. And now it has descended to us, as a chain which binds us to them in holy fellowship. The same anthems which you sing, have been sounded forth from ancient confessors and martyrs, as they went joyfully to the stake, and been the last accents heard from their lips as the flames gathered around them.* Countless generations of the saints—the dead who slept in Christ a thousand years ago—have worshipped in the very prayers which now you use, and had their souls thus trained up for Heaven.

Therefore it is that, as each age passed by, this Ritual has gone down with a richer freight of hallowed associations and blessings to the generation which succeeded, until we in our turn have inherited

* "Their bodies were quickly wrapped in flame ; they shouted *Te Deum laudamus*. Soon their voices were stifled—and their ashes alone remained."—*Death of Esch and Voes, the first martyrs of the Reformation, at Brussels, 1525.*

The venerable Bede, as he was dying, repeated the Collect for the day, which was the Festival of our Lord's Ascension.—*Malms.* l. i. c. 3.

it. We wish, therefore, nothing better. We are willing to tread in the footsteps of the holy dead who have gone before us. We will worship in their words, and trust that at the end we shall share in their reward. We will feel, too, that the noblest legacy we can leave to those who shall come after us, is this form of sound words—so full—so complete, that we may well say in the words of Dr. South—“There is no prayer necessary, that is not in the Liturgy, but one, which is this: that God would vouchsafe to continue the Liturgy itself, in use and honor, and veneration, in this Church forever.”

VI.

THE CHURCH'S VIEW OF INFANT BAPTISM.

Blest be the Church, that watching o'er the needs
Of infancy, provides a timely shower,
Whose virtue changes to a Christian Flower
A growth from sinful nature's bed of weeds !
Fitliest beneath the sacred roof proceeds
The ministration ; while parental Love
Looks on, and grace descendeth from above,
As the high service pledges now, now pleads.

Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Sonnets, XV.

HUMAN language could not frame a question which would appeal with greater force to the parent's heart than that simple inquiry which Elisha addressed to the woman of Shunem—"Is it well with the child?"* It is asking after the welfare of one around whom their warmest affections are clustering, with all the strength of a father's love, and the undying steadfastness of a mother's tenderness. The infant, even in the first months of its helpless innocence, is already exerting a powerful influence over many hearts. How many bosoms—alike of childhood and of age—are filled with its love! How many countenances, as they cluster around it, light up with gladness at its smiles! How does its presence spread happiness through its home! Thus early do the threads of its influence go out, and entwine about the hearts of those to whom Providence hath committed its keeping. How powerfully, then, do the warmest feelings

* 2 Kings iv. 26.

of our nature respond at once to the question—"Is it well with the child?"

But expressive as is this inquiry when applied to the *temporal* welfare of your child, what an added emphasis does it have, when we carry it still farther, and refer the question to that child's *spiritual* hopes! There it is, in the feebleness of wailing infancy—apparently so frail, that its existence, like that of the delicate flower, might suddenly be nipped even by the rude winds of heaven—and realizing the description which Job gives of our nature, that its "foundation is in the dust, and it is crushed before the moth." Yet that frail creature is a candidate for immortality, and no power in the universe can end the existence which has now been breathed into it. Disease or violence may reduce to insensibility that tender frame, but it will only be transferring its life to another sphere of being. That weak and powerless body is the prison-house of a spirit which must live long after the material universe has passed away, and which, through all the wasteless ages of its immortality, must be rejoicing in bliss ineffable, or else mingling its wail with the despairing cry of those to whom

—————"Hope never comes,
That comes to all."*

To the thoughtful mind, then, what solemn reflections gather around the unconscious infant! How strange the contrasts suggested, between what it is and what it shall be! How lofty the speculations in which we may indulge, on the destiny which awaits it in this world, and in that which is to come!

But with what intense interest should these emo-

* Paradise Lost, Book i. c. 66.

tions come home to the hearts of those who are intrusted with the guidance of that child! They are to give the first impulse and direction to that immortal being. They are to allure it on to Heaven, or else suffer it to be lost forever. They are to impress upon its infant mind, those earliest lessons which are to give tone and character to its expanding faculties. On them, then, in a great measure it depends, whether that infant is to be hereafter a saint in glory, or through eternity, undone—a castaway. What force, therefore, is there in the question—"Is it well with the child?" It is asking, whether you have done all that is in your power to lead it forward in the way of life.

Neither is this an inquiry which is without meaning until your child is old enough to be benefitted by your instructions. You have a spiritual duty to perform in its behalf, even before the hours arrive when its unfolding mind allows it to profit by your teaching. Long ere that time has come, you may place it within the fold of Christ, and by the waters of baptism dedicate it to Him forever. This is your earliest duty, and until it is fulfilled, you have neglected the first step in seeking the welfare of your child. In addressing you then, this evening, on THE CHURCH'S VIEW OF INFANT BAPTISM, I would endeavor, by God's blessing, to impress upon you the necessity of bringing your children forward, "that they may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church, and be made living members of the same."*

The first point, then, to be considered is—*the*

* Address in the Baptismal Service.

authority for infant baptism. This rite is rejected by some, as you are well aware, on the ground that it is not expressly commanded in Scripture. The futility of this objection will at once be seen, if we remember how many other duties we perform, which are not even mentioned in the word of God. That volume is intended to be merely the outline for our guidance, and it would be impossible, within its narrow limits, to specify each particular act incumbent upon us. If we take this ground, that the authority for each rite and custom must be drawn only from the Inspired Volume, we must refuse to admit females to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, because there is no instance recorded in the New Testament of their having received it, and decline any longer to observe as holy the first day of the week instead of the seventh, because we can find no express command enjoining the change. We turn, therefore, to the practice of the Primitive Church, and as we find that the early followers of our Lord observed both these customs, we have no hesitation in following their example. And for a reason precisely similar we feel constrained to admit infants to the waters of baptism.

But although this rite is not expressly inculcated in Scripture, yet we think there are many intimations in the New Testament which are clearly in its favor. We find that when the heads of families were converted to Christianity by the Apostles, they were not only themselves baptized, but also their households with them. Thus it is stated, that "Lydia and her household"*—"the jailer and all his . . . with all his house"†—and "the household of Stephanas"‡—

* Acts xvi. 15.

† Acts xvi. 33, 34.

‡ 1 Cor. i. 16.

were baptized by St. Paul. Now, is it probable that these households were all composed of none but adults—that there were no children belonging to them? If, indeed, we examine in the original the meaning of the word (*οἶκος*) rendered “house” and “household” in our version of Scripture, we shall find that the term has a comprehensiveness, extending to children, and sometimes to even more remote descendants.* And this interpretation is strengthened by the fact, that in the Syriac version of the New Testament, which was completed early in the second century, if not before,† this word is in every case rendered “children;” thus—“Lydia and her children”—“the jailer with all his children”—and “the children of Stephanas.” The Church therefore in that age must surely have believed, that children were baptized by the Apostles. This indeed was only the enjoyment of that grace which St. Peter declared to the Jews they were to inherit. “For the promise”—said he—“is unto you, and to *your children.*”

And this too was but in accordance with the conduct of our Lord while on earth. He seems to have loved the little ones of His flock, and to have received them into His peculiar favor. On one occasion, we are told, “He took a child, and set him in the midst

* “*οἶκον*, ‘family,’ including every age and sex, and of course, infants. So Ignatius Epist. p. 21, cited by Wolf: ἀσκάζομαι τοὺς οἴκους τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου σὺν γυναῖξι καὶ τέκνοις.” *Bloomfield’s Greek Test.*, I Cor. i. 16.

† “This version (the Syriac) is confessedly of the highest antiquity, and there is every reason to believe that it was made, if not in the first century, at least in the beginning of the second century.”—*Horne’s Introd. to Scrip.*, v. ii. p. 203.

of them ; and when He had taken him in His arms, He said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me." And when, again, His disciples would have prevented those who brought little children to Him, our Lord rebuked them, and "was much displeased," saying, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the Kingdom of God." And may not the phrase, "Kingdom of God," refer to the Militant Church here, as well as to the Church triumphant in Heaven? St. Mark also adds—"And He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them." Among, too, the last exhortations which He gave to His Apostle Peter, was the injunction—"Feed my lambs." Is it probable, then, with this affection for the little ones of the flock, that he would debar them from entrance into His Church—that He would bid them stand without the shelter of the fold, and not participate in the benefits it affords? No—such a course would be but little in accordance with that character, under which the prophet Isaiah foretold Him, when he described Him as the good Shepherd, who should "gather the lambs with His arm, and carry them in His bosom."

Neither can anything be argued—as is often done—from the command to His disciples, which seems to render faith a necessary antecedent to baptism—"He that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." This refers to the adults who then listened to the word, and who, of course, as the Gospel was in that generation new in the world, had never before had an

opportunity of being baptized, and therefore in their maturer years were obliged to submit to that rite when they became proselytes to Christianity. It is by no means an evidence that faith was in every case an indispensable requisite for baptism. This argument, indeed, would prove entirely too much. If the first half of the verse—"he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved"—debars infants from baptism for want of faith, then the last half—"he that believeth not shall be damned"—would exclude them from heaven, for the same reason. The Church, therefore, in her Baptismal Service, after that portion of St. Mark's Gospel has been read, which gives the narrative of our Lord's love for little children, directs the following exhortation to be made—"Beloved, ye hear in this Gospel the words of our Saviour Christ, that He commanded the children to be brought unto Him; how He blamed those who would have kept them from Him, how He exhorteth all men to follow their innocency. Ye perceive how, by His outward gesture and deed, He declared His good will toward them; for He embraced them in His arms, He laid His hands upon them, and blessed them. Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe, that He will likewise favorably receive this present infant; that He will embrace him with the arms of His mercy; that He will give unto him the blessing of eternal life, and make him partaker of His everlasting Kingdom. Wherefore, we being thus persuaded of the good will of our Heavenly Father towards this infant, declared by His Son Jesus Christ: and nothing doubting, but that He favorably alloweth this charitable work of ours, in bringing this infant to this holy baptism;

let us faithfully and devoutly give thanks unto Him."

And I rejoice, brethren, that it is so. I thank Heaven that the Church takes this wide and expanded view of the loving kindness of Him, in whose steps she directs us to walk. Were she unfaithful to her high trust, in this particular, I could not minister at her altars, or coldly repel from her fold those who most need her nurture. I could not preach the chilling doctrines of a creed, which proclaims to be unworthy of admission into the Church on earth, those little ones, with regard to whom our Lord has expressly said—"of such is the Kingdom of God."

Again—a direct argument in favor of infant baptism is derived from the fact, that baptism has taken the place of circumcision. The Christian dispensation—as I have already remarked to you in a former Lecture—is only a continuation—a fuller development of the Jewish. It is the same Church, but expanded into a nobler form.* While, therefore, the most perfect parallel can be drawn between the two, among other particulars, we find circumcision as an initiatory rite laid aside, and baptism adopted in its place. We should expect, therefore, to find the latter in every respect answering to the former. And so it does. When an adult became a proselyte from idolatry to Judaism, God commanded him to be circumcised; and when a heathen in this age, in the maturity of his years, listens for the first time to the news of the Gospel, and bows his heart to its sway, he in the same way is baptized, in token of his allegiance. But by the express direction of God,

* See Lecture II.

infants were also admitted by circumcision into the Jewish Church; why, then, can they not by baptism be received into the Christian fold? If they are unworthy in the latter case, why were they not in the former? If they are to be debarred now, because they are incapable of understanding their obligations, and believing in God, surely they were equally incapable of doing so under the Mosaic Economy. No, brethren, believe it not, that the little ones of the flock are to be excluded. The Church is the same in all ages, and so are the general principles by which she is regulated. And now, as in the ancient days, "the promise is to you and to your children."*

* This argument might be strengthened by a more particular reference to Jewish customs. Baptism, under the Christian dispensation, was not a new rite, for it had long been practised among the Jews. Our Lord merely retained it, at the same time investing it with a new authority and meaning. When John, therefore, commenced baptizing, the Pharisees and Scribes did not ask him the meaning of this rite, but, simply, by what authority he administered it. "Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?" (*John* i. 25.)

Every proselyte among the Jews was circumcised, baptized, and obliged to offer a sacrifice. Thus, Maimonides says—"In all ages, when a Gentile is willing to enter into Covenant, and gather himself under the wings of the Majesty of God, and take upon him the yoke of the Law, he must be *circumcised* and *baptized*, and *bring a sacrifice*: or, if it be a woman, *be baptized and bring a sacrifice*."

In such cases, their children, even if infants, were baptized with them. This was done in the presence of three persons, called *the Court, or the House of Judgment*, who acted as witnesses; and from this Jewish practice the Christian Church has derived the custom of having the same number of sponsors at the Baptism of each child. Thus, in the Gemara Babylon, we find this declaration—"They are wont to *baptize such a Proselyte in infancy*, upon the profession of the House of Judgment; for this is for his good." Upon which passage there is the following gloss—" 'They are wont to baptize.' Because none is made a Proselyte without circumcision and *Baptism*. 'Upon the profession of the House of Judgment.' That is, the three men

There is another argument on this subject which is most conclusive. It is the fact, that even in the first age of the Church—from the Apostles' days—infant baptism has been practiced. We learn this, in a great measure, incidentally from the early writers. We do not find this rite explicitly set forth and commanded by them, because it was unnecessary to do so; for in that age no one doubted its obligation. Yet the allusions to it are such as with any reasonable mind place the matter beyond a doubt.

For instance—Justin Martyr, who was born near the close of the first century, in speaking of Christians cotemporary with himself, says that “there were among Christians in his time many persons of both sexes, some sixty, some seventy years old, who had been *made disciples to Christ from their infancy*, and continued virgins or uncorrupted all their lives.”* Now in what way, we ask, could infants be made disciples of Christ, except by baptism? And as who have the care of his Baptism, according to the law of the baptism of proselytes, which requires three men, who do so become to him a father, and he is by them made a Proselyte.” Again, “He is no Proselyte, unless he is circumcised and baptized, and *if he be not baptized he remains a Gentile.*”

Again, Maimonides says, “A Proselyte that is *under age*, they are wont to baptize upon the profession of the Court; because this is for his good.” And—“An Israelite that takes a *little Heathen child*, or that finds a Heathen infant, and baptizes him for a proselyte, behold he is a proselyte.”

The works of Lightfoot, Selden, and Wall, abound with similar extracts from Jewish writers, proving their custom of baptizing infants. But did our Lord any where rebuke his countrymen for it? Did He denounce it as a vain form and superstition? If He did not, is it not rather late in the day for uninspired teachers to begin this work, or to stigmatize as “a remnant of Popery,” a custom which had existed for 2500 years?

* Apol. ii. p. 62.

Justin wrote this Apology about the year 148,* those of whom he speaks as baptized sixty or seventy years before, in their infancy, must have been persons baptized in the first age, while some of the Apostles were living. This rite must therefore have been administered with their concurrence and sanction.

Again—such is also the testimony of Irenæus, who was born during the days of the Apostles, in the year 97,† and trained up under St. Polycarp, “the angel of the Church in Smyrna,” who had himself been a disciple of St. John. He speaks of baptism as “regeneration,”‡ and mentions among those who are

* Bingham's Orig. Eccles. lib. xi. ch. 4, sect. 7.

† Cave's Hist. Liter. vol. i. p. 41.

‡ To show the sense in which the word “regeneration” has always been used in the Church, we give the following passage from Bishop Herbert's writings—“When the Churchman, in the language of Scripture, of primitive antiquity, and of the Articles and Liturgy of his Church, calls baptism *regeneration*, he does not employ the term in its popular signification among many Protestants, to denote the divine influences upon the soul in its sanctification and renovation, in abolishing the body of sin, and raising up the graces and virtues of the new man. The term *regeneration* is used by him in its *original*, and *appropriate*, and *technical* acceptation, to denote the translation of the baptized person from that state in which, as destitute of any covenanted title to salvation, he is styled ‘the child of wrath,’ into that state which, as it proffers to him in all cases the covenanted mercy and grace of God, and in the exercise of repentance and faith actually conveys to him these blessings, is styled a ‘state of salvation.’ (Catechism of the Church.) It must be obvious, that the sacramental commencement of the spiritual life in the regeneration of baptism, and the subsequent sanctification of the principles, the powers, and affections of the new man, by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, are distinct acts and operations; the former leading to the latter, which, without it, is wholly inefficacious to salvation; on the contrary, increases the condemnation of the despiser of the gifts and calling of God.” *Charge to the Clergy of New York, in 1819.*

thus regenerated to God, "*infants and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons.*"*

Clemens of Alexandria, who was born about the middle of the second century, wrote a work intended to instruct young Christians in the practical duties of their faith. In the course of this, he reproves them for the devices engraved on their seals, for which purpose they sometimes used images taken from the ancient idolatry, and at the same time suggests some figures more Christian in their character. Thus, he says,—“If any one be a fisherman, let him think of an Apostle, and *the children taken out of the water.*”† If then, Clemens could thus exhort them to select the representation of an Apostle baptizing infants, does it not prove that he believed the Apostles did administer that rite even to those of that tender age, and that such in his time was the practice of the Church?

Origen—who was born in the second century—had been trained up from infancy by Christian parents—visited, in his travels, most of the churches in the world—and gained the reputation of being the most learned man of his age—records his testimony most unequivocally in behalf of infant baptism. His language is—“Let it be considered, what is the reason why the baptism of the Church, which is given for remission of sins, is, by the usage of the Church, *given to infants; also* whereas, if there were nothing in infants which needed forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would seem to be to them superfluous.”‡

Again, he says—“*Infants are baptized for the remission of sins.* Of what sins, or at what time have

* Adv. Hæres. lib. ii. ch. 39.

† Pædagog. lib. iii. ch. 11.

‡ Homil. viii. in Levit. ch. 12.

they sinned? Or how can there be in infants any reason for the Laver, unless according to that sense of which we have spoken a little before, viz.—‘No one is free from pollution, although his life upon the earth has been but one day.’ And because by the Sacrament of baptism native pollution is removed, therefore *infants also are baptized.*”*

And again—“*The Church received from the Apostles a tradition to give baptism also to infants.* For they to whom the Divine mysteries were committed, knew that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which should be washed away by water and the Spirit, and on account of which, also, the body itself is called the body of sin.”†

We would appeal then to your reason; who is most likely to have been correct on this point, Origen—who lived before the memory of the Apostles had faded from the Church—or those who, 1500 years after their day, for the first time discovered that infant baptism should not be administered?

St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, in Africa, who was born about the middle of the fourth century, bears the same testimony. His words are—“And if any one do ask for Divine authority in this matter—though that which *the whole Church practises, and which has not been instituted by councils, but was ever in use,* is very reasonably believed to be no other than a *thing delivered by authority of the Apostles*—yet we may besides take a true estimate how much the Sacrament does avail infants, by the circumcision which God’s former people received.”‡

* Hom. in Luc. c. 14.

† Com. in Rom. lib. 5.

‡ De Bap. lib. v. c. 23.

“We affirm, that the Holy Spirit dwells in *baptized infants*, though they know it not; for after the same manner they know Him not, though He be in them, as they know not their own soul. The reason whereof, which they cannot yet make use of, is in them as a spark raked up which will kindle as they grow in years.”*

In another place, referring to the Pelagians, he says—“They grant that *infants must be baptized*, as not being able to oppose the authority of the whole Church, which was doubtless *delivered by our Lord and his Apostles*.”†

“Original sin is so plain by the Scriptures; and that *it is forgiven to infants in the Laver of Regeneration*, is so confirmed by the antiquity and authority of the Catholic faith, and so notoriously the practice of the Church, that whatsoever is contrary to this cannot be true.”‡

“The custom of our mother, the Church, in *baptizing infants*, must not be disregarded, nor considered needless, nor believed to be other than a tradition of the Apostles.”§

St. Ambrose, the Bishop of Milan, who was born A. D. 340, in speaking of the miracle by which Elijah divided the river Jordan, and caused the waters to flow backwards to their source, (2 Kings xi.) says—“It signified the Sacrament of the Laver of Salvation, which was afterwards to be instituted, by which *those infants that are baptized* are reformed

* Epist. 57, ad Dardanum.

† De Peccat. c. 26.

‡ Contra Pelag. Lib. iii. c. 10.

§ De Gen. ad lit. lib. 10.

back again from a state of wickedness, to the primitive state of their nature." *

"No person comes to the kingdom of Heaven but by the Sacrament of Baptism. For 'unless a person be born again of water and of the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' You see He excepts no person, *not an infant*, not one that is hindered by any unavoidable accident." †

St. Chrysostom, the eloquent Bishop of Constantinople, who was also born about the middle of the fourth century, says—"And those that are baptized, *some of them were children when they received it.*" ‡

Again, when referring to the Jewish Circumcision, and the age of eight days, at which it was administered, he says—"But our Circumcision—I mean the grace of Baptism—has no determinate time as that had; but *one that is in the very beginning of his age*, or one that is in the middle of it, or one that is in his old age, may receive this circumcision made without hands, in which there is no trouble to be undergone, but to throw off the load of sins, and receive pardon for all foregoing offences." §

In the same way, his cotemporary, Theodoret the historian, a Syrian Bishop, speaking of Baptism as conveying forgiveness of past sins, says—"If it had no other effect than that, what need we *baptize infants*, that have not tasted of sin?" ||

Such, then, is the unvarying testimony of the Primitive Church, on this important doctrine. And

* Comm. lib. i. in St. Luc. c. 1.

† De Abraham Patriarch, lib. ii. c. 11.

‡ Hom. 23, in Acta. Apost.

§ Hom. 40, in Gen.

|| Hæretic. Fabular. lib. v. de Bapt.

the view we have given is strengthened by the discussions which in those ages took place on this subject, since in none of them do we ever find a doubt suggested as to the *lawfulness* of infant baptism. The controversy was always on some collateral point. The earliest of these is by Tertullian, in the beginning of the third century, a writer whose strange speculations led him on from one step to another, until at last he fell into heresy, and openly became a Montanist. Believing that the rite of Baptism at any period of life entirely washed away all sin, he proposed that it should be delayed as long as possible, even if it could be done, to a person's last hour, that thus the collected iniquities of a lifetime might at once be swept away. He acknowledges, however, that the custom of the Church has always been otherwise; a fact which is sufficiently proved by the very nature of his argument. He is plainly contending in behalf of an innovation. His words are—"For according to every one's condition, and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of Baptism is more advantageous, especially *in the case of little children*. For what need is there that the godfathers should be brought into danger? Because they may either fail of their promises by death, or they may be deceived by a child's proving of wicked disposition. What need their innocent age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins?"* "The way of Tertullian's arguing upon this point"—says Bingham—"shows plainly, that he was for introducing a new practice; that therefore it was the custom of the Church in his

* De Bap. c. 18.

time to give Baptism to infants, as well as to adult persons.”*

But, in giving this advice about delay, he himself confines it to cases where there was no danger or apprehension of death. For, otherwise, he pleads strongly for the necessity of immediate baptism, both from those words of our Lord—“Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God”—and also from that general corruption of original sin, which infects infants as much as adults.†

The only other ancient writer who varied somewhat from the general opinion of the Church was St. Gregory Nazianzen, Bishop of Constantinople, in the latter part of the fourth century. He did not carry his wish for innovation as far as Tertullian, for he did not desire Baptism to be postponed until persons had reached years of maturity, but only until they were three years old, that they might gain at least some little glimmering of religious truth. He agrees with Tertullian, however, in declaring that all who are in any danger should be at once baptized, lest any die without that sacrament. With regard to those in whose case nothing like this is apprehended, his language is—“As for others, I give my opinion that they should stay three years or thereabouts, when they are capable to hear and answer some of the holy words; and though they do not perfectly understand them, yet they form them; and that you then sanctify them in soul and body with the great sacrament of initiation.”‡ Here again we see, that he was

* Orig. Eccles. lib. xi. ch. iv. sect. 10.

† De anima, cap. 40—De Bapt. cap. 13.

‡ De Bap. Orat. 40.

pleading against the ancient, uniform practice of the Church.

Such, too, is the evidence we may draw from the first discussion of this subject before a public council of the Church. This was the Council of Carthage, A. D. 253, where 66 Bishops were assembled, whose proceedings we learn from St. Cyprian. No one had then the hardihood to inquire, whether infant baptism ought to be administered or not; but Fidus, the Bishop of a country diocese, proposed to the Council the question—"Whether infants ought to be baptized before they were eight days old?"—since this was the age for circumcision in the Jewish Church. But the Council unanimously decided, that there was no occasion for this delay, but infants might be baptized at any time. And in their *Synodical Epistle to Fidus*, the following unequivocal language is used—"As to the case of infants, whereas you judge 'that they must not be baptized within two or three days after they are born, and that the rule of circumcision is to be observed, so that none should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born,' we were all in our assembly of the contrary opinion. For, as for what you thought fitting to be done, there was not one that was of your mind, but all of us, on the contrary, judged that the grace and mercy of God [*i. e.*, as conveyed through Baptism] is to be denied to no person that is born." "And, therefore, dearest brother, this was our sentence in the Council, that no one ought to be hindered by us from Baptism and the Grace of God, who is merciful and kind and affectionate to all."

The result, then, to which history brings us is this

—that during the first 1100 years of the existence of the Christian Church, no society of men, or even single individual of whom we have any record, denied the lawfulness of infant baptism. The first direct opposition to this rite arose about the year 1126, in the midst of the darkness which had overspread the greater part of Europe, and the wild fanaticism and fearful perversions of the truth to which it gave birth. At this time, an obscure sect founded by Peter de Bruys—some of whose opinions were afterwards adopted by the Albigenses and Waldenses—declared against the baptism of infants, because they believed them to be incapable of salvation.* This doctrine, however, was received by but few, and became extinct in 1147, after the death of de Bruys and his immediate followers.

It was not until about 1522 that this heresy obtained any permanent footing. At the time of the Reformation, when the human mind, bursting from its long thralldom, naturally abused its newly acquired liberty—when it rioted in a thousand fantastic forms, enabling each one to form his creed according to the peculiar caprices of his own heart—when, antiquity and authority being disregarded, an hundred sects arose, each differing from the Church in some one particular which it insisted upon as essential—then it was, that Infant Baptism was set aside, and a small and inconsiderable party announced to the Christian world that for 1500 years the whole Church had been in grievous error. The preacher of this new doctrine was Munzer, 1521, who, having excited his followers to insurrection and civil war, was finally

* Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* v. ii. p. 309.

defeated and executed. It was not until 1534 that the sect of the Anabaptists became regularly organized as a distinct religious society. In this year, headed by John Boccold, a journeyman tailor, whom they had named their King, and incited to the most impious extravagances by John Matthias, a baker, who claimed to be a prophet, they captured the city of Munster, and attempted to establish a kingdom to be called the New Zion.* The city being re-captured in the following year, and their forces dispersed, some escaped to England, and then for the first time these doctrines began to spread in that land.

This then is the view which history gives us, of the rise of those who deny to infants the rite of Baptism. And who, with this account before him, could hesitate for a moment to decide whether or not it should be administered? On the one side is the united testimony of the Catholic Church, as it comes down through eighteen centuries, and on the other are the loud clamors of a sect which three centuries ago just struggled into being, and whose cradle was rocked by the wild heavings of ignorance and fanaticism.†

* Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. v. iii. p. 65.

† It is well known that Roger Williams was the founder of the sect of the Baptists in this country. Who, then, gave him his commission? An answer to this question is found in the following extract from the "History of the Baptist Church in Providence." "Being settled in this place, which, from the kindness of God to them, they called Providence, Mr. Williams, and those with him, considered the importance of Gospel union, and were desirous of forming themselves into a Church; but met with considerable obstruction. They were convinced of the nature and design of believers' baptism by *immersion*, but from a variety of circumstances *had hitherto been prevented from submersion*. To obtain a *suitable administrator* was a matter of consequence. At length the candidates for communion nominated and appointed Ezekiel Holliman, a man of gifts and piety, *to baptize*

We may in this respect, as in every other, cleave to the faith of Apostles and Martyrs who lived when the memory of their Lord's instruction was still fresh on the earth; or we may turn aside from the old paths, to embrace every novelty which courts our notice. We may repose on the wisdom and example of the many generations which have gone before us; or we may unsettle our faith by yielding to the varied teaching of those whose creed arose when the human intellect was let loose from its old restraints, and in the first moments of its delirium scarcely knew what to believe.

The next point to be considered is—*the benefit to Mr. Williams, and who in return baptized Mr. Holliman and the other ten.*"

It is now a principle for which none contend more strenuously than the Baptists, that *Scriptural and valid baptism cannot be administered by any one who is himself unbaptized*. Yet of these twelve persons who thus baptized each other, not one had previously been immersed, and, of course, on Baptist principles, they were *unbaptized*. What right, then, had they to admit into the visible fold of Christ, or to "form themselves into a Church?" And are not the Baptists in this country, on their own confession, now destitute of any kind of valid baptism? We have never yet seen a satisfactory answer to this question. It was brought forward in the *Banner of the Cross*, April 1, 1843, but those to whom it was addressed seem not to be anxious to have any inquiry into their origin in this country, or to reply to the demand—"By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?" The *Missouri Baptist*, however, with more candor than its associates, thus apologizes for the manner in which these *unbaptized laymen* mutually dipped each other—"Under other circumstances they would gladly have availed themselves of a regular administration of the ordinance; but situated as they were, . . . they naturally and wisely concluded that He who requireth this service will not annex conditions incompatible with their obedience, and, of course, will accept of their *right intention* in the performance." May not this presumption be met with the question addressed by Jehovah to some of old—"Who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts?" (See the *Banner of the Cross*, April 22.)

be derived from Baptism. We hear the question often asked—“What use is it to the infant?” I answer—“Much, every way.” In the Catechism of the Church it is defined to be, “an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us.” We have already seen in what lofty terms the Primitive writers always refer to it, and how St. Augustine speaks of the Spirit which then rests upon the heart of the unconscious infant, as “a spark which will kindle as he grows in years.” And this is in strict accordance with the view given in Scripture, where it is mentioned in direct connection with the influences of the Holy Spirit. Thus our Lord speaks of a person as being “baptized with water *and the Spirit.*” One of the Fathers of our Church—Bishop Seabury—therefore thus sums up this point:—“As to the benefits of Baptism, they are remission of sins, regeneration or adoption into the family of God, the presence of the Holy Spirit, the resurrection of the body, and everlasting life. That these benefits are annexed to baptism, the Holy Scriptures give ample testimony. ‘Repent’—said Peter to the multitude inquiring what they should do—‘and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.’ In the same language Ananias addresses Saul—‘And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins.’ That we are regenerate and born, or adopted into the family or Church of God by Baptism, Christ declared to Nicodemus when he said—‘Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of

God.' The Kingdom of God is the Church of God—the same Church both in this world and the next, (for God has but one Church, the body of Christ.) By Baptism we are made members of this Church; and if we continue faithful members till death, shall in it obtain a happy resurrection and everlasting life—shall continue members of it to all eternity."

Therefore it is, that in our service we use petitions like these, before the Baptism—"We beseech Thee, for Thine infinite mercy, that Thou wilt mercifully look upon this child: wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost"—"We call upon Thee for this infant, that he, coming to Thy holy baptism, may receive remission of sin by spiritual regeneration"—Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant, that he may be born again, and be made an heir of everlasting salvation"—"Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin, and grant that this child, now to be baptized therein, may receive the fulness of Thy grace." And after the rite is administered, we say—"We yield Thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for Thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into Thy holy Church." Such is the plain and unequivocal teaching of the Church as displayed in her formularies. And unless this truth is allowed, that the Spirit is given in Baptism, that rite becomes nothing but a mere empty ceremony.

Now look for a moment at the two most common objections to this view. The first is—"that infants cannot receive the influences of the Spirit at so tender an age. But who can pretend thus accurately

to draw the line, or to assert at what period it first becomes possible for the image of God to be stamped upon an immortal soul? Who can declare the manner in which the Father of spirits acts upon our spirits, or the rules by which He is guided? We are told that John the Baptist was "filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb;" why then is not an infant as capable of receiving spiritual blessings now, as it was eighteen centuries ago?

The other objection is—"that the child, as it advances in years, often gives no evidence of these spiritual influences." We reply—that this is no proof that grace was not imparted to it in Baptism. May it not be given at that time, but when not subsequently nourished by the proper means, become as it were dormant, and even be quenched? Baptism is the child's spiritual birth into the Church of Christ; but unless, through the unceasing care of parents, it is nurtured and trained up in the fear of the Lord, it may soon impair and weaken the benefit to be derived from this introduction into the fold. It is precisely so in the natural world. The fact that the child is born into it, is no proof that it shall certainly live and grow. If neglected, and the proper means are not used to increase its strength, it assuredly will die. And in the same way the spiritual life which it gained at baptism may by neglect and the commission of sin, soon decay, until, as its faculties unfold, it becomes more and more of the earth, earthly. Yet for all this who can gainsay the truth that Baptism is a high and holy privilege? If it place benefits within the reach of those who receive it, and impart to the soul the first principles of vital, spiritual life, have we

not reason to rejoice that God thus permits us to dedicate our children to Him? We believe, therefore, there is as much truth as beauty in the passage in which one of the religious poets of England describes this touching rite—

“In due time
A day of solemn ceremonial comes ;
When they, who for this minor hold in trust
Rights that transcend the highest heritage
Of mere humanity, present their charge
At the baptismal font. And when the pure
And consecrating element hath cleansed
The original stain, the child is there received
Into the second ark, Christ's Church, with trust
That he, from wrath redeemed, therein shall float
Over the billows of this troublesome world
To the fair land of everlasting life.”*

The third point in connection with this subject, which I would bring before you, is—*the manner in which this rite should be administered*. The Church regards as a lawful mode of Baptism, either *Immersion*, *Affusion*, or pouring—and *Aspersion*, or sprinkling. In each of these ways she declares it to be equally valid. If therefore the consciences of any of her members are scrupulous on this point, her ministers can administer this sacrament in the way they may select. The Church has decided that the *manner* is indifferent, for three reasons.

The first is, because the word *Baptizo* (Βαπτίζω,) which we translate *baptize*, and which our Lord used when he gave the command—“Go teach all nations, baptizing (Βαπτίζοντες) them”—does not, necessarily, mean to immerse. On the contrary, in many

* Wordsworth's Excursion, Book V.

cases to translate it in this way would entirely destroy its meaning. The same is true with regard to *Bapto* (*Βαπτω*), from which it is derived.* We will give a single example of this result with each of these words.

In the Septuagint—the Greek translation of the old Testament—Daniel iv. 30, in the description of the judgment which fell upon Nebuchadnezzar, when he was “driven forth from the abodes of men, and did eat grass as oxen,” it is stated that “his body was wet (*ἐβραφη*) with the dew of heaven.” Here the word

* “As it is agreed on all hands, that the native Greeks are the best authority for the meaning of their own language, we shall refer the question to them. We give therefore the definitions of these words, only from the native Greek Lexicographers.

“The oldest native Greek Lexicographer is HESYCHIUS, who lived in the fourth century of the Christian Era. He gives only the root *Bapto*; and the only meaning he gives the word is *antleo*, ‘to draw or pump water.’ Next in order comes SUIDAS, a native Greek, who wrote in the tenth century. He gives only the derivative, *Baptizo*, and defines it by *pluno*, ‘to wash.’ Passing over the intermediate Greek Lexicographers, we come down to the present century, at the beginning of which, we find GASES, a learned Greek, who with great labor and pains compiled a large and valuable Lexicon of the ancient Greek language. His book, in three volumes quarto, is a work deservedly held in high estimation by all, and is generally used by native Greeks. The following are his definitions of *Bapto*, and *Baptizo*.

- ‘BAPTO. Brecho, to wet, moisten, bedew.
Pluno, to wash, (viz., clothes.)
Gemizo, to fill.
Buthizo, to dip.
Antleo, to draw, to pump water.
- ‘BAPTIZO. Brecho, to wet, moisten, bedew.
Pluno, to wash.
Leuo, to wash, to bathe.
Antleo, to draw, to pump water.’

“These are the definitions of a native Greek, and are entitled to the highest deference, both for his learning and his ecclesiastical connections.” *Chapin's Primitive Church*, pp. 43, 44.

certainly means nothing but to *wet* or to *moisten*. And we would ask, which sounds most in accordance with common sense, to say—"his body was *sprinkled* with the dew of heaven"—or, "his body was *immersed* with the dew of heaven?"

Again—in the New Testament, John the Baptist predicting the coming of our Lord, says—"He shall baptize (*βαπτίσει*) you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Now, translate this—"He shall *immerse* you with the Holy Ghost and with fire"—and we at once perceive the absurdity. But the prophet Joel, when referring to this same event, (as St. Peter declares, "this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel," Acts ii. 16,) says—"I will *pour out* my Spirit upon all flesh." This prophecy, therefore, was first fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost descended and rested on the Apostles, and afterwards when it was given to the Gentiles also; and we are told—"they of the circumcision were astonished, because the gift of the Holy Ghost was *poured out* upon the Gentiles also." This is the only direct reference in the New Testament to *the mode* in which baptism of any kind was performed, and it certainly argues nothing in favor of immersion.*

A second reason for this decision of the Church is—because it is not in accordance with our Lord's custom, to enjoin upon his disciples any duty or rite

* It is of course impossible in this brief lecture to enter into any particular discussion of the meaning of these terms. The reader will find, however, in *Chapin's Primitive Church*, a critical examination of all the places both in the Old and New Testaments, in which the words *Bapto* and *Baptizo* are used, (p. 44-52.) The result is, that out of *twenty-three* cases in which *Bapto* occurs, it has the sense of immersion but *twice*; and that in *seventy* places where *Baptizo* is found, there is *not one* where it means to immerse.

which cannot be universally put in practice. Were immersion, therefore, absolutely necessary, you perceive that in some situations and climates it would be impossible to receive it. Suppose, for instance, that a person should be lying on a bed of sickness, with life waning away, yet feeling the earnest desire, before death comes, to be admitted into the Church of Christ. That privilege must, in this case, be denied him. He must die an alien from the fold, if we believe that our Lord has appointed but one form in which the Sacrament of Baptism is valid. But all His commands, on the contrary, bear the stamp of universality. The Holy Communion of His body and blood can be administered in all climates, and to any one, however enfeebled by sickness, and so we believe can baptism. Our Lord never directs any thing which it would be impossible to obey.

The third reason is—because affusion and sprinkling have been both practised and recognized as valid in all ages of the Church. It is not probable, that John the Baptist, when “there went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan,” administered this rite by immersion, for time would scarcely have been found, to allow so slow a process to be so often repeated to these multitudes. Many, too, must have come there unprovided with proper garments for this purpose. And these same objections will apply against immersion being the form used in any of those cases, in which, under the preaching of the Apostles, large numbers at once submitted to the faith. Rivers and lakes could not always have been

at hand, nor a sufficiency of water have been easily obtained.*

The probability seems to be that all three methods were practised in the Early Church. In the hot countries of the East, where men went lightly clad, and bathing was often used, it was natural that immersion should frequently be the manner of baptism. As, however, the faith extended into the colder climates of the North and West, affusion and sprinkling were more generally resorted to, as agreeing better with local circumstances. Thus St. Cyprian, even when he declares against the validity of heretical Baptism, defends that performed by sprinkling. "For the contagion of sin"—says he—"was not

* "After the preaching of St. Peter, it is stated that 3000 were baptized, and that these were added to the Church in *one day*. Now the immersion of 3000 persons in so short a time, carries with it so great an air of improbability, that we must be excused, if we suspect that some more rapid mode was adopted for their baptism. Reflect upon this one moment :—Peter's sermon began (as we are told) after the third hour of the day ; that is, nine o'clock in the morning. His addresses occupied a considerable time ; for, besides the sketch given in the Acts, it is said that ' with *many more words* he exhorted them '—which are not recorded. Now, it was not until *after* all this, that the Baptisms began—and the time remaining to the evening, could scarcely have been more than eight hours. Dividing, therefore, the 3000 persons, there would be 375 to receive baptism in each of those eight hours—a number so great that it is difficult to imagine how they could possibly have been immersed.

"But again ; in the case of the jailor at Philippi, we have an instance of a whole family, suddenly baptized, and this, too, at *midnight*. The whole matter was transacted in a very limited time, and we cannot, without violence, bring ourselves to believe in the reality of such a thing as the instant arousing from slumber of a whole family and the immediate *plunging* of them in the cold element of baptism, to say nothing of the improbability of there being on the spot, and at the time, a sufficiency of pure water, and suitable vessels to meet the emergency."—*Staunton's Church Dictionary*, Art. "Immersion."

washed away as the filth of the body is, by a carnal and secular washing. There was no need of a lake or other such like helps to wash and cleanse it." And he proves the lawfulness of aspersion from Ezekiel xxxvi. 25—"I will *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean."* The manner was conformed to the climate, and the situation of the recipient.

The mistake in all this matter is, that men have not distinguished what is essential from what is non-essential. The essentials in baptism are—the proper person to administer it—the use of water—and the name of the Trinity in which it is applied.† Other things may be regulated by circumstances. The case is precisely the same with the Eucharist. This, at its first institution by our Lord, was administered in a very different way from what it now is; but we have discriminated, and retained what is essential. And why not do so with Baptism? To make the *mode* of Baptism the distinctive feature of a sect, is as reasonable as it would be, now to form a new party in the Christian world, to be called "the Communionists," who should sever themselves from the Catholic Church on the ground that the Communion is not administered in a valid manner, unless received precisely as it was by the Apostles of our Lord, reclining on couches around a table, and in an upper chamber. The fact that the whole Christian Church for eighteen centuries had believed differently, would, in this

* Epist. 76.

† "It cannot appear that the child was baptized with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (which are *essential parts of baptism.*")—*Rubric at the end of Form for private baptism of children.*

age of new discoveries, be a matter of no importance.

There is, however, a much more summary way of disposing of the question. Suppose we were to allow, that in the early Church in the East, immersion was always used, does it prove that the Church is now bound to continue it? Certainly not. There is nothing in this *manner* essential to the existence of the Sacrament. This is merely a practice, resting on no express command, and involving no doctrine or point of faith. The only difference about the manner is, whether this or one of the other two ways is most significant of spiritual purification. It is one of those things which the Church has a right to alter and adapt to the changing circumstances of the world. And the Church general has long since adopted *aspersion* as the mode of baptism. A striking instance of this same power of altering the *manner* in which rites are administered, is furnished by the history of the Passover. The Jews, at first, by the express command of God, were to receive this, "with their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand," as those who eat in haste. But when settled in their own land, they seem to have totally changed the mode—to have added many new rites to it—and to have partaken of it, reclining on couches. *Yet our Lord sanctioned this by His example.* And has not the Christian Church this same power?

Such is precisely the view given by Bishop Burnet, when discussing Art. XX., "The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies." He even gives this very case of Baptism, as one of his illustrations. His words are—"In matters that are merely ritual, the

state of mankind on different climates and ages is apt to vary; and the same thing that in one scene of human nature may look grave, and seem fit for any society, may in another age look light, and dissipate men's thoughts. It is also evident there is not a system of rules given in the New Testament about all these: and yet a due method in them is necessary to maintain the order and decency that become divine things. This seems to be a part of the Gospel *liberty*, that it is not a 'law of ordinances;' these things being left to be varied according to the diversities of mankind. Though a kiss of peace, and an order of deaconesses, were the practices of the Apostolical time; yet when the one gave occasion to raillery and the other to scandal, all the world was, and still is, satisfied with the reasons of letting both fall." After speaking of the changes made by the Jewish Church in their rites, he says—"If then such a liberty was allowed in so limited a religion, it seems highly suitable to the sublimer state of Christian liberty, that there should be room left for such appointments or alterations as the different state of time and places should require. In hotter countries, for instance, there is no danger in dipping; but if it is otherwise in colder climates, then, since 'mercy is better than even sacrifice,' a more sparing use may be made of water; *aspersion may answer the true end of baptism.*" It is of course to be observed, that these changes can only be made in things merely *ritual*, and by the authority of the Catholic Church.

The last point which we would briefly bring forward is—*the place in which the Sacrament of Baptism should be administered.* This is declared by

our regulations to be in the Church. The Rubric states that "the Godfathers and Godmothers, and the people with the children, must be ready *at the font*, either immediately after the last lesson at Morning Prayer, or else immediately after the last lesson at Evening Prayer, as the minister, at his discretion, shall appoint." And the minister is also enjoined, to warn the people, "that without great cause and necessity, they procure not their children to be baptized at home in their houses."

And this surely is right—that here at the Font, in the house of God, these solemn vows should be made, which devote your children to the Lord. Thus is it shown, that we all are one body, united by a common tie when we enter our Master's temple—that here at least, before His altar, all worldly distinctions are unknown. "If baptisms always took place on Sundays or holydays, and in the public service, and at every poor child's baptism the rich did not sit in their pews, as if it did not concern them and were a weariness, but rose, and knelt, and joined in the service with readiness and fervency; experience in certain places has shown that a good feeling has been generated among the poor far beyond what seemed likely from such a trifle; and of course a more right feeling would be produced among the rich, who in such cases are far more deficient in it than the poor."*

The severity of the climate, however, sickness, or other causes which cannot be enumerated, may often furnish that "great cause and necessity" which will justify the minister in performing this service in private. Yet, in such cases, you will perceive at

* Faber's "Churchman's Politics," p. 44.

once that it should be *private*. The administration of this solemn Sacrament is surely not a time for gathering together your worldly friends, and giving loose to festivity and mirth. When the young immortal is signed with the sign of the Cross, and the influences of the Spirit are invoked to uphold it in its future life, is it the time or place for frivolity and amusement? When solemn words are spoken, and the pomps and vanities of this sinful earth are renounced, shall worldliness in that hour have gathered there to hold its carnival? Should there thus be furnished at the very moment, a practical denial of all the lips are uttering? Should this be made merely an excuse for excitement and gayety? No, brethren, whatever else you may do, at least bring not the Sacraments of the Church into your homes, except with awed and chastened feelings. The humble prayer and the heartfelt petition for grace to fulfil your fearful responsibilities, might well befit a scene like this—not the light jest or the empty laugh. Remember, with whom you are dealing in that rite—that He is not mocked—that He marks the feelings with which you kneel before him—and that this service concerns the eternal well-being of a young spirit, which is thus setting out for immortal life.

We have thus, my brethren, endeavored to bring before you in the narrow limits of this single Lecture, a subject which might well fill a volume. You will perceive, however, even from these brief observations, the spiritual force of the question—"Is it well with the child?" If it be still uncleansed by the waters of baptism, I tell you, it is not well with it. It is an "alien from the commonwealth of Israel," and a

stranger to the Christian Church. Are you willing that thus it should remain? Shall that being around whom your fondest affections are clustering, be sent forth into a stormy and sinful world, without being fortified by the aid of God's Spirit—feeling as if no obligation was resting on him—and cut off from all union with that holy fellowship, which comprehends the just on earth and the angels in Heaven? Are you willing, that through *your* remissness that link should be wanting which binds him to the throne of the Eternal? Who can tell the momentous results which may ensue from his being thus debarred? Separated from the nursing care of the Church, whose object is, to have her children first in infancy brought within her fold—then in maturer years confirmed in this grace—and thus by regular steps advanced to partake of the communion of their Lord's death—he may feel himself enabled to live without restraint or care for these things. Thus, the world claims him as its own, and the claim is allowed. He yields to temptation—resigns himself to its embrace—lives in sin, and dies without hope. And when at length he has risen from his lowly grave, only to find himself a partaker in “the resurrection of damnation,” and you and he meet once more before the last dread tribunal; as you stand up to receive your sentence, perchance from the ranks of the lost there may start forth one, whom in speechless dismay you recognize as him whom you have nurtured on earth; and as he points to you, the author of his being, his familiar tones thrill in your ear, when he shrieks forth to the Judge—“This, this, O Lord, is he, through whose

remissness I must inherit the horrors of the second death! Through his neglect it happened, that I was not numbered with Thy Church, or baptized with Thy Spirit, ere the cares of life gathered around me, and now, I am a castaway—undone forever !”

VII.

THE MORAL TRAINING OF THE CHURCH.

I love the Church—the Holy Church,
 That o'er our life presides,
The Birth, the Bridal, and the Grave,
 And many an hour besides !
Be mine, through life, to live in her,
 And when the Lord shall call,
To die in her—the spouse of Christ,
 The Mother of us all.

Rev. A. C. Coxe.

OUR faith appeals to the heart as much as to the intellect. Its object is not to inculcate a set of abstract truths, but to render us “meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.” Among the changes and trials of this lower world, we are to exercise our hope and patience—the grace of God being our strength—the prizes of eternity, the rewards to which we look forward. Thus, as this life wears away, we shall feel that in our spiritual warfare we are going on from “conquering to conquer” — mastering the evil of our nature—and, by self-denial and self-discipline, fitting ourselves hereafter to mingle with the children of immortality. Each year will witness some new advance in the divine life—some new acquisition in holiness, until, as our sun declines towards the West, we can calmly watch its setting, being confident that the night of death which gathers around us, shall soon give place to a glorious awakening.

It is to produce this result that the whole system of the Church is intended. She would educate the soul for Eternity. She is indeed the Churchman's guide through life—at once his instructor and his own familiar friend, who meets him at every change and turn, with words of warning and of comfort, and thus systematically and unceasingly exerts her influence to prepare him for that rest which awaits the just in the Paradise of God. This then is THE MORAL TRAINING OF THE CHURCH, with regard to which I would this evening address you. I wish to show, that no emergency can happen to us in this world, for which the Church has not provided—no possible condition of life, from the cradle to the grave, which she has not anticipated, or where she is found wanting in her power to convey spiritual aid. Thus it is, that we are enabled to attain that privilege, for which the kingly Poet of Israel longed—"to dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of our life, to behold the fair beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple."

Let us begin then with the infant, whose reason and senses are just unfolding to a perception of the world it has entered, and what course does the Church pursue? Does she disregard or scorn that feeble being, as it passes through the months of wailing infancy and the years of helpless childhood? Does she repel it from her fold, telling it to live on, "an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, and a stranger from the covenants of promise," until the fresh dew of life is gone, and the beauty of its early years departed? Does she refuse to notice that young immortal, until in maturer years it can apply

for admission at her gates, coming fresh from the world as a heathen would do, who had not till then heard the news of redeeming love? Does she proclaim, that by nature that being, about whom your warmest affections are gathered, is born in sin, yet without offering any remedy to blot out the stain? Such is by no means the Church's want of care for little children. She claims them even from their birth, and gathers them at once into her fold, that from the first the promises of the Gospel may be pledged to them, and they share in those rich blessings which are offered to her members.

The first Rubric in our Prayer Book which relates to the infant, is one for the guidance of the minister of the Parish, directing him "often to admonish the people, that they defer not the baptism of their children unless upon a great and reasonable cause." As the children of the Israelites at eight days old were made members of the Jewish Church, and thus entitled to the covenant promises which God had made to the nation, so are your children by baptism to be received into the fold of the Christian Church. When, therefore, the child is presented before the altar, the appeal is made to those present—"I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of His bounteous mercy, He will grant to this child that which by nature he cannot have; that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's Holy Church, and be made a living member of the same."

And this is done. The water is poured forth—the sign of the Cross* is impressed upon the forehead of

* Among the refinements of modern wisdom is a dread of the Sign

that unconscious being, "in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ of the Cross. Are we ashamed of it? Have we forgotten the example of St. Paul, and ceased to "glory in the cross of Jesus Christ?" Such was not by any means the view of the Primitive Christians. "When heathens," says Hooker, "despised the Christian religion because of the sufferings of Jesus Christ, the Fathers, to testify how little such contumelies and contempts prevailed with them, chose rather the sign of the Cross, than any other outward mark, whereby the world might most easily discern always what they were." (*Eccles. Polity*, book v.) Tertullian, in the second century, testifies, that on all occasions they used this sign. *Deo Coron. Milit.* c. iii.) It was made upon those persons who were admitted as Catechumens, (*Bing. Orig. Eccles.* lib. x. c. i. sec. 3., and c. ii. sec. 8,) and signed upon their foreheads at the time of baptism. (*Palmer's Orig. Lit.* v. ii. p. 190.) Thus they would manifest—St. Augustine says—"that so far are they from blushing at the Cross, they do not conceal this instrument of redemption, but carry it on their brows." (*In Psalm cxli.*)

It was this spirit which induced our forefathers every where to set up the sign of the Cross—in their Churches—their houses—by the wayside—and at the fountain—that as the weary traveller stopped to drink, he might have before him the emblem of the Crucified. There may sometimes have been superstition mingled with this, but was not even superstition better than the refined indifference of our day? In a treatise on the Ten Commandments, entitled "*Dives et Pauper*," and printed at Westminster by Wynken de Worde, A. D. 1496, the real and pious object of erecting the Cross by the road-side is thus expressively assigned—"For this reason ben Crosses by ye waye, that whan folke passynge see the Crosses, they sholde thynke on Hym that deyed on ye Crosse, and worschyppe Hym above all thynges."

But we are told, "it is Popish." Are we then to give up every Primitive practice which the Romish Church has retained? If so, we shall soon be worse off than our dissenting brethren. The Church of England in one of her canons thus vindicates her retention of this sign--

"Following the steps of our most worthy King, because he therein followeth the rules of the Scripture, and *the practice of the Primitive Church*, we do commend to all true members of the Church of England these our directions and observations ensuing: the honor and dignity of the name of the Cross begat a reverent estimation even in the Apostles' time, (for aught that is known to the contrary,) of the sign of the Cross, which the Christians shortly after used in all their

crucified, and manfully to fight under His banner, against sin, the world, and the devil; and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end." Thus he becomes a member of the visible

actions. The use of this sign in Baptism *was held by the Primitive Church*, as well by the Greeks as the Latins, with one consent and great applause. This continual and general use of the sign of the Cross is evident by *the testimonies of the ancient fathers*.

"It must be confessed, that in process of time, the sign of the Cross was greatly abused, in the Church of Rome. BUT THE ABUSE OF A THING DOES NOT TAKE AWAY THE LAWFUL USE OF IT. Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches in all things which they held and practised, that as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departeth from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen *both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches which were their first founders*.

"The sign of the Cross in Baptism being thus purged from all Popish superstitions and error, and reduced in the Church of England to the primary institution of it, upon those rules of doctrine concerning things indifferent, which are consonant to the word of God, *and the judgments of all the ancient fathers*, we hold it the part of every private man, both minister and other, reverently to retain the true use of it prescribed by public authority." *Canon xxx.*

Let us then continue to glory in the Cross. Let it be elevated on our Churches, to show a heedless world the object of those consecrated buildings. Surely, this emblem of our common faith—glittering in the sunshine, and immovable in the storm—is more appropriate on our pinnacles and spires, than the light vane, turning to every point of the compass, as if to teach, that the minds of those who worship below are "carried about with every wind of doctrine."

"And we will not conceal the precious Cross,
Like men ashamed. The sun with its first smile
Shall greet that symbol crowning the low pile,
And the fresh air of 'incense-breathing morn'
Shall wooingly embrace it; and green moss
Creep round its arms through centuries unborn."

Wordsworth's Eccles. Sonnets.

Church. Her responsibilities are resting on him—her blessings belong to him.

“A few calm words of faith and prayer,
A few bright drops of holy dew,
Have worked a wonder there
Earth’s charmers never knew.
For there the holy Cross was sign’d,
And the young soldier duly sworn,
With true and fearless mind,
To serve the Virgin-born.” *

The Church in this way offers to take your children, and by her spiritual influence to educate them for the Lord. While you would be compelled to send them out to encounter the snares of a sinful world, unaided by Divine Grace, she steps forward, and like Pharaoh’s daughter, rescues them from this death, adopts them for her own, and then gives them back to you, to nurse for her sake. Thus it is that she obeys that injunction of her Lord, when he said—“Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven.” And when he declared again—“Whosoever shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me.” She knows that He not only gives great encouragement, but also promises a reward to those who thus dedicate their children to Him. She knows, too, that this solemn Sacrament is not merely an outward form, but also “a visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us.” Therefore it is, that in Scripture, when Baptism by water is mentioned, the influences of the Holy Ghost are so often connected with it.† She trusts, then, that

* Keble’s Christian Year.

† Matt. iii. 11, John iii. 5, Eph. v. 26, Titus, ii. 4-7, 1 Pet. iii. 21, 1 John, v. 6-8.

Divine Grace does descend upon that young candidate for immortality—that the germs of holiness are implanted there—which may afterwards, as the faculties expand, and life goes on, be cherished into confirmed godliness. Thus she commences life with the children committed to her care.*

Now look at the second step. The Church still keeps her hold upon that child, and, as its reason strengthens, has provided her Catechism, with which its training is to be commenced. She does not send it forth to feed in “strange pastures,” or to attempt, in the highways and byways of this busy world, to

* “In ancient times men had Holy Baptism continually in their thoughts. They could scarcely speak or write on any religious subject without the discourse turning on Baptism at last. Children were educated simply as baptized children. They were taught that things were right or wrong in proportion as they affected the Baptismal vow. Sins were considered more or less heinous as they were supposed to stain Baptismal purity. Baptism was to them all in all; because it was there they found the cross of Christ set up.”—*Faber on “The Prayer Book a Safeguard,”* p. 8.

“Christian education is the education of a baptized soul. Now it is not too much to say, that there are very few of us who give this prominence to Baptism in the education of our children. The little ones tell us, that they *were* made in their Baptism ‘members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven;’ and moreover they ‘heartily thank God their Heavenly Father that he *hath* called them to this state of salvation.’ Yet we educate them as if we did not believe a word of all this. Alas! many among us do not believe it. We bring them up as if they were one day to be Christians, not as if they were so already. The Church, when she educates her children in the Catechism, *is ever teaching them to look back. We, on the contrary, are always making them look forward.* She gives them great thoughts, and tries to make them careful, jealous, and obedient, because they *are* Christians. We educate their minds, and inform them with high principles of action, because they *may* be Christians, and *ought* to be Christians. In a word, with the Church, Baptism is a gift and a power: with us it is a theory and a notion.”
Faber on “The Catechism,” p. 13.

gather that knowledge which can make us wise unto salvation. She furnishes it with aliment for the intellect as well as for the heart. As it was enjoined upon the Sponsors at the time of baptism, that "the infant be taught, as soon as he shall be able to learn, what a solemn vow, promise, and profession he hath made by them," so the Church provides the means at an early day of beginning this work. He is to be "instructed in the Church Catechism set forth for that purpose."

And how admirable is every portion of this little formulary! While so short that the young child can commit it to memory, and so simple that its meaning can be easily explained and learned, it is at the same time so comprehensive an outline of religion that it familiarizes the mind with all its cardinal truths. Neither is there anything dim or vague in the instruction which it imparts. All is plain and practical. The opening questions naturally lead the child to speak of its baptism—the privileges and obligations of which are accordingly explained. Then follow the Articles of the Creed, which it is required to believe—the Ten Commandments, which are laid down as its rule of life towards God and its neighbor—and the necessity of grace from on high having been inculcated, that prayer is added which our Lord Himself gave His followers to use. The whole then concludes with a brief exposition of the nature of the two Sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper—the benefits to be derived from them, and the requisites necessary for their proper reception.

Tell me, then, where in so small a compass can you find so admirable a view of the doctrines of our faith?

While the doubts and questionings of controversy are shunned, everything is inculcated which is necessary to inform the mind or regulate the life by the rules of holiness. In this respect, therefore, the Church has done her part; and were parents and sponsors but faithful to their trust, the children of the fold would go forth into the world, instructed in the truth, armed against error, and prepared to repel the insidious suggestions of those who would seduce them from the right way.”*

Nor let the oft-repeated objection be heeded, that the doctrines of our faith are above the comprehension of the young child. We believe there are none taught in our Catechism, of which a careful explanation will not enable the learner to gain some perception, even if he do not fully grasp the meaning. And what more than this, do we “children of a larger growth,” even in the maturity of our reason, understand of many of the divine mysteries? The deep things of God seem to float dimly before our eyes—“we see through a glass darkly”—and are obliged to wait, until in another state of being, with our faculties expanded, we “shall know, even as also we are known.” Thus also is it with the child, and precisely on this principle do we store its mind with many branches of human learning which at present it cannot understand. We know that these truths

* “What may be the cause why so much cloth so soon changeth color? It is because it was never wet wadded, which giveth the fixation to a color, and setteth it in the cloth.

“What may be the reason why so many, now-a-days, are carried about with every wind of doctrine, even to scour every point in the compass round about? Surely it is because they were never well catechized in the principles of religion.”—*Thomas Fuller*.

will be laid up in its memory, and as the intellectual powers are developed, their meaning will gradually dawn upon it. Beautifully and effectually, indeed, has a living Christian poet answered this objection—

“O say not, dream not, heavenly notes
To childish ears are vain,
That the young mind at random floats,
And cannot reach the strain.

“Dim or unheard, the words may fall,
And yet the heaven-taught mind
May learn the sacred air, and all
The harmony unwind.”*

Now look at the third step in this moral training. The solemn obligations resting on parents having been discharged, and the child been trained up from infancy “in the nurture and admonition of the Lord,” the Church calls upon him again when he has arrived at years of discretion. She supposes that the grace of God has been ripened and matured in his heart, and that he is now prepared, openly, before the world, to confess himself a disciple of the Crucified Son of God. This is done in Confirmation, when he publicly takes his Baptismal vows upon himself; and therefore the Church directs, that at this period of life—just when he is in the freshness of his youth, and before he has entered on the busy, active world—he shall be thus farther armed against temptation. He returns then to the chancel, where he has once been admitted by Baptism into the Church, and standing up before the altar, the Bishop addresses to him the question—“Do you here, in the presence of

* *Keble's Christian Year*. The reader will find the subject of Catechising nowhere more fully and admirably discussed, than in Bishop Doane's Charge to the Convention of New-Jersey, in 1836, entitled, “The Church's Care for Little Children.”

God, and of this congregation, renew the solemn promise and vow that ye made, or that was made in your name, at your Baptism; ratifying and confirming the same; and acknowledging yourself bound to believe and to do all those things which ye then undertook, or your sponsors then undertook for you?" To this the candidate "audibly answers, *I do.*" And then, after the united prayers of all have commended him to God, the Bishop lays his hands upon his head, while kneeling before him, with the appropriate petition—"Defend, O Lord, this Thy servant with Thy Heavenly grace; that he may continue Thine forever; and daily increase in thy Holy Spirit more and more, until he come unto Thy everlasting kingdom." How solemn then is all this service? Who can unite in it, without having first determined most fully to devote himself to the service of God, or without having every holy resolution quickened and strengthened within him!*

Thus it is that we have traced the young member

* "At that moment the question was asked, 'Do ye here'—the Bishop began,—'in the presence of God and this congregation, renew the solemn promise and vow made in your names at your baptism?' I had separated myself from the company of candidates, and stood a little apart, looking at them. 'Do they'—I thought—'here, where the dead in Christ are lying to rest around them; where the eye of God is in an especial manner upon them; where their ministers are watching as those who must give account, and anxious friends are looking on even with prayers and tears—Do they come *here* with true hearts, or dare they here to trifle? O let them turn back now! I almost said—let them not lie unto God! or rather, here, as at the foot of the Cross, let them accept the offered mercy of Him who waiteth to be gracious.' Of all the thoughts that come into one's mind in looking on that lovely congregation, the saddest was the dread that some there, perhaps, though charity hoped better things of all, had come carelessly, as to an unmeaning ceremony."—*Scenes in our Parish*, p. 198.

of the Church, from his early infancy, until he stands upon the verge of manhood, and is prepared to go forth and take his part in its engrossing cares. You have seen how the Church watched over him, and gathered her restraints about his steps, training him up until the hour when he publicly professed himself one with the faithful. Now see her future care, and what, as life goes on, she has provided to strengthen him against the encroachments of worldliness.

Our thoughts naturally turn at once to the Holy Communion. Of this he is now invited to partake, if he can do so humbly, reverently, and with the wish to lead a godly life. The emblems of his Master's broken body and shed blood are placed before him, and from this Sacrament he can gather strength for his future course. Solemn indeed are the reflections which in these moments must crowd upon his mind, wafting his thoughts away from this lower world! "With angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, he lauds and magnifies God's glorious name," and thus is forced to realize, that there is indeed such a bond as "the Communion of saints," uniting in one fellowship the faithful in Christ Jesus, whether they have entered into the Paradise of rest, or are still toiling on in the wilderness. And this spiritual feast is provided so frequently, that its holy influence cannot wear out by the continual contact into which he is forced with the things which are appealing to his outward senses. Each month he is called to partake of it, that worldliness may have no time to gather over his soul—the affections become alienated from his God—or the solemn scenes of Calvary be strange and unaccustomed to his thoughts.

Thus it is that the Church provides for man's "spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament, which is so divine and comfortable a thing to them who receive it worthily."*

* In the exhortation we say—"He hath given *His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ*, not only to die for us, but also to be *our spiritual food and sustenance* in that Holy Sacrament." This then is the doctrine of our Church, that the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper, *only after a heavenly and spiritual manner*. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith." (*Art. XXVIII.*) The Church holds therefore the doctrine of *the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist*, but not the doctrine of His *material presence*. She teaches that the change wrought in the Elements, by their consecration, is simply a *spiritual one*. Mr. G. S. Faber, in his "*Difficulties of Romanism*," in speaking on this subject, uses the term, "*moral change*," p. 44.

On the other hand, the Church of Rome contends, that by the consecration the bread and wine are changed in their essential qualities so that they cease to be bread and wine, but become strictly and literally the *material and substantial body and blood of Christ*. This is their doctrine of Transubstantiation.

That the doctrine of a *spiritual change* was that of the early church, is evident from the illustrations they use to explain this subject. For example, Gregory of Nyssa says—"This altar, before which we stand, is physically mere common stone, differing nothing from the stones with which our houses are built: but, after it has been consecrated by benediction to the service of God, it becomes a holy table, a sanctified altar. In a similar manner, the eucharistic bread is originally mere common bread; but when it has been consecrated in the holy mystery, it becomes, and is called, the body of Christ. The same power of consecration likewise imprints a new and honorable character upon a priest, when by a new benediction he is separated from the laity. For he, who was previously nothing more than a common man, is suddenly transformed into a teacher of religion, and into a steward of the holy mysteries. Yet this great mutation is effected without any change in his bodily form and appearance. Externally, he is the same that he already was; but internally, by an invisible and gracious operation, a mighty change is effected in his soul." (*De Baptism Oper.* v. iii. p. 369.) In these cases of the altar and the priest, Gregory can of course refer to no spiritual change.

The rise of this error of transubstantiation was natural. The early fathers evinced an extreme anxiety to avoid any mode of speech which

Then, again, we have her constant round of services. These are regulated by no fitful devotion, but keep steadily in view the great principle of instructing her children in the doctrines of Christianity, and gradually building them up in a knowledge of the faith. Look at her Sunday services, how they go through the whole circle of religious truth, and bring constantly before our eyes the eventful life of our Lord, and the doctrines he came to unfold. We begin at Advent, by looking forward in anticipation of his coming, until at Christmas, "with cheerful hymns and garlands sweet," we celebrate His nativity. Then, one prominent action after another of His earthly pilgrimage passes in review, until in the season of Lent we commemorate His bitter sufferings—His Passion—and death. But Good Friday goes by—the darkness which had gathered about the tomb is dispelled by "the vernal light of Easter morn," and we enter the house of God to listen to the story of our Master's joyful Resurrection. Forty days afterwards we celebrate the Festival of the Ascension—then, at

might lower the dignity of this Sacrament in the estimation of the people. They therefore often resorted to a fervid and poetical style of address, dictated by the glowing imagination of the Greeks or Asiatics, which identified the hallowed elements with the sacrifice they represented. "Thus," says Le Bas, "the impassioned eloquence of the preachers grew imperceptibly into the doctrine of the Church." (*Life of Wiclif*, p. 253.) To this language of rhetoric the Romish writers now appeal, as if it had been uttered with didactic caution. And yet, in all the early fathers there is no expression stronger than that contained in one of our own hymns—

"Hail, sacred feast, which Jesus makes !

Rich banquet of his flesh and blood !"

Would it be logical a thousand years hence, to point to this line as proof that our Church in the 19th century believed in a *physical* change? Yet such is the Romish argument from the early fathers.

Whitsunday, the Pentecostal coming of the Holy Ghost—and then, on Trinity Sunday, we are called to remember that solemn mystery of the Three in One, about which men indeed can profanely argue, but on which angels meditate with an awful reverence. “But as hitherto we have celebrated His great works, so henceforth we magnify Himself. For twenty-five weeks we represent in figure what is to be hereafter. We enter into our rest, by entering in with Him who having wrought and suffered, has opened the kingdom of Heaven to all believers. For half a year we stand still, as if occupied solely in adoring Him, and with the Seraphim crying, ‘Holy, Holy, Holy,’ continually.”* Now, who can go through this round of instruction, and thoughtfully contemplate all these solemn truths, without being deeply impressed by the realities of our religion?

Look, too, at the Church’s plan of daily services, as laid down in her Calendar. She has so divided up the Word of God, that the Psalms can be read over once in each month, and during the course of each year, in her lessons, she goes once through the Old Testament, and three times through the New, except the Book of the Revelation of St. John. And at the same time, at intervals come the Saints’ Days, when we are called to commemorate each of the Apostles in succession, and others of the holy dead who have passed away to glory. Thus we are shown that, to serve God truly, and to shine like lights in the world, we must follow in the steps of these His favored servants, and devote our hearts and lives to his worship and service. We are taught to live for a time with

* Newman’s Sermons, Vol. VI. p. 400.

the dead—to be joined with them, as it were, in a mysterious love, realizing that though the earthly eye cannot see them, yet they are “not far from every one of us,” living in a nobler existence than they ever enjoyed on earth. And even when the Church does not *publicly* celebrate this daily service, her members have still the Prayer-Book in their hands, to lead their thoughts aright, and to direct them each day to the same portions of the Word of God, that they may thus with one mind follow the Church in the lessons she prescribes, and be ever advancing in religious knowledge. She has both her Festivals of holy joy, when they are called to exult in the rich promises which are made them, and again her weekly and yearly Fasts, when they are directed to chasten their spirits, and bring their bodies into subjection, that the earthly and sin-born nature may not war against that influence in the heart, which is ever striving to lead them nearer to their God.*

In this way it is that, year after year, through a lifetime, the Church appeals both to the intellect and the heart. She instructs her children through the

* The following is the Church's table of Fasts, as given in the Prayer-Book immediately after the Calendar.

A TABLE OF FASTS.

ASH-WEDNESDAY.

GOOD-FRIDAY.

Other days of Fasting; on which the Church requires such a measure of Abstinence, as is more especially suited to extraordinary Acts and Exercises of Devotion.

1st. The Forty Days of Lent.

2d. The Ember-Days at the Four Seasons, being the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the first Sunday in Lent, the Feast of Pentecost, September 14, and December 13.

3d. The three Rogation Days, being the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Holy Thursday, or the Ascension of our Lord.

4th. All the Fridays in the Year, except Christmas Day.

mind and the affections. She uses devotion as the instrument; by her holy prayers elevating their thoughts above this passing world—sanctifying their hearts—and, by teaching them to conquer themselves; rendering them children of the light and of the day. They must acquire the *habit* of prayer—not that irregular, varying devotion which burns around us—at one time apparently kindled to an angel's fervor, and at another, utterly dead and cold—but the flame which shines on steadily, unaffected by the dampness of this earth, and growing brighter and brighter to the end. “As our Lord led persons gradually to the knowledge of the truth, by quiet teaching, by leading them to observe His works, by drawing out their self-denial and engaging their confidence, so, in obedience to his command ‘to make *disciples* of all nations,’ the system of the Church is that of parental and pastoral training, and building up by practical instruction, such as catechizing and the use of a constant devotional form.” She acts on this principle—to induce her members to acquire a devotional frame of mind, by self-discipline and frequent repetition—for thus only can it be formed.

But besides this regular, constant training of the Church, there are also her occasional services, which are adapted to every situation in which her children can be placed. At home or abroad—in safety or in peril—in peace or in war—she is ever at their side. Even on the wild billows of the sea, she speaks to the storm-tossed mariner in words which bring to his remembrance the quiet Church at home, and thus connect him in spirit with the little circle he has left.

“Thou too are there, with thy soft inland tones,
 Mother of our new birth ;
 The lonely ocean learns thy orisons,
 And loves thy sacred mirth :
 When storms are high, or when the fires of war
 Come lightening round our course,
 Thou breath’st a note like music from afar,
 Tempering rude hearts with calm angelic force.”*

In every hour of joy, she is with the members of her fold, to impart a calm and holy spirit to their happiness. Have mercies been vouchsafed to them? Here are her prayers of thanksgiving, putting words into their mouth, by which in the great congregation they can pour out the overflowing gratitude of their hearts. By her holy blessings she sanctifies the marriage-tie, divesting it of its worldliness, and in the name of the Triune God, invokes upon those who kneel before the altar, “His spiritual benediction and grace, that they may so live together in this life, that in the world to come they may have life everlasting.” Thus she follows the leadings of Scripture, where St. Paul declares this state to be “honorable in all,” and even exalts it as a solemn mystery to be an image of the union between Christ and His Church.†

Neither is it for the sunshine of life, only that the

* Keble’s Christian Year.

† Is it not in accordance with the spirit of the present day, to deprive this tie of its religious character, and to regard marriage as a mere civil contract? Widely different from this has always been the feeling of those who have imbibed the old Catholic spirit of the Church. Tertullian in the second century asks—“How shall I sufficiently declare the happiness of that marriage which the *Church makes, the oblation confirms, and the benediction seals?*”—(*Ad Uxorem*, lib. ii. c. 8.) And where can this service so properly be performed as before the altar?

“Where should ye seek Love’s perfect smile,
 But where your prayers were learn’d erewhile,
 In her own native place !”

Keble.

Church has provided her services. Knowing that here we are "born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upwards," and that God most often purifies us by the furnace of affliction, she is ready also to "weep with them that weep." An Apostle says—"is any among you afflicted? let him pray." And in obeying this injunction, where can we find petitions more suitable than she sets forth—so simple, yet so touching? "O merciful God, and Heavenly Father, who hast taught us in Thy Holy Word, that thou dost not willingly afflict or grieve the children of men; look down with pity, we beseech Thee, upon the sorrows of Thy servant, for whom our prayers are desired. In Thy wisdom, Thou hast seen fit to visit him with trouble, and to bring distress upon him. Remember him, O Lord, in mercy; sanctify Thy fatherly correction to him; endue his soul with patience under his affliction, and with resignation to Thy blessed will; comfort him with a sense of Thy goodness; lift up Thy countenance upon him, and give him peace, through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

"Is any sick among you?"—asks the same Apostle—"let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him." And for this also the Church has provided. In her "Visitation of the Sick," she marks out the course to be pursued, bringing down the subject of our faith to something tangible and practical—dispelling at once the dreamy reveries of modern days—and fastening upon those points in the belief of the mind, and the conduct of the life, which present the only true evidence of preparation for Heaven. She has also "The Communion of the Sick," by which, with appropriate

prayers, the Sacrament of the Lord's death can be administered to him who is debarred from mingling with his fellow-worshippers in the house of God, and in this way, he eats the bread of life and keeps up his spiritual union with the faithful.* And thus she is present, to sustain and comfort his fainting spirit, while days of suffering and nights of weariness are appointed him, ever being at hand with her holy words. Nor does she leave him when life is just flickering away. In the very latest moment of existence, when the soul is trembling on the brink of eternity, she has provided that solemn prayer by which her ministers may commend the departing spirit into the hands of its God. Thus, the last accents which fall upon his ear are the touching words—"O Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of just men made perfect, after they are delivered from their earthly prisons; we humbly commend the soul of this Thy servant, our dear brother, into Thy hands, as into the hands of a faithful Creator, and most merciful Saviour; most humbly beseeching Thee that it may be precious in Thy sight; wash it, we pray Thee, in the blood of that Immaculate Lamb, that was slain to take away the sins of the world; that whatsoever defilements it may have contracted in the midst of this miserable and naughty world, through the lust of the flesh, or the wiles of Satan, being purged and done away, it may be pre-

* "A simple altar by the bed
 For high Communion meetly spread,
 Chalice, and plate, and snowy vest,
 We eat and drink: then calmly blest,
 All mourners, *one with dying breath,*
 We sate and talk'd of Jesus' death." *Keble.*

sented pure and without spot before Thee." Never, indeed, in time of health and strength, can the words of this prayer come home to us in all their force. To realize their full solemnity, we must hear them uttered in the chamber of the dying, when the spirit of the Christian is wrestling in its last conflict, and the mortal is just putting on immortality.

Nor does the Church's care end here, even when the spirit is gone. She still has a voice to utter with regard to the earthly tabernacle which it once inhabited. She proclaims over it the holy promises of the Gospel, in the name of Him who has declared Himself to be "the Resurrection and the Life," and then commits it to its last resting-place, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust," pointing forward the surviving relatives who have gathered around, to "the general resurrection in the last day, and the life of the world to come, through our Lord Jesus Christ; at whose second coming in glorious majesty to judge the world, the earth and the sea shall give up their dead; and the corruptible bodies of those who sleep in Him shall be changed, and made like unto His own glorious body; according to the mighty working, whereby He is able to subdue all things to Himself."

Such then is the system of the Church—that ancient and Catholic system, derived by her from her earlier and better days—which she has kept in her formularies, and which by means of her Prayer-Book is ever spread out before her children. You perceive, then, that never for an instant does she lose sight of one committed to her trust. From his Baptism to his Burial—from the cradle to the grave—

she is ever at his side. She does not hazard his spiritual improvement on the fidelity or changing views of those who may happen to minister at her altars, but herself marks out the plan and sketches the system by which her members are to live. Day after day—month after month—year after year—she expects to go forward, leading them ever on to nobler attainments in the divine life, and as this world gradually fades away, preparing them more fully for that which is to come. Her lesson is—“*In quietness and confidence shall be your strength.*”

Tell me then—I again ask—is not this the end which God intended his Church should answer, to train up His children for Heaven? And is not this the true object of our faith—by a constant struggle with ourselves, and by inward, spiritual discipline—steadily to increase the power of holiness over our hearts? Or, does religion consist in periodical excitements—in renouncing for a time all dependence on the reason, and suffering the imagination to be awakened to a perfect delirium—until we lose sight of things earthly and terrestrial? Is the soul to pass from spiritual death to life, by one spasmodic effort, amid the whirlwind of excited passions? Is an inquiring, immortal being to be taught the way to Heaven, by distorted, unnatural appeals—by arraying scenes of terror before the eye, until the mind is incapacitated from forming a calm and rational decision? Are the holiest themes of our faith—themes on which angels can dwell with the deepest adoration—to be bandied about by ignorance and fanaticism, and lowered by every degrading association, until all reverence is gone? Was it thus that our

Lord proclaimed the solemn precepts of the Gospel, on the hill-sides of Judea, or in the Courts of the Temple? No, everything with Him was elevating, lofty, and impressive. Men might quail beneath the truths He uttered, but the skeptic found nothing in His teaching from which he could gather new topics for scoffing, nor were the worldly-minded able to indulge in ribaldry and laughter.

And in the same spirit would the Church impart all her instructions. Solemnly, and steadily her voice is heard, impressing upon our hearts the awakening lessons with which she is charged. She appeals to you, not for to-day only—or for this month—or this season—but she goes on unceasingly through your lifetime. She wishes you deeply to realize the truth that religion is not a thing for particular times and places, but a holy influence which is to be exerted over every part of our existence, here and hereafter. Therefore it is, that “she takes to herself almost every common action of our lives, and makes it her own by giving it a religious turn, a Church meaning. She keeps meddling with us in every stage of our lives. She comes among us in our Baptism, Education, Confirmation, Marriage, Sickness, and Death. She calls upon us to consecrate our worldly goods, by yielding a portion up to her. She bids us make our time minister to Eternity, by calling us away from a worldly use of it on her Sunday and Saints’ days. She makes us put a limit even upon our natural appetites, that she may teach us, through her Fasts, obedience and self-denial and bountiful giving of alms. Thus she strives to interweave herself with our most secret and common

thoughts, our every-day actions, our domestic griefs and joys. She would put something spiritual into them all. She is diligent, unwearying, ungrudging as her Master, always going about doing good."*

Is not this system, then, one most beautiful in all its parts, and proving what care the Church has taken of our spiritual interests? Is there anything here left undone, which ought to have been done—any link wanting in the chain by which she binds us to the Throne of God? No, he who is once within her fold, and yet wishes to cast aside her influence, and return to worldliness, would be obliged to make an effort, before he can succeed in bursting the bands which she hath twined about him, and breaking away from her holy restraints. Not on her therefore must be cast the blame, when any who have belonged to her, fall by the way, and thus prove that they are to have no part nor lot in the Heavenly inheritance. She has provided everything necessary for their spiritual welfare. The waters of life are flowing beside them, brightly and beautifully, but they will not stoop and drink. The Heavenly armor is before them, but they will not array themselves in it for the conflict.

Do I address one individual, then, who has ever felt inclined to distrust the Church, and to wander elsewhere seeking food? Is there one, who fears lest he cannot grow in holiness beneath her quiet round of services, who charges her with formality, and wishes to turn to some place, where he can find more excitement? My brother! it is not by noise and bustle that you are to be aided in your progress

* Faber on "The Church Catechism," p. 6.

to Heaven. The contest you are to wage, must be fought within—in your own heart—and from the responsibility of this, nothing can relieve you. Excitement will only lead your thoughts away to the outward world of action, instead of the little inward world of meditation. It can never produce the necessary moral discipline, and if you trust to it, you will find, when the morning of the Resurrection comes, that you are without the wedding garment.

Again; let me ask such a person another question—Have you thoroughly tried this system of the Church, to see what is its effect? She has appointed, as we have shown you, varied services. Have you faithfully attended *all* of these—Sundays and week-days—on Festivals and in Lent? Have you acted out that principle, by which alone her true children are guided, that nothing but an insuperable obstacle shall prevent them from being present here? If you have not, what possible idea can you form, of the influence of her holy system? She has also her regular Fast days, to discipline your spirit, and recall your affections from a world which is passing away. Have you observed them as you should, afflicting the soul here that it may be saved hereafter? She has too her Holy Festivals, when, in a spirit of subdued joy, we are to come before God in thanksgiving. Have you done so, or have those solemn, consecrated days been lost, and unmarked amidst the other days of your worldly life? Oh, if you have not, month after month, sat humbly at her feet, and listened to her teaching, what right have you to allege that she does not supply every spiritual want? She can only place her system before you, and then leave it to

yourself to enjoy its benefits or not. She can minister only to the faithful.

Come, then, and make but trial of her power. While trouble is out among the nations, and "men's hearts are failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth," we call you to this ancient fold, where the landmarks are still unchanged. Her strength is unabated—her grace is undiminished—and she can now pour into your heart the same full tide of joy, which she has given to the saints in the generations which have gone. Still, her prayers, and Sacraments, and holy rites, remain as of old, and she stands before you, in this world a home for the lonely, and at the same time a type of that eternal and unchanging home for which she would prepare you.

VIII.

POPULAR OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE CHURCH.

Bide thou thy time !
Watch with meek eyes the race of pride and crime :
Sit in the gate, and be the heathen's jest,
Smiling and self-possess.
O thou, to whom is pledged a Victor's sway,
Bide thou the Victor's day !

Lyra Apostolica.

THERE are some so blinded by prejudice, that everything connected with the distinctive principles of the Church, is the object of their special anathema. They see no beauty in her ancient, solemn services—nothing venerable in the long succession of her Bishops, as the unbroken line comes down through eighteen centuries. They understand but little of her peculiarities—they know not what is Primitive and Catholic—and they care not to inquire. The fact that anything which they have abandoned, has been retained by the Church, is sufficient to draw down upon it their reprobation. “Having eyes, they see not, and having ears, they hear not.” They form a perfect illustration of old Fuller’s description of Prynne—“So great is his antipathy against Episcopacy, that if a Seraph himself should be a Bishop, he would either find or make some sick feathers in his wings.” Now, to such persons explanations are useless. Words are wasted on them. They can only be left to go on, until their wilful blindness leads them into some strange extravagance, and they

thus by their conduct give a new proof of what Dr. Johnson asserted, that "fanaticism is robust ignorance."

There are others, however, who will listen like reasonable beings. They have, perhaps, been educated in entire misapprehension of the spirit which pervades the Church, and even of the object of her services. They have heard the oft-repeated calumnies which are urged against her, yet never met with their refutation. By such persons, then, a few words of explanation will often be received in that spirit which should always characterize the sincere inquirer after truth. I propose, therefore, this evening briefly to discuss some of the COMMON AND POPULAR OBJECTIONS WHICH ARE URGED AGAINST THE CHURCH. Several which I shall mention, may appear to those already within the pale of the Church, as being too trivial and unimportant to be noticed. Yet they are only such as I have often myself encountered, for few subjects connected with religion are so little understood by the great mass of those about us, as the claims and true position of our Church.

One objection employed against us is—*our use of the word "Catholic."* In the Apostle's Creed, which we repeat every Sunday, we declare—"I believe in the Holy *Catholic* Church"—and in the second Creed set down in our Prayer-Book—that called the Nicene, and which was adopted A. D. 325, to be explanatory of the first—this confession is made still more strongly—"I believe one *Catholic* and Apostolic Church." So, too, in one of the Prayers in "The Visitation of the Sick," we pray God, that "when we shall have served Him in our generation, we may be gathered

unto our fathers . . . in the communion of the *Catholic Church*." Now, to many persons the phrase *Catholic Church* conveys nothing but the idea of the *Church of Rome*, because they have most erroneously been accustomed to distinguish the members of that particular body by the name of *Catholics*, although it is a title which belongs to them no more than it does to any other branch of the Christian Church.

This word is derived from the Greek word *Καθολικος*, which means *general* or *universal*. The Holy Catholic Church, then, means the Holy Universal Church, as existing in her different branches in all parts of the earth, and in all ages of the world. For example, this is the Greek word which is employed in the New Testament in setting forth the titles of the Epistles of St. James, St. Peter, St. Jude, and the First Epistle of St. John; because instead of being addressed to particular Churches—as St. Paul addressed his Epistles to the Church in Corinth, or Rome, or Ephesus—they were written to all the Churches throughout the world. It might, therefore, be translated—and it would be the most literal rendering—"the *Catholic* Epistle (*Επιστολη Καθολικη*) of James, or Peter, or John." Instead of which, as you remember, it is translated in our version—"the *General* Epistle of James, and Peter, and John."

In the early ages, when small heretical sects occasionally arose, and separated from the great body of the faithful, calling themselves by different party names, the Church instead retained the title of *Catholic*, to distinguish herself from them, as being that one, continuous, orthodox body, which had always existed, and to which the preservation of the

truth was committed. The Catholic Church then was that which was spread throughout the world, and was destined to continue also through all ages, even unto the end of time. Her common bond was the Apostolic Ministry, and her unity on all the grand cardinal doctrines of the faith. On every shore her branches were found under their different Bishops. Thus, there was the Catholic Church of Jerusalem, that of Antioch, of Alexandria, of Rome, and that in Western Europe. They had, indeed, no single, visible earthly head, presiding over them all, but were independent of each other, in the same way that the Church in this country is now independent of the Church in England.* Yet, although thus separated in distant regions, and speaking divers languages, they still looked to each other, as being branches, together of the same vine. Beautifully, indeed, is this illustrated in the writings of one of the old Fathers—"The Church," he says, "is one, though

* The causes which gave rise to the supremacy of the Bishops of Rome are obvious. The principal one was, the temporal dignity and wealth of that city. This gave to its Church an early pre-eminence, and placed great power in the hands of her rulers. Rome was the mistress of the world—the centre to which all eyes were directed—and this feeling of respect and veneration naturally extended to the Church there. Thus the Council of Chalcedon declared that Rome had obtained privileges on account of its being the imperial City (*Can.* xxviii.) Cyprian also assigns this reason for honoring the Roman Church: "Quoniam pro magnitudine sua debet Carthaginem Roma præcedere." (*Epist.* 49.) Precisely the same causes now give the Bishop of London greater influence in the Christian world, than is possessed by the Bishop of Sodor and Man. In an age of darkness and superstition, it was easy for a succession of ambitious prelates gradually to expand this influence into supremacy.

Nothing, however, can be more conclusive than the historical argument against this claim of the Bishop of Rome. When Polycrates and the Bishops of Asia disagreed with Pope Victor, they

multiplied far and wide by its naturally prolific tendency; in like manner as the sun has rays many, yet one light; and the tree has many boughs, yet their strength, from the root upwards, is a single property; and when many streams flow from one head, a character of multiplicity may be developed in the copiousness of their discharge, and yet the unity of their nature must be recognized in the fountain they proceed from. Divide the ray from the

seemed to pay very little regard to his opinions or his excommunications. (*Euseb. Eccles. Hist.* lib. v. c. 24.) Irenæus, too, rebuked the same Pope for his arrogance. (*Ibid.*) St. Cyrian bestowed on the Bishop of Rome no higher title than that of brother and colleague, and expressed the utmost disregard of Pope Stephen's judgment with regard to heretics. (*Cyp. ad Pomp.* 74.) The early Bishops of Rome indeed disclaimed all such authority. Gregory the Great, in the 6th Century, tells us, that "the Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon were they who first offered to his predecessors the title of Universal Bishop, which they refused to accept." (*Epist.* Lib. vii. Ep. 30.) He elsewhere condemns the Patriarch of Constantinople for assuming this title, and says—"Whoever claims the Universal Episcopate, is the forerunner of Anti-Christ." (*Ego fidenter dico, quod quisquis se Universalem Sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua, Anti-Christum præcurrit.*) (Lib. vi. Epist. 30.) The Second General Council indeed—that of Constantinople, A. D. 381—gave the title of "Mother of all Churches," not to the Church of Rome, but that of Jerusalem. (*Percival's Roman Schism*, p. 32.) It was not until the eleventh century that this gigantic system was fully matured. Then came the attempt by the Henries of Germany—the Imperial line of Fraconia—to secularize the Church, and incorporate it into the State. The question was, therefore, whether the Church should submit to this feudal vassalage, or be herself the ruler of the world? To effect the latter result, Hildebrand set forth lofty and unauthorized pretensions in behalf of the Church of Rome, and his victory in this struggle endowed her with that supremacy, which she has ever since claimed. See *Bowden's Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII.* 2 vols. Lond. 1840, *passim*.

See this subject fully discussed in *Barrow on the Pope's Supremacy*—*Bp. Hopkins's Church of Rome compared with Prim. Church*—and *Palmer's Treatise on the Church*, vol. ii. p. 451—493.

sun, and the principle of unity will negative their separation; lop the bough from the tree, it will want strength to blossom; cut the stream from its fountain, the remnant will be dried up. Thus the Church, invested with light from the Lord, sends out her rays over the whole earth; and yet the light is one, disseminated over everywhere; with no separation of the original body, she stretches forth the rich luxuriance of her branches over all the world, and pours out her onward streams, and spreads into the distance; yet is there one head, one source, one mother, in all the instances of her eventful fecundity.*

Such in that day was the view entertained of the Church. Her members felt, therefore, that they were one "in the fellowship of the Spirit," while with the different sects of heretics about them, they held no communion. It was in this spirit that St. Augustine defined the word *Catholic*. "The Catholic Church," said he, "is so called, because it is spread throughout the world."† Again, he adds, addressing certain heretics—"If your Church is Catholic, show me that it spreads its branches throughout the world; for such is the meaning of the word Catholic."‡ So also Vincentius of Lerins writes in the fifth century—"The Catholic or universal doctrine is that which remains the same through all ages, and will continue so till the end of the world. He is a true Catholic, who firmly adheres to the faith which he knows the Catholic Church has universally taught from the days of old."§

Who then in this day are the Catholics? We

* Cyprian, de Unit. Eccles.

† Epist. 170, ad S. Sever.

‡ Contra Gaudent, l. iii. c. 1.

§ Commonit ad. Hæret. c. 25.

answer, those who belong to any branch of the original Church, in whatever country it may exist, which has retained the Apostolic ministry, and owns its subjection to the Universal Church, rendering obedience to her voice. We are members of the Catholic Church, for we derive our succession from Primitive days, and still hold in all respects to "the faith once delivered to the saints." We recognize our connection with the Universal Church whenever we repeat the Creeds, or that declaration in the *Te Deum*—"The Holy Church *throughout all the world* doth acknowledge Thee."

Our Mother Church in England has never given up the title. "We hope,"—says Hooker—"that to reform ourselves, if at any time we have done amiss, is not to sever ourselves from the Church we were of before. In the Church we were, and we are so still."*

This too, is the title of the Greek Church, and of those vast and numerous Churches in the East, which, even in their low estate, have never severed themselves from the Universal Church. We acknowledge, too, as Catholics, the members of the Church

* *Eccles. Pol. works*, v. i. p. 437, ed. Keble. Mr. Palmer has collected many instances from public documents, of the continued use of the title *Catholic*. For example—In the order of prayer before sermons in 1535, the preacher was to "pray for the whole Catholic Church of Christ, &c., and especially for the *Catholic Church of this realm*," and for King Henry VIII. the "supreme head of this *Catholic Church of England*."—(See *Burnet*, v. iii. *Records*, n. 29.) In the act against Annates, (23 *Hen.* viii. c. 33,) it is said, that the King and all his subjects, "as well spiritual as temporal, be as obedient, devout, *Catholic*, and humble children of God, and holy Church, as any people be within any realm christened." (*Treatise on the Church*, v. i. p. 227.) The writers of the Church in England always speak in these terms.

of Rome, within the bounds of her own proper jurisdiction, and when she does not put forth claims which conflict with those of other branches of the Church.* You perceive then, from this explanation, how erroneous is that popular mode of speech by which so many are accustomed to confer this title

* There are some writers who take the ground that, since the Council of Trent, the Romanists have cut themselves off from the Catholic Church, and are schismatics. This opinion is supported by Jewel, Field, and others. Even Mr. Froude, who has been accused of leaning towards Romanism, says—"The Romanists [are not schismatics in England and Catholics abroad, but they] are wretched Tridentines every where." *Remains*, v. ii. p. 434.

We have followed, however, on this point, the great body of English divines. Hooker calls the Church of Rome "a part of the house of God, a limb of the visible Church of Christ." (*Works*, ii. 478.) And again—"We gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Jesus Christ." (*Ibid.* 438.) This was the view of Laud, Hammond, Bramhall, Andrewes, Chillingworth, Tillotson, Burnet, &c. It is asserted also most clearly in the formularies of the English Church. Thus, in the "Institutions of a Christian Man," signed in 1537 by twenty-one Archbishops and Bishops, (among whom were Cranmer, Latimer, Shaxton, Bradford, May, and Cox, all warm supporters of the Reformation,) we find this passage—"Therefore I do believe that the Church of Rome is not, nor cannot worthily be called the Catholic Church, but only a *particular member thereof*. And I believe also that the said Church of Rome, with all the other particular Churches in the world, compacted and united together, do make and constitute but *one Catholic or Church body*." (p. 55.) So again, the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition," approved by the Bishops of England, in 1543, after acknowledging the particular Churches of England, Spain, Italy, Poland, Portugal, and Rome, adds that these churches are "*members of the whole Catholic Church, and each of them by himself is also worthily called a Catholic Church*." (p. 248.) We think, therefore, that the decision of the Church in England, on this point, is clear.

Leading modern writers generally take the same view. It will be found expressed in the works of Palmer, Bp. Whittingham, Dr. Hook, G. S. Faber, and others. The latter, even when writing against the Romanists, says—"That the Latins constitute one of the many branches of Christ's Universal Church, I am far from wishing to deny." *Diff. of Romanism*, pref. xxxiii.

exclusively upon the members of the Romish Church. "The name *Catholic* belongs equally to all the members of Christ's Catholic Church, wherever dispersed and however distressed. Hence a name, which belongs equally to all, whether oriental, or occidental, cannot be correctly employed as the special, and exclusive, and descriptive appellation of a part only; because when the term is thus used, the common character of Catholicism is by implication denied to every Christian, who happens not to be a member of that provincial Western Church which is in communion with the Bishop of Rome, and which acknowledges him as its chief or Patriarch."*

Let us not then misinterpret this term, or shrink from acknowledging, that we "believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church." It is declaring the truth, that we are no obscure sect†—no mere party in the

* *Faber's Difficulties of Romanism*, pref. xxxiii. The same idea is expressed by Dr. Hook, in a sermon preached before the Queen, in the Chapel Royal—"You see here, by the way, the folly (if it be not a sin, for it is calling 'evil good, and good evil') of styling the Romish Dissenters in England, as some persons in extreme ignorance, and others perhaps with bad intentions, do, *Catholics*; for this insinuates, that we of the Church of England are heretics, whereas you have seen that ours, not theirs, is the true and orthodox Church of Christ in this country, the real Catholic Church in and of England. If they dislike the name Papist, we may speak of them as Romanists, or even Roman Catholics. Roman Catholics they may be styled, for (though schismatics and dissenters in England) in France and England they belong to a Church true by descent, though corrupted by Roman or Popish superstitions. A bad man is still a man, and you may refuse to associate with him before he reforms; but still you will never permit him so to style himself a man, as to imply that you yourself are not a human being."

† By not adhering to this name we furnish the Romanist with an argument against us. Thus, Dr. Milner, speaking of the members of the Church in England, says—"Every time they address the God of truth, either in solemn worship or in private devotion, they are forced

Christian world, calling ourselves by the name of some human teacher; but that we claim fellowship with the great fold of Christ—the communion of the faithful, not only in this generation, spread everywhere throughout the earth, but also of those who, in every age which has gone, have “slept in Jesus,” and those who shall be united “with His body, which is the Church,” in all future time, even until the trump of the archangel proclaims that the warfare of His followers is over.

Again, another objection often urged against us is—*the use by our ministers of peculiar clerical garments.* In the English Ritual, published in 1549, directions are given on the subject of Ecclesiastical Vestures. Among these we find particular mention made of the Albe. This garment, which is noticed among the acts of the Council of Narbonne, A. D. 589, was very similar to the present Surplice, by which name it began to be called about the twelfth century.* We will quote some of these Rubrics of 1549. “Upon the day and at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration: that is to say, *a white albe, plain,*” &c. “In the saying or singing of matins and evensong, baptizing and burying, the minister, in parish churches and chapels annexed to the same, shall use a *surpless.*”

each of them to repeat, ‘I believe in the Catholic Church.’ And yet, if I ask any of them the question, ‘Are you a CATHOLIC?’ he is sure to answer me, ‘No, I am a PROTESTANT.’ Was there ever a more glaring instance of inconsistency and self-condemnation among rational beings?”—*End of Religious Controversy*, letter xxv.

* Palmer on the Ritual, v. ii. p. 320.

Following this ancient regulation of the English Church, we have adopted the custom that the Priest, when he officiates in the usual services, should be clothed in a white linen surplice.* And yet there are some so sensitive, as to make this a cause of offence.

“It is used by the Romanists”—we are told. And so it is; but if good in itself, is this any reason for abandoning it? Is it the object of the Christian world, to get as far as possible from the Church of Rome, without exercising any discrimination as to what is correct, and what incorrect in her rites and services? Why not then abandon the custom of singing, as a part of public worship, because vocal music is heard in her temples—or give up baptism, because that Church has retained it—or the use of any commissioned ministry whatsoever, because she has still clung to the order of the priesthood.† The question is not, whether it is a custom of the Romish Church, but whether it is sanctioned by the usage of

* The origin of this word is somewhat doubtful. Webster, in his Dictionary, gives its derivation as from the Latin “*super pellicium*, above the robe of fur.” This agrees with the account given by Durandus, who, in his work on the *Divine Offices*, written about the year 1286, traces up the etymology of the word *superpellicium*, to a custom which anciently prevailed in the Church, of wearing tunics made from the skins of such animals as the country furnished, over which was cast a white linen alb or vest, which thus received its name *superpellicium*, from the circumstance of its being worn above fur.—*Rock's Hierurgia*, vol. ii. p. 661.

† We might find a fit answer in the reply given by Cyprian in ancient times, to similar objections—“*Quid ergo? quia et honorem cathedræ sacerdotialis Novatianus usurpat, num idcirco nos cathedræ renunciare debemus? Aut quia Novatianus altare collocare, et sacrificia offerre Contra jus nititur; ab altari et sacrificiis cessare nos oportet, ne paria et similia cum illo celebrare videamur!*”—*Epist. aa Jubaian de Haret. rebapt.*

the ancient Church, and whether it is advantageous, as adding solemnity to the forms of public worship? When on this, and other kindred points, such puerile objections are brought forward, instead of attempting gravely to meet them, we feel inclined to respond with the Apostolic injunction — “Brethren, be not children in understanding; but in understanding be men.”*

“But the Surplice is not necessary for the worship of God”—we are again told. Now suppose we should carry out this principle, and only retain what is absolutely and barely necessary; how much would be left to us? Why, not even these consecrated temples, in which we offer up our prayers, are indispensable. We might worship God “in spirit and in truth,” in any building, however humble. We might pour forth our petitions, where the dark forests were waving around us, and the Heavens above formed our only canopy; like the ancient Christians, when in days of persecution, far away from the abodes of men,

“They shook the depths of the desert’s gloom
With their hymns of lofty cheer.”

But we know that the mind and the devotional feelings are reached through the outward senses, and therefore it is meet and proper, that some spot should be set apart, in which week after week we may assemble before God. By being thus “separated from all unhallowed, worldly, and common uses,” it will “fill men’s minds with greater reverence for God’s glorious majesty, and affect their hearts with more devotion and humility in his service.”† And the

* I Cor. xiv. 20.

† Address in the form for the Consecration of a Church.

same regard for the principles of association would dictate, that when the minister of the Church officiates in the solemn rites of the sanctuary, even his outward apparel should declare to those before whom he stands, the sacred duty in which he is engaged. Thus, the recollections of this world are broken in upon—men forget the individual, and remember only the office which he holds.

Look again at the authority for the use of this garment, and the antiquity which can be pleaded in its behalf. Under the Jewish dispensation, God Himself prescribed with the utmost minuteness, the dress of all who should minister before Him in holy things. While magnificent robes were provided for the High Priest, the ordinary priests, when performing service, were to wear, "a white linen ephod." The Levites also, who were singers, were arrayed in white linen. And this continued to be the law through all ages of the Jewish state.

The early apostles being Jews, and thus trained up to see "all things done decently and in order," it was natural that under the new dispensation they should have continued to observe the ancient custom of appropriate priestly garments. This is shown by frequent allusions to the surplice in the primitive writers. Thus it is said in the Apostolical Constitutions—"Then the High Priest standing at the altar with the presbyters, makes a private prayer by himself, having on his *white or bright vestment.*"* Pontius, in his account of St. Cyprian's martyrdom, says that there was by chance near him at that time "*a white linen cloth*, so that at his passion he seemed

* Lib. viii. ch. 12.

to have some of the ensigns of the Episcopal honor.”* Eusebius, in his address to Paulinus, Bishop of Tyre, mentions “the sacred gown” and “the sacerdotal garments” worn by Bishops and Priests.† It was one of the charges made against St. Athanasius, that he had imposed a tax upon the Egyptians, to raise a fund for *the linen vestments of the Church*.‡ This fact is mentioned both by Athanasius himself, and by Sozomen. We observe in this, that the accusation was not, that he used such vestments in the Church, but only that he laid a tax upon the people to provide them; which supposes them to be in ordinary use. St. Chrysostom intimates that Deacons wore this habit in their ministrations, when he says, “their honor, crown, and glory, did not consist so much in their walking about the Church in a *white and shining garment*, as in their power to repel unworthy communicants from the Lord’s table.”§ The historian Sozomen, when speaking of the assault made upon the Church by the enemies of St. Chrysostom, says —“The priests and deacons were beaten and driven out of the Church, as they were in *the vestments of their ministration*.”|| And to give one more instance; St. Jerome in the same sentence both shows the ancient use of the dress, and reproveth the dress, and reproveth the needless scruples of those who oppose it —“What harm or enmity, I pray, is it against God, if a Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon, or any other of the Ecclesiastical Order, come forth in a

* Wheatly on Common Prayer, p. 105.

† Eccles. Hist. lib. x. ch. 4.

‡ Bingham’s Orig. Eccles. lib. xiii. ch. 8. sec. 2.

§ Chrys. Hom. 82 in Matt.

|| Sozom. Lib. ii. cap. 21.

white vestment, when they minister the Sacraments?"*

And how suitable is the color of this dress in which the priests minister at the altar! White has in all ages been the emblem of innocence and purity. Therefore it is that when in the book of Daniel, the Ancient of Days is represented as appearing to the prophet, we are told, that "His garment was white as snow"—when our Lord was transfigured, "His raiment was white as the light"—and when angels have appeared to men, they have always been clothed in white apparel.

It declares the frame of mind in which we should appear before God—cleansed from all sin, like those whom St. John saw in vision, who had "washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." To the Lamb's wife, which is the Church, we are told, "it was granted, that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints."

And more than all, by this significant emblem we are pointed forward to the glory which awaits the ransomed. "They"—declares our Lord—"shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy. He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels." And again, the same Apostle says—"I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindred, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white

* Adv. Pelag. lib. i. ch. 9. tom. 2.

robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb."

Surely then it is right, that our ministers, when publicly offering prayers to God, should retain this ancient garment, which was first prescribed by the God of Israel Himself—adopted in the primitive Church—in all ages the emblem of devotion—and thus descending to us, consecrated by the veneration of more than three thousand years.

But a third objection urged against the Church, is one much more important. It is—that *the terms of admission into our fold are easy, and but little scrutiny exercised*. Now, what is the door of admission into the Christian Church? We answer, of course, *Baptism*—for this was commanded explicitly by our Lord, as the right of entrance into His Kingdom, for all who embraced His doctrines. "Go," said He, "and teach"—or, as it might be translated—"make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Every person, therefore, who has been baptized, is as much a member of the Church as he ever can be. The question, Whether after this he walks worthy of his high calling? opens an entirely different subject, and one, the responsibility of which rests upon himself, not upon the Church.

But let us see whether the Church does lightly receive her members in Baptism. Take up the questions proposed to one who is a candidate for that Holy Rite, and the mere reading of them will at once cause this objection to vanish. What then does she require him *to believe*, on entering her fold? The

question addressed to him is—"Dost thou believe all the Articles of the Christian faith, as contained in the Apostles' Creed?" Now, you well know the simple, comprehensive Creed called by this name, and which is repeated in our services every time we meet. It contains a brief summary of all the cardinal doctrines of our faith—of all which are to be believed, as necessary to salvation. These are to be received heartily and truly—in their literal meaning, as they have always been explained and interpreted by the Church.*

And is not this all that we can lawfully require of our members? Have we any right to force them to subscribe to minute points of abstruse theology, not fully proved from Scripture, and which are often, to say the least, questionable? No—the very simplicity of this Creed—and it has been used for this purpose in all ages of the Church—is its strong recommendation. It can be clearly understood by all—even the unlettered and the child. Regulating essential matters, it places such restrictions on its members as prevent them from straying beyond the bounds of orthodoxy, while on the other hand, in those things which are unessential, where different minds will necessarily take different views, it leaves room for a liberal variation of opinion. Thus are

* It is evident, that a person may sometimes be able to repeat the Creed and profess his belief in its articles, while at the same time he gives his own interpretation to some of them, and philosophizes away their natural sense. In this way Arius was willing to subscribe to the Apostles' Creed, while denying the true and proper divinity of our Lord. The Church therefore obviates this difficulty by having from the earliest age explained the creed in her formularies, and her members must hold it in the honest sense she does, or be counted heretics.

avoided those endless disputes on the deep doctrines of our faith, which so often disturb the peace of those denominations around us, and even rend them asunder into separate bodies, while attempting in every minute particular to bring all men down to one precise standard.

Experience, too, has proved that this system is the best in its practical effects, to preserve purity in doctrine. Let one come to us who has erred from the faith—who disbelieves, for example, in the Divinity of our Lord—and by applying the test of this Creed, (as interpreted by the Nicene Creed,) we debar him from the Church as a heretic. There is, therefore, as much sound orthodoxy within our ranks, as within the ranks of any of those who endeavor to enter into a more minute investigation of doctrinal belief. This however is but one requirement at Baptism, and concerns the intellect only. There are others also, which refer directly to the heart and the life.

Another question then is—"Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the sinful desires of the flesh; so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them?" To which, the answer is given—"I renounce them all; and, by God's help, will endeavor not to follow nor be led by them." Now, how can a more perfect vow of renunciation be uttered? The individual who thus wishes to "put on Christ"—standing here before God, and in the presence of His people, looks back at a world of sin, with which heretofore he has been leagued, and then solemnly abandons it; recording

his decision, that for the future he "will not follow nor be led by it."

But the Church even goes farther, and puts one more question—"Wilt thou then obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life?" To which the required answer is, "I will, by God's help." Let me ask you, therefore, to weigh these pledges, and then tell me, where is there any body of persons calling themselves Christians, who more strictly oblige those uniting with them to discard an evil world, and devote themselves to the service of God? How futile then is this objection against us!

Again, a fourth objection often urged is—*that we receive persons lightly and hastily to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.* Look then at our Communion Service, and see its requirements. Like those in the Baptismal vows, they also are simple, yet comprehensive. The priest is directed to say—"Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye who mind to come to the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, must consider how St. Paul exhorteth all persons diligently to try and examine themselves, before they presume to eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament, so is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily. Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord; repent ye truly for your sins past; have a lively and steadfast faith in Christ our Saviour; amend your lives, and be in perfect charity with all men; so shall ye be meet partakers of those holy mysteries." Can

any one, then, hearing this solemn invitation, and realizing its force, come forward lightly? Or, supposing that he should do so, is the Church to be blamed? Certainly not; he has the requirements before him, and the responsibility rests with himself.

The rule then with us is this. Since all baptized persons are members of the Church, we regard them as having a right to come forward to Communion, if they are giving evidence by their daily walk, of the existence of Christian character. If, however, they have been baptized in infancy, there is yet a preparatory step which they must take. They must first publicly assume those vows for themselves, or at least show their willingness to do so. This, as we have shown in the last lecture, takes place at Confirmation. And the Rubric declares,—“There shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.”

Is it not evident, therefore, that any one who can go through the solemn service by which he thus publicly assumes and ratifies his Baptismal vows, devoting himself willingly to the service of God, must be prepared for the Holy Communion? At all events, we can have no better security with regard to him, than this ordeal. If, therefore, after seriously weighing the matter, he has passed through it, or professes to be ready to pass through it, we have no right to debar him from the Christian privilege which his Lord has provided, of partaking of His body and blood. The Church, therefore, takes the power out of the hands of her ministers, and throws the responsibility upon the individual himself. She

bids us explain to him this holy-rite, lay the requirements before him, and then he is left to form his own decision. We may advise him, but we have no power to investigate his heart, or to penetrate into the nature of those hidden, sacred feelings, which rest between his God and himself.

The only case in which we have authority to debar an individual from communion is, (as stated in the Rubric,) "if among those who come to be partakers of the Holy Communion, the minister shall know any to be an open and notorious evil liver, or to have done any wrong to his neighbors by word or deed, so that the congregation be thereby offended; he shall advertise him, that he presume not to come to the Lord's table, until he have openly declared himself to have repented and amended his former evil life, that the congregation may thereby be satisfied; and that he hath recompensed the parties to whom he hath done wrong; or at least declare himself to be in full purpose to do so, as soon as he conveniently may. The same order shall the minister use with those, betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign; not suffering them to be partakers of the Lord's Table, until he know them to be reconciled. And if one of the parties so at variance be content to forgive from the bottom of his heart all that the other hath trespassed against him, and to make amends for that wherein he himself hath offended; and the other party will not be persuaded to a godly unity, but remain still in his frowardness and malice; the minister in that case ought to admit the penitent person to the Holy Communion, and not him that is obstinate. Provided that every minis-

ter so repelling any, as is herein specified, shall be obliged to give an account of the same to the ordinary, as soon as conveniently may be." In these cases, we have of course the overt act—the outward conduct—by which to judge. There can, therefore, be no doubt on the subject, and we act with certainty in cutting off the unworthy member.

And now, is not this reasonable? If an individual has been by baptism solemnly admitted into the Church of Christ—unless he should show beyond doubt, by his outward conduct, that he is unworthy of the privilege—have I, or any one else, authority to debar him from a Sacrament which his Lord has provided to sustain and strengthen him? After the Jews were admitted into their Church by circumcision, was any priest gifted with power to prevent them from partaking of the Passover, until *he* should think them prepared? And if the baptized Christian, in addition to this, after having arrived at years of discretion, professes his willingness to stand up publicly before the Church in Confirmation, to take these solemn baptismal vows upon himself, and then is able also, after listening to the searching test proposed in our Communion service, to come forward, where is the fallible man who shall dare to read his heart, and say that he is not prepared? By what examination can we arrive at any certainty on this point? An individual may have the grace of God in his heart, and yet be unable clearly to disclose his feelings, or embody them in language. On the other hand, the self-deceiver, or the wilful hypocrite, may be gifted with a volubility which shall set the most severe scrutiny at defiance. Each minister of the Church

has, therefore, reason to be thankful that this power rests not in his hands, lest at the last day it might appear that in some cases he had been mistaken, and had debarred from that spiritual feast some of the little ones of Christ's flock. We may well shrink from this responsibility, and rejoice that it is taken away from us, and placed upon the individuals themselves who wish to come forward.

Another objection which it may be well briefly to notice is—*that the Church does not believe in what is called "a change of heart."* To this we reply, that she nowhere, it is true, uses this term in her formularies. Neither, indeed, is it to be found in the Bible. It is not, of course, to be expected that a Liturgy framed more than a thousand years ago should now have engrafted upon its rich and beautiful services, the shifting, changing phraseology, with which the religious world around chooses in this day to express its views. Her object rather is, to shun every thing modern and evanescent, and to cleave steadfastly to those old expressions which, drawn originally from the solemn language of Holy Writ, have come down generation after generation among her children, always "familiar in their mouths as household words."

But that the Church requires her children to be renewed, renovated, and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, as requisite for membership with her, while militant here, or in glory hereafter, no one can doubt who has ever read her offices. She every where teaches the truth, that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." She constantly seeks to draw men away from dependence on their own changing feelings, or the delusive visions of the imagination.

She presents before them tests of Christian character which are real and tangible, calling them to self-denial and a holy life. On this principle every page of our Prayer-Book has been framed, and we might prove it from each of her services, or from the general spirit and tenor of her prayers. We content ourselves, however, with merely quoting the collect for Ash-Wednesday—"Almighty and Everlasting God, who hatest nothing that Thou hast made, and dost forgive the sins of all those who are penitent; *create and make in us new and contrite hearts*, that we, worthily lamenting our sins, and acknowledging our wretchedness, may obtain of Thee, the God of all mercy, perfect remission and forgiveness, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

There is but one more objection which our limits will allow us to bring forward. It is—*that the standard of religious feeling is low among the members of the Church.* How this conclusion is reached, I know not; for I cannot perceive but that they walk as consistently as others, who are called by a different name. It is a question, therefore, entirely intangible, and I cannot pretend to discuss the amount of religion among the members of the Church, as compared with other religious bodies around, for God has not given me the power thus to judge the heart. Neither can I presume to forestall His final sentence, and decide on the spiritual condition of my neighbors. "For we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves; but they, measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not

wise.”* On such topics the Christian rule is—to fear everything for ourselves, and to hope everything for others. We would merely warn you, however, that talking about religion, is not religion itself; and that there is a wide difference between possessing an elevated degree of devotion, and being familiar with its language, and having it ever on our lips. The Church tells her members, that their daily lives must be the test—that in silence and quiet they must, by the aid of God’s grace, train themselves up for Heaven; and not be forming erroneous conclusions with respect to others. Her direction is that which was once given by an Apostle—“Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come.”

In such cases, it is well to follow that proverb given by Solomon—“Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips.” What, then, is the reputation of the Church with those whose opinion is worth heeding? Has she “a good report of them which are without?” We know that the storm of vituperation is constantly directed against her, yet amidst the uproar we can gather the testimony of the more thoughtful and considerate. Let us attempt then to do so. The Puritans of New England—the first settlers of Massachusetts—are generally quoted, as having been arrayed in deadly hostility against the Church of England. We are told that they were driven from their own pleasant homes by religious corruption and ecclesiastical tyranny; and obliged to fly to the wilderness of this western world, that here they might worship God in purity. Was this the

* 2 Cor. x. 12.

case? We can answer the question by referring to the letter written by the leading men in that enterprise, "aboard the Arbella, April 7, 1630," and signed by Gov. John Winthrop, Rich. Saltonstall, Charles Fines, Isaac Johnson, Tho. Dudley, William Coddington, Geo. Phillips, &c., &c. As they were about to launch forth upon the deep, and direct their course for that "rock-bound coast" which was to be their future home, they once more looked back, and sent their parting farewell to the Church they were leaving. From her care they had voluntarily cut themselves off. If formerly oppressed by her, they had now nothing more to fear. What, then, were their emotions? As they listened to the surging sea on whose bosom they were soon to be tossing, did no sound of the sweet anthems of their ancient mother come back, and seem to mingle with the sighing of the wild winds which were sweeping around them? Did there not flit across the eyes of any of those stern men, a bright vision of the old Parish Church, at whose font he had been baptized—at whose altar he had received his bride—and within the shadow of whose walls his forefathers were sleeping? Did they not realize, that the very strength which now upheld them in their hours of darkness, had been gathered in her courts? Such is the inference we draw from their address, entitled—

The humble request of his Majesties loyall subjects, the Governor and the Company late gone for New-England; to the rest of their Brethren in and of the Church of England.

"Reverend FATHERS and BRETHREN, We desire you would be pleased to take notice of the

principals, and body of our Company, as those who esteem it our honour to call the Church of England, from whence wee rise, our deare mother, and cannot part from our native cuntry, where she specially resideth, without much sadness of heart, and many tears in our eyes; *ever acknowledging that such hope and part as we have obtained in the common salvation, we have received in her bosome, and suckt it from her breasts*: wee leave it not, therefore, as loathing that milk wherewith we were nourished there, but, blessing God for the parentage and education, as members of the same body, shall alwayes rejoyce in her good, and unfainedly grieve for any sorrow that shall ever betide her, and while we have breath, syncerely desire and indeavour the continuance and abundance of her welfare, with the enlargement of her bounds in the Kingdom of CHRIST JESUS So farre as God shall enable us, we will give him no rest in your behalves; wishing our heads and hearts may be as fountaines of tears for your everlasting welfare, when wee shall be in our poore cottages in the wilderness, overshadowed with the Spirit of supplication, through the manifold necessities and tribulations which may not altogether unexpectedly, nor, we hope, unprofitably, befall us. And so, commending you to the grace of God in Christ, wee shall ever rest,

“Your assured friends and Brethren.”*

How beautiful is this testimony! thus acknowledging gratefully the spiritual benefits they had received within the fold of our Mother Church— ascribing to the purity of her faith and the soundness

* Gov. Hutchinson's Hist. of Massachusetts, (Appendix, No. 1,) v. i. p. 431.

of her instructions, the hope of everlasting life which they then enjoyed—and praying earnestly for the enlargement of her bounds. How do their words rebuke the carping spirit of too many among their descendants !

Our next witness is Dr. Adam Clarke, the author of the Commentary on the Bible, and one of the brightest lights of the Methodist connection. “I consider”—he says—“the Church of England, the purest national Church in the world. I was brought up in its bosom. I was intended for its ministry. I have been a Methodist for half a century. I have been a preacher for forty-three years. And I am greatly deceived indeed, if I be not, without any abatement, a thorough member of the Church of England. Its doctrines and its sacraments, which constitute the essence of a Church, I hold conscientiously as it holds them. I reverence the Liturgy next to the Bible. I proclaim its doctrines and administer its sacraments, not only in the same spirit in which it holds and administers them, but also in the same words or form. I also reverence its orders, and highly esteem its hierarchy, and have not a particle of a dissenter in me ; though I love and esteem all good men and able ministers wherever I find them. But I preach, and have long preached, without any kind of Episcopal orders. My family fell into decay, and my education was left imperfect. I would greatly have preferred the hands of the Bishop, but not having gone through the regular courses, I could not claim it. Even now, at this age of comparative decrepitude, I would rejoice to have that ordination, if I might, with it, have the full liberty to

preach Jesus, wherever I could find souls perishing for lack of knowledge. . . . The Church has our warm attachment, and if the time should ever come, which Dieu ne plaise ! that the bodies of the various dissenters were to rise up against the Church, the vast bodies of Methodists would not hesitate to be your light infantry.”*

Hear also the sentiments of the celebrated Dr. Chalmers of Scotland—“There are many who look with an evil eye to the endowments of the English Church, and to the indolence of her dignitaries. But to that Church, the theological literature of our nation stands indebted for her best acquisitions. And we hold it a refreshing spectacle, at any time that meagre Socinianism pours forth a new supply of flippancies and errors, when we behold, as we have often done, an armed champion come forth in full equipment, from some high and lettered retreat of that noble hierarchy. Nor can we grudge her the wealth of her endowments, when we think how well, under her venerable auspices, the battles of orthodoxy have been fought; that, in this holy warfare, they are her sons and her scholars, who are ever foremost in the field, ready at all times to face the threatened mischief, and by the weight of their erudition to overthrow it.”†

Similar to this is the testimony of another in the same land—“Thus much an attached Presbyterian may sincerely and readily say of the Church of England: It is a noble and venerable hierarchy. Its foundations are laid deep in the old feelings of the people. Its clergy, mingling the accomplishments of

* *Christian Guardian*, Dec. 1832. † *Quarterly Review*, Dec. 1832.

the aristocracy with the condescension of Christian pastors, rivet together the different ranks of society, as with crossing bars of iron. Its bishops have exhibited, many of them, the pomp of the prelate in beautiful unison with the spirit of Christ's meekest martyr. Its massive learning is the bulwark of Christianity. Its exquisite Liturgy, second in divine composition only to Scripture itself, ready at all times to supply the needs of the fainting soul, and fitted, in its comprehensive devotions, aptly to embody every different individual aspiration, binds in one chain of prayer, the hearts of its members, and the hearts of generation after generation. From its pulpits, no longer occupied by slumbering watchmen, the true doctrines of the Cross are proclaimed, as with the sound of a trumpet. The costliest offerings for the cause of Christ are poured in generous profusion into the treasury. The zeal of the missionary, that finest token of apostolic origin, has awoken within its bosom; and bishops are going forth, making of the crosier a pilgrim staff, in order to proclaim amongst the Gentiles the good tidings of salvation. Well might the members of any other communion excuse the generous feeling which would awake those words of holy writ, concerning her whom the best of her sons have rejoiced to call their Mother Church of England, 'Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all.' '*

And such also is the feeling of many in our own country, who, although arrayed against us, can yet acknowledge the beauty of the Church's system, and

* A Tract for the Times, by William Penny, Advocate, of Edinburgh.

pay their proper tribute to the services she has rendered the world. Read for example the words of Dr. Barnes of Philadelphia—the more valuable because written in the midst of a controversy. “We have no war to wage with Episcopacy. We know, we deeply feel, that much may be said in favor of it, apart from the claim which has been set up for its authority from the New Testament. Its past history, in some respects, makes us weep; in others, it is the source of sincere rejoicing and praise. . . . We associate it with the brightest and happiest days of religion, and liberty, and literature, and law. We remember that it was under the Episcopacy that the Church in England took its firm stand against the Papacy; and that this was its form when Zion rose to light and splendor, from the dark night of ages. We remember the name of Cranmer—Cranmer, first in many respects among the Reformers; that it was by his steady and unerring hand, that under God, the pure Church of the Saviour was conducted through the agitating and distressing times of Henry VIII. We remember that God watched over that wonderful man! that He gave this distinguished prelate access to the heart of one of the most capricious, cruel, inexorable, bloodthirsty and licentious monarchs that has disgraced the world; that God, for the sake of Cranmer and His Church, conducted Henry, as ‘by a hook in the nose,’ and made him faithful to the Archbishop of Canterbury, when faithful to none else; so that, perhaps, the only redeeming trait in the character of Henry, is his fidelity to this first British prelate under the Reformation. The world will not soon forget the names of Latimer, and

Ridley, and Rogers, and Bradford ; names associated in the feelings of Christians, with the long list of ancient confessors 'of whom the world was not worthy,' and who did honor to entire ages of mankind, by sealing their attachment to the Son of God on the rack, or amid the flames. Nor can we forget that we owe to Episcopacy that which fills our minds with gratitude and praise, when we look for example of consecrated talent, and elegant literature, and humble, devoted piety. While men honor elevated Christian feeling ; while they revere sound learning, while they render tribute to clear and profound reasoning, they will not forget the names of Barrow and Taylor, of Tillotson, and Hooker, and Butler ; and when they think of humble, pure, sweet, heavenly piety, their minds will recur instinctively to the name of Leighton. Such names, with a host of others, do honor to the world. When we think of them we have it not in our hearts to utter one word against a Church which has thus done honor to our race, and to our common Christianity.

“Such we wish Episcopacy still to be. We have always thought that there are Christian minds and hearts that would find more edification in the forms of worship in that Church, than in any other. We regard it as adapted to call forth Christian energy, that might otherwise be dormant. . . . We ourselves could live and labor, in friendliness and love, in the bosom of the Episcopal Church. While we have an honest preference for another department of the great field of Christian action ; while providential circumstances, and the suggestions of our own hearts and minds, have conducted us to a different

field of labor; we have never doubted that many of the purest flames of devotion that rise from the earth, ascend from the altars of the Episcopal Church, and that many of the purest spirits that the earth contains minister at those altars, or breathe forth their prayers and praises in language consecrated by the use of piety for centuries.”*

“She [the Church] is consolidated; well marshalled: under an efficient system of laws; and pre-eminently fitted for powerful action in the field of Christian warfare. We desire to see her what the Macedonian phalanx was in the ancient army; with her dense, solid organization, with her unity of movement, with her power of maintaining the position which she takes, and with her eminent ability to advance the cause of sacred learning, and the love of order and of law, attending or leading all other Churches in the conquests of redemption in an alienated world. We would ever rejoice to see her who was first in the field at the Reformation in England, first also in the field when the Son of God shall come to take to Himself His great power.”

“We remember the former services which the Episcopal Church rendered to the cause of truth, and of the world’s redemption; we remember the bright and ever-living lights of truth, which her clergy and her illustrious laymen have in other times enkindled in the darkness of this world’s history, and which continue to pour their pure and steady lustre on the literature, the laws, and the customs of the Christian world; and we trust the day will never come, when our own bosoms or the bosoms of Chris-

* *Episcopacy Examined*, pp. 89—91.

tians in any denomination, will cease to beat with emotions of lofty thanksgiving to the God of grace, that he raised up such gifted and holy men to meet the corruptions of the Papacy, and to breast the wickedness of the world."*

Beautiful indeed are these testimonies to the purity and devotion of our venerable Church! We point then to such acknowledgments as an appropriate answer to those who, unacquainted with her past history, and ignorant of the spirit which now reigns within her courts, would charge upon the members of the Church, a want of religious principle.

We have thus endeavored to notice some of the prominent arguments urged against the Church. Do they not come from those who—in the words of the Apostle—"understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm!" There are other objections, also, which might be brought forward; but the time would fail, were we to attempt to reply to every thing which ignorance or captiousness may allege. All indeed that we ask, is investigation. We know that the Church which our Lord founded, and which now has descended to us with the veneration of eighteen centuries, cannot be found wanting in any one single point which concerns man's spiritual welfare. We will trust her, therefore, in preference to any of the shifting, changing experiments which court our notice. From the many ages that have gone, there comes down to us the recorded experience of those who have slept in the faith—the holy dead whose words and actions still speak to the world, urging it on to godliness—and whose spirits are now

* *Ibid.* p. 170.

rejoicing in the Paradise of God. We question them, therefore, as to the way in which they reached their lofty stand in holiness. We ask them to point out to us the path in which we should tread. And their answer is uttered in the words of the prophet—“Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.” We learn, that they were nurtured in the bosom of our ancient Church, who regards all, the high and the low, as alike her children,*—that in her solemn rites and services they found all the spiritual aliment necessary for their souls, and thus were prepared for the Church in glory.

Let us then profit by their example. As we travel on our way, each year convulses the religious world with a new excitement, and gives birth to some plan for leading the lost to the truth, which, in the judgment of erring man, is better than that practised by Apostles and Saints in primitive days—more effectual

“* Our Mother, the Church, hath never a child,
 To honor before the rest,
 And she singeth the same for mighty kings,
 And the veriest babe on her breast ;
 And the Bishop goes down to his narrow bed
 As the ploughman's child is laid,
 And alike she blesseth the dark-brow'd serf,
 And the chief in his robe arrayed.
 She sprinkles the drops of the bright new-birth,
 The same on the low and high,
 And christens their bodies with dust to dust,
 When earth with its earth must lie ;
Oh, the poor man's friend is the Church of Christ,
 From his birth to his funeral day ;
 She makes him the Lord's, in her surpliced arms,
 And singeth his burial lay.”

Rev. A. C. Coxe.

than that by which the early heralds of the Cross broke the power of heathenism, and Christianized the world. Those deep and searching sorrows by which the contrite heart turns to its Lord, and thus, as in a furnace of fire, purifies the whole man, are all now derided, as something formal and antiquated. In their place, new machinery is invented, which, by one sudden, violent effort, sweeps the abandoned sinner from the depth of his degradation, and elevates him immediately to the very heights of Mount Zion. Peace, rather than holiness, is made the end and object of their search.

But oh, be not deceived, or believe that anything can be substituted in place of that discipline—that holy training, which gradually, yet surely, prepares for heaven, and which it is the object of the Church to effect by her constantly recurring round of services. Voices on every side are summoning you to leave the fold of the faithful. The restless and unsettled are ever pointing out new paths, and exclaiming, “Lo here,” and “Lo there.” They cry with regard to our Lord—“Behold, he is in the desert,” and thus would induce you to be wanderers with them in the pathless wilderness. We say therefore unto you, in that Master’s words—“Believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.” Not in the whirlwind and the storm is it, that faith takes root, and godliness grows up in strength. It is beneath the gentle dews of divine grace, which fall silently yet steadily, that the vineyard is quickened

into fertility. The whisperings of "the still small voice," lead us on to peace and happiness. And this is pledged to the Apostolic, Catholic Church, and in her courts is never sought in vain by her children.

IX.

THE CHURCH IN ALL AGES THE KEEPER OF THE TRUTH.

She sits—Truth's Witness in an evil world,
And sore environ'd by unnumber'd foes,
With wiles and weapons stern against her hurl'd ;
The Child of Life, death's shades around her close ;
The Crown of joy, amid o'erwhelming woes :
Her right hand holds the keys of death and life,
And calm she sits in undisturb'd repose,
But all around with hostile arms are rife,
And foes of earth and hell are arming for the strife.

The Baptistery.

MELANCHOLY indeed was the view presented to the great Apostle of the Gentiles, when standing upon the Mount of Observation, he first looked forth over the world which was to be the scene of his labors. The greater portion of mankind were crushed down by the iron power of Rome—a tyranny the most oppressive and degrading, which seemed to be gradually treading out every spark of generous feeling, and fitting the human race only to be slaves. Neither was there anything to correct the cruelty and licentiousness which were so fearfully on the increase. For ages men had made trial of their moral strength, but seemed now to have resigned themselves to despair. Every prevailing system had lost what purifying influence it might formerly have possessed. The philosophy of Greece—perverted from all the nobler ends at which once it aimed—was only investing vice with new grace, and causing the arrow to

sink deeper because its point was polished. The old Paganism of Rome had begun to lose all moral hold on the mind, and now was only sustained as the religion of the Empire, and the instrument of power to its priesthood. Even its ministers in secret scoffed at it as an imposture. "Diligently practising"—says Gibbon—"the ceremonies of their fathers; devoutly frequenting the temples of the gods; and sometimes condescending to act a part on the theatre of superstition, they concealed the sentiments of an atheist under the sacerdotal robes."* In Egypt, forgetting the lessons of wisdom which in an older day were taught in the sacred groves of Memphis and Heliopolis, her people now bowed to deities of their own creation, and worshipped the herb they eat, or the reptile upon which they trod.

Neither did the East furnish to the Apostle any more cheering view. There was the fruitful home and the cradle of every debasing form of idolatry. The ancient inhabitants of Palestine had bequeathed to their descendants the adoration of Astarte, the Queen of Heaven, or of that spirit which, under the name of Baal, was supposed to guide the chariot of the sun; while still more distant nations, with their innumerable gods, had collected in their worship every thing which was degrading and licentious. Even God's own people, the Jews, had shared in this debasement. Their religion had degenerated into formality. The purity of their earlier days had departed, and so marked was their wickedness, that their own historian, Josephus, bears his indignant testimony to their

* Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. ii.

depravity.* Such was the prospect which presented itself to St. Paul, as he looked over the moral landscape. Truly, it was a "world lying in wickedness." "The people were sitting in gross darkness."

Where then was the power which could meet all this array of idolatry and vice, and mould it into purity? On what did the Apostle rely, that he was enabled to go forth so boldly to confront it? His hopes rested on that Church—then in the feebleness of her early day—which his Lord had founded. He looked to her, as a perpetual witness against sin. He expected her, with her holy institutions, to enter the dark and troubled waves, and spread over them a glory not of this world. His trust was, in "the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."

Has the Church then realized these high expectations? Has she fulfilled the lofty destiny which St. Paul marked out for her? Has she in the ages which have gone, been the Ark of truth for a fallen and apostate world? The history of the past answers, that she has. From every page of the records of our race, there comes a testimony, that the Church alone has been the preserver of all that is most valuable to man in time and through eternity. It is on this subject then that I would address you this evening—THE CHURCH, IN ALL AGES, THE KEEPER AND GUARDIAN OF THE TRUTH. From an historical view of her origin and progress, it will be evident, that in each crisis, intellectual or moral, in the existence of our

* "Nor did any age ever breed a generation more fruitful in wickedness than this was, from the beginning of the world." *Antiq.* lib. v. chap. 10.

race, the Church has stood forth to rescue man's best interest from ruin. And she was enabled to accomplish this great work by her strict organization and government, and the union produced by the Apostolic ministry, binding together the different branches by a common tie.

We might indeed say at once, that since God adopted this plan for preserving in the earth a knowledge of our faith, it must be the best method that could be devised. The very fact that it was the choice of Infinite Wisdom, proves this point conclusively. But it is evident, even to the eye of human reason, that this end could probably have been effected in no other way. Had the word of God, and the holy principles of His Gospel, been left to be treasured up only in the breast of each private individual, or to be swept about on the wild waves of popular feeling, they would long since have disappeared from the earth. The same result would have followed, had the spiritual destinies of the world been committed to the care of the discordant sects which are now around us. These, deprived of the high claims of the Apostolic Church, and standing independently of each other, unite both the nature and the weakness of mere voluntary associations. It is the existence of the Church, which keeps the truth always before the world, which gives to religion "a local habitation and a name," and endows it with permanency.

We shall easily perceive this by looking back to the past history of our faith. It was the regular organization of the Church—her systematic discipline, and her unity, which enabled her, in the first three

centuries, not only to survive the violence of enemies, but even to be always the aggressor, and to advance with a steady step from conquering to conquer. It is to this, under God, that we must ascribe the triumphs she gained. Wherever the Apostles went, they left not the converts who had been gained, to confine their feelings to their own breasts—to stand isolated and alone—to use their principles only as articles of individual belief—or, in their blindness, just starting from the sleep of heathenism, to endeavor to settle a system of ecclesiastical polity for themselves. On the contrary, they formed their followers into one united body, the different parts of which were bound together by the closest alliance. Thus, they grew up to maturity and strength, in secret and in silence, while their enemies were scarcely aware of their increase. In the midst of the mighty empire of Rome, a new kingdom quietly arose.* “It came not with observation.” No sound of a trumpet heralded its approach—no clang of arms marked its progress—but, like the building of the first temple, while the noise of the workmen’s instruments was not heard, the mighty fabric was fast rising up into splendor and beauty.†

* “While the great body [the Roman Empire] was invaded by open violence, or undermined by slow decay, a pure and humble religion gently insinuated itself into the minds of men, grew up in silence and obscurity, derived new vigor from opposition, and finally erected the triumphant banner of the Cross on the ruins of the Capitol.” *Gibbon’s Decline and Fall*, vol. ii. p. 265.

† “There was neither hammer nor axe, nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was building.” *1 Kings* vi. 7.

———“In awful state,
The temple reared its everlasting gate.

The faith stretched its ramifications through every class of society, and enlisted everywhere its proselytes. The degraded bondsman in his chains became "a freeman in Christ Jesus," and the inmate of palaces began to aspire after diadems whose glory was eternal, and which were to be received only when "the mortal had put on immortality." Thus, the heathen saw their temples suddenly deserted*—their fellow-worshippers changed into foes—and themselves encompassed by ten thousand associations, all uniting in the same discipline, and all proclaiming irreconcilable hostility to the time-honored faith of their fathers. "It was not a foreigner who invaded them, not barbarians from the north, not a rising of slaves, nor an armament of pirates, but the enemy rose up from among themselves. The first-born in every house, 'from the first-born of Pharaoh on the throne to the first-born of the captive in the dungeon,' unaccountably found himself enlisted in the ranks of this new power, and estranged from his natural friends. Their brother, the son of their mother, the wife of their bosom, the friend that was as their own soul, these were the sworn soldiers of the 'mighty army,' that 'covered the face of the whole earth.' And when they began to interrogate this enemy of Roman greatness, they found no vague profession among themselves, no varying account of themselves, no irregular

No workman's steel, no ponderous axes rung!
Like some tall palm the noiseless fabric sprung."

Heber's Palestine.

* In the celebrated letter of C. Pliny, to the Emperor Trajan, in describing the progress of Christianity, he mentions, that "the temples were almost desolate," "the sacred solemnities had been long intermitted," and "the sacrificial victims could scarce find a purchaser." See whole Letter in *Wilson's Evidences*, vol. 1. p. 214.

and uncertain plan of action or conduct. They were all members of strictly and similarly organized societies. Every one in his own district was the subject of a new state, of which there was one visible head, and officers under him. These small kingdoms were indefinitely multiplied, each of them the fellow of the other. Wherever the Roman Emperor travelled, there he found these seeming rivals of his power, the Bishops of the Church.”*

Thus it was that the faith went on. It measured strength with the proud philosophy of Greece, and planted its standard in the midst of Athenian luxury and superstition. Along the shores of the Mediterranean, every city reared its temples, on whose lofty pinnacles the Golden Cross glittered in the sunbeams; while there rose at break of day the melody of countless thousands singing “hymns to Christ as God,”† in those lovely valleys from whence now only

“The Moslem’s prayers profane,
Morn and eve come sounding.

Spain received the Gospel gladly—Africa sent her hundreds of Christian Bishops to the Councils of the Church ‡—while St. Paul himself preached the faith

* Newman’s Sermons, vol. ii. p. 264.

† “They were accustomed, on a stated day, to meet before daylight, and to repeat among themselves a hymn to Christ as to a God.” *Pliny’s Letter to Trajan.*

‡ The argument is often advanced by those opposed to us, that from the great number of Bishops present at some of the ancient councils, it is evident they must have been only Presbyters. The error here arises from not remembering two facts—1st, that these regions of the world, although now thinly inhabited, then contained a dense population.—2d, that Dioceses in that day were much smaller in geographical extent, than now. We will take Africa as an illustration of this. The northern, or Christian portion of this continent, comprehending the six Roman Provinces, is computed by Procopius

in that little barbarous isle, which then was looked upon as "cut off from all the world,"* but which has

to be ninety days' journey in length, that is, 2360 miles. The breadth varied from 200 to 500 miles. It has been estimated that the population was at least eighty millions, the majority of whom were nominal Christians.

Now we know that in St. Augustine's day there were, in this compass, at least 466 dioceses. (*Bing. Orig. Eccles.* lib. ix. ch. 2, sect. 5.) When the Vandals exiled the whole body of the African Bishops, their number amounted to nearly 500. (*Fleury, Hist. Eccles.* lib. xxx. s. 7.) In addition to these, the provinces of Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, contained 100 dioceses.

These dioceses averaged from 60 to 80 towns and villages, each of which contained at least one congregation, while in some of them we know there were several. There were above 500 clergy in the Church of Carthage. (*Bing.* lib. ix. c. 2, s. 5.) St. Augustine's Diocese of Hippo, was above 40 miles long. (*Ibid.*) There was a Canon of the African Councils, which says, "No Bishop shall leave his principal Cathedral, and reside in any other church of his diocese." (*Ibid.*) Thus implying, that there were more churches than one in each diocese. And when there were in the same diocese rival Bishops set up by the Catholics and Donatists, they were in different parts of the diocese.

In this way we might go through the East, and one who had not investigated the subject, would be surprised at the strength of the Church, as shown by the number of her dioceses. In the Patriarchate of Constantinople were about 600 dioceses, varying in size. Of these, 400 were in Asia, and 200 in Europe. In the diocese of Cæsarea, which was about one hundred miles square, St. Basil, when Bishop in A. D. 375, had under him 50 Chor-episcopi, or assistant Bishops, each having under his authority many Presbyters and Deacons. (*Greg. Naz. Carm. De Vita, Basil. Bas.* Ep. 181, 412.) In Italy were 300 dioceses; in Spain 70, in France 117. In Persia alone there were 50; and during a persecution, A. D. 330, we learn that 23 Bishops suffered martyrdom at the same time. In one of these dioceses, 250 of the clergy were put to death with their Bishop. See *Bingham*, lib. ix.

So easy is it, by an appeal to the records of that day, to refute the objection derived from the great number of Bishops. In those lands Christianity has receded, and it is estimated that we have lost 150 millions of worshippers by the returning wave of Paganism, or the strange imposture of the prophet of Mecca.

* "Britannos orbe divisos."

since sent the Church to us, and now is planting it throughout the earth. Thus it was that, in the words of an Apostle—"the Gospel was preached to every creature which is under Heaven."

But the triumphs of the Church were not confined to the provinces. Our faith entered the Imperial City, and St. Paul was "ready to preach the Gospel to them that were at Rome also." It did indeed require fortitude and devotion, to attack Paganism in this its strongest hold. The obstacles which impeded its progress in other lands, were tenfold increased in the Capital. The chariot-wheel of Roman greatness had gone on, levelling one kingdom after another, until all the earth had been given to its sceptre. Idolatry was there in its most splendid form, and its strongest array. Embodied in the national customs, it seemed exactly suited to the tastes and feelings of the popular mind. Its Pantheon of gods appealed to the prejudices of every nation. The Court was there, wielding a despotism which scorned all opposition, and which scrupled not to shed rivers of blood in furthering its designs. The luxury, and vice, and licentiousness, which prevailed in the rest of the world, seemed but a faint reflection of that developing itself in every form in the Capital.

Here then was a task, to plant the pure faith of our Lord in the midst of all this corruption. But it was accomplished. The sacrifice was indeed a great one, for Rome through many years was purple with the blood of the children of God; and the sands of the amphitheatre were dyed with the gore of the martyrs. But yet, the end was attained, and in a space of time

shorter than the wildest hopes of the Christian could have imagined. It was but thirty years after the crucifixion, that Nero, to remove from himself the suspicion of having set fire to the city, charged it on the Christians, and proceeded to inflict upon them the most cruel torments. The historian Tacitus, when giving an account of this persecution, shows us how strong at that time must have been the Church at Rome. "The founder of that name"—he says—"was Christ, who suffered death in the reign of Tiberius, under his procurator Pontius Pilate. This pernicious superstition, thus checked for a while, broke out again; and spread, not only over Judea, where the evil originated, but through Rome also, whither every thing bad finds its way, and is practised. Some who confessed their sect, were first seized; and afterwards, by their information, a vast multitude were apprehended."* We see, then, from this statement, how great must have been the number of disciples in the city.

But persecution did not stop the good cause. The faith increased, even within the precincts of the court. It forced itself into high places. It entered the palace of the Cæsars; and three centuries more beheld a Roman Emperor adopting, as his proudest badge, the Cross of the once despised Nazarene, and proclaiming Christianity to be the religion of the Empire. Then came one decree after another, smiting heathenism, and closing its temples, until it gradually withered away. That splendid mythology of Greece, from which the immortal poets of old time drew their inspiration, faded utterly from the earth.

* Annals, lib. xv. § 44.

The long array of divinities, whose names once were held in reverence, vanished even from the knowledge of the people ; until to later generations, they have

“ Gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were—
A school-boy’s tale.”

It was a ruin, which Gibbon pronounces “ perhaps the only example of the total extirpation of any ancient and popular superstition.”*

Thus died the antagonist of the Gospel, an enemy which, while it gathered around it all that was splendid and alluring, was also the natural enemy of man ; for in its whole creed it could point to no traces of purity and holiness. Its fall, therefore, was the freedom of the world.

Such, then, was the early triumph of the Church. And now, looking back upon this history, what do we perceive to have been the secret of her strength ? We answer, under Providence, it was her union—the presentation of herself visibly before the world—her strict, compact, and energetic government.

And if we come down a few centuries later, to the time when the fierce barbarians from the North trampled the Roman Empire beneath their feet, we shall find, that then the perfect organization of the Church was the instrument of Heaven for the preservation of religion. Had it not been for the influence of her standing ministry, all traces of our faith would at once have been obliterated from the West. Look at the materials of which the population was then composed. Among the conquered people, the higher classes had ceased to be either numerous or powerful ; while the lower, recently converted from polytheism,

* Decline and Fall, chap. xxviii.

were not always the most sincere in their change, nor had their faith — which was no longer purified by persecution—yet gained the requisite strength. The clergy alone occupied a commanding position, which rendered them the able and efficient defenders of the oppressed. They extorted respect even from their Gothic invaders. In the first confusion of conquest, they might indeed share in the indiscriminate evils of warfare, yet the rudest soldier brought with him a superstitious reverence for the priesthood, particularly when he found them honored, and the ceremonies of their worship imposing.”* He soon learned to invest the ministers of this faith with a sanctity, which enabled them to wind their chains about the hearts of their conquerors, and to win them to that faith itself. The illiterate prince found himself confronted fearlessly by the Christian Bishop; and the respect which he felt was soon increased by the discovery, that the clergy were the exclusive possessors of that learning which commands the reverence even of barbarians. The invaders had been already converted to the faith before they left their northern homes, and now the ministers of the Church stood between them and the conquered, as the only connecting link—the only intermediate power—which gave some community of interest to the master and the slave. They found themselves worshippers of the same God, gathered into the same Church, and united under the same spiritual supervision. Thus the Church, with her high authority, prevented the complete disorganization of all the existing relations of society. She gradually mingled

* Waddington's Church History, p. 203.

up the invaders with the invaded into one people, and before the next wave of conquest came from the North, the community was in some measure prepared to breast the shock.

In this way, by regulating the social system, and standing forth a perpetual witness for the truth, the Church prevented all religion being absorbed and lost, in the conflict and confusion of the times.* But had Christianity then existed as a mere individual belief, or had its form of government been less complete and vigorous, it would have possessed neither the energy nor discipline necessary to maintain its hold in the midst of the deluge which rolled over it. Or, had its preservation been then committed to the keeping of warring sects, which were ever shifting and changing, both it and they would have been swept from the earth like chaff before the wind.

And thus it was through all the ages which followed, when a twilight gloom had gathered over the earth, even down to the dawn of the Reformation. Although the Church was existing only in a corrupted form, yet still she was in some measure discharging her duty to the world, by keeping alive the remembrance of religion in the minds of men. The spiritual despotism of the Romish Church had indeed stretched an iron sceptre over the earth; yet in the good providence of God it seems to have been permitted, because more efficacious than any gentler form of faith, to keep the social system in order during an age of savage turbulence and unceasing tyranny. The Church was then the only "City of refuge" for the helpless and oppressed. The power

* Milman's Hist. of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 163.

of superstition was the only one which in that war-like age formed any efficient barrier between the nobles and their down-trodden vassals. The very claim of the Bishop of Rome to be the vicegerent of God on earth, while it invested him with a fearful power, perhaps enabled him also to save our race from the horrors of perpetual barbarism. Customary as it has been to speak of the Church in these centuries only in the language of denunciation, he who does so knows but little of the spirit of those times.

In truth, the world has never witnessed a spectacle more sublime than that furnished by the Church in her progress through the Middle Ages. It was a mental supremacy, which cannot but command our admiration, even when it devised and wielded the weapons of superstition. It was the triumph of intellect and learning, over ignorance and brutal force. The higher classes of Europe, at that time, were a fierce and lawless nobility, yielding to no authority but that dictated by superior strength, and regarding all beneath them as being only the helots of the soil, doomed forever to exist but as "the hewers of wood and drawers of water" to their lords. The elements of society were always at war, and often threatening to rush into a ruinous conflict. But above these wild waves of anarchy and turbulence there arose a mighty form, its foot indeed resting on the earth, but its head reaching to the clouds, clothed with the attributes of both worldly and spiritual power, and holding in its hand the enchanter's rod, which alone could awe into silence the threatening storm or afford a timely succor from external violence. The mightiest of mankind trembled before it, while it

“bound their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron.” The Church, therefore, in that day, was the sanctuary of the earth. She was the ark in which, while the flood of error was sweeping around, the truth was preserved in being for better times. Corrupt then as the Romish Church undoubtedly was, and often “holding the truth in unrighteousness,” her movements were still overruled by a wise Providence to the furtherance of good, and her colossal strength was enlisted to keep alive in the earth the true Church, that “the gates of hell should not prevail against it.”

There were, indeed, at that time, innumerable ways by which, through her instrumentality, religion was daily brought before the people, until the degraded peasant, and the rude and warlike baron, were alike obliged to yield to her claims. In the first place, her rites and services were gorgeous, and well adapted to an illiterate age, when the heart must be reached and the mind enlightened, through the medium of the senses.

Again — the Church was the dispenser of the charities of the age. Thus, that work was effectually accomplished, which is now attempted with such inadequate results, by a multitude of voluntary associations — often ill-directed in their zeal — conflicting in their efforts — and bound together by no sympathy of religious principles. The pious made the Church the almoner of their bounty, and thus, among other good effects, the tie was strengthened which bound the people to their spiritual pastors. They came to them for relief of their worldly necessities, as well as of their religious wants, and thus

that "most excellent gift of charity"—one of the brightest virtues of Christianity—was inculcated upon the multitude, not only by the preaching, but also by the daily example of those who ministered at the altar. Beautiful, indeed, is the picture which has come down to us of the crowds which morning and evening assembled around the doors of the religious houses, to have their wretchedness relieved,* and sad was the day for England's poor, when these establishments—instead of being remodelled in accordance with the rules of that purer faith which had then dawned upon the land—were entirely suppressed by

* The Rev. J. J. Blunt—an author who surely will not be accused of any attachment to Romanism—writes thus—"As we know not, says the proverb, what the well is worth till it is dry, so was it found after the dissolution, that with all their faults, the monasteries had been the refuge for the destitute, who were now driven to frightful extremities throughout the country, the effect of the suppression being with respect to them the same as would now follow from the sudden abolition of the poor laws; that they had been the almshouses, where the aged dependents of more opulent families, the decrepit servant, the decayed artificer, retired as to a home neither uncomfortable nor humiliating; that they had been the country infirmaries and dispensaries, a knowledge of medicine and of the virtues of herbs being a department of monkish learning, (as passages in the old dramatic writers sometimes indicate,) and a hospital, and perhaps a laboratory, being component parts of a monkish establishment; that they had been foundling asylums, relieving the state of many orphan and out-cast children, and ministering to their necessities,—God's ravens in the wilderness, (neither so black as they had been represented,) bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening; that they had been inns for the wayfaring man, who heard from afar the sound of the vesper bell, at once inviting him to repose and devotion, and who might sing his matins with the morning star, and go on his way rejoicing; that they filled up the gap in which the public libraries have since stood, and if their inmates were not very desirous to eat of the tree of knowledge themselves, they had at least the merit of cherishing and preserving it alive for others." *Hist. of Reformation in England*, p. 142.

the rude hand of violence, and their pensioners scattered abroad, to subsist by the cold charity of their countrymen, or to be driven by want into licentiousness and crime. Well may a living poet ask—

——“ When the old must pass
The threshold, whither shall they turn to find
The hospitality—the alms, (alas !
Alms may be needed,) which that house bestowed? ”*

Even to this day we have witnesses to the noble spirit of self-denial which prompted the men of those generations to sacrifice all private interests to the advancement of their faith. The magnificent edifices scattered through every land in Europe, which were dedicated to the service of our Lord, and which succeeding ages have attempted in vain to rival, testify how abundant was the liberality, and how deep the religious feeling of those, who were then the members of the Church. We may call it superstition—and such it sometimes was—yet we believe that often

* Wordsworth's *Eccles. Sonnets*, No. xix. “On the whole, King Henry VIII. at different times, suppressed 645 abbeys and monasteries. Ninety Colleges were demolished in several counties. Two thousand three hundred and seventy-four Chantries and Free Chapels; and 110 Hospitals. The whole revenue of these establishments amounted to £161,100.” *Hume*, vol. iv. p. 182.

The effect of this change upon education alone is thus told in a single sentence by Latimer, in the middle of Edward VI.'s reign—“I think there be at this day, ten thousand students less than there were within these twenty years.” *Latimer's Sermons*, vol. i. p. 246. At the time of their destruction, Latimer had pleaded with Cromwell, Henry's minister, that some might be reserved as places of study and prayer. “Alas, my good Lord”—said he—“shall we not see two or three in every shire changed to such a remedy!” He pleaded, however, in vain, for Henry and his courtiers, grasping at the spoils, were deaf to every religious argument. See *Sir H. Spelman's Hist. and Fate of Sacrilege*, or the last part of *Churton's Early English Church*.

these works were prompted by a loftier, holier feeling—that

“ They dreamt not of a perishable home,
Who thus could build.”*

Again—the penitential discipline of the Church was continually enforcing the moral precepts of our religion. The superstitious crowd, who could be awed by nothing else, trembled when they heard the terrible denunciations of the Church; and as the penitent stood before them in his public shame, they were impressed with a salutary awe, as they witnessed his deep humiliation, the intensity and bitterness of his remorse. No elevation of rank was so lofty as to shield the offender. Kings bowed to the spiritual authority of the Church, and were forced to realize, that when they entered her walls, they stood in the sight of the King of kings, on a level with the meanest of their subjects. In an age when the true spirit of religion was but dimly perceived, this system must have possessed the strongest power, when exerted to advance man’s moral improvement. And in these days of laxity and carelessness, would not a revival of something of this ancient and stern discipline of the Church tend to call back also in some measure a portion of her former spirit?

The Church, too, sought unceasingly to correct the vices of the whole system—to improve the spirit of society—and to interpose as peacemaker for the prevention of outrage and warfare. If indeed we closely examine the history of the past, and compare the condition of society in successive centuries, we shall be surprised to find how many of the glaring

* Wordsworth’s Ecclesiastical Sonnets, No. xxxv.

abuses of the Middle Ages have gradually disappeared before the increasing light of the Church, until they have been entirely extirpated. Without her influence, we should now be sunk in degradation and barbarism; for even of that literature which has come down to us from the days of classic antiquity, the Church was the guardian in a time when the world at large knew not the worth of these models of the past. It was in the libraries of the monasteries that the intellectual treasures of former ages were preserved, when these were the only places of safety; because the rude noble, whose trade was war, and who felt no remorse in rifling cities and palaces, dared not lay the finger of violence on those consecrated buildings. He dreaded too much the threatenings of the Church.

Such was the Church of the Middle Ages. A dark pall was indeed drawn over Western Christendom, and the human mind in the mass of men slumbered in a rest which was unbroken. But fearful as the picture was, there were still some redeeming traits. Within the courts of the Church were ever those, whose learning enlightened the age in which they lived. "There was a continual succession of individual intellects—the golden chain was never wholly broken, though the connecting links were often of baser metal. A dark cloud, like another sky, covered the entire cope of Heaven; but in this place it thinned away, and white stains of light showed a half-eclipsed star behind it—in that place it was rent asunder, and a star passed across the opening in all its brightness, and then vanished."*

* Coleridge's *Literary Remains*, vol. ii. p. 26.

tired spot, too, humble piety was training up for Heaven, and the Church in secret was nurturing within her fold those whose names live not in history, but whose record is now on high. Mingled with the superstition which then prevailed, there was indeed a heartiness in their devotion—a reality for every day life in their religion—which might well shame the lukewarm faith of modern times. Therefore it is, that even now, in these days of greater light, the thoughtful mind cannot forbear often turning back with regret, and amid the worldliness which is around us, feeling that far better was the simple, unlearned piety of former centuries. Yet these imaginings are not to be indulged. The past cannot return. “Neither the churches nor the empires of the Middle Ages are to be rebuilt, however lovely many things about them were, nor the forms of that warlike Christianity to be wished back again, in place of the better forms of a more primitive pattern. They were forms which primitive truths put on, and in which they then saved the world: forms which were real for awhile. But the present state of things must surely teach the ardent and the hopeful disciples of old times, that it is the primitive truths for which they have to strive, and not to do battle for the chivalrous, middle-age accessories of them, however gorgeous or picturesque.”*

Review, however, the picture we have presented. See the lawlessness of those centuries through which the Church passed, and then tell me, which of the religious societies that have grown up around her during the last three hundred years, would have been

* Faber's *Churchman's Politics*, p. 6.

able to perform the work that she did—assert the same rule over the human mind, wild and turbulent as it then was—and thus save the faith alive?

And look around you now—even in these times, which boast so much of their spiritual and intellectual light—and think what we should be without a Church. The external world is continually presenting its fascinations—acting on the imagination—and tempting us, in view of “things seen,” to dismiss all remembrance of “the things which are unseen.” Now, to counteract this, what more efficacious than a visible, unchanging Church, to be a witness for Christ—to speak to us continually by her solemn services—to preach to a gainsaying world the great truths of Redemption—and, with a ceaseless voice, to summon it to heed the whispers of conscience, and to think of Eternity. Thus the Church alike rebukes the ungodly, and inspires the fainting believer with new courage. She is a witness of the invisible world—setting forth, even in this life, that separation which is one day to take place between the just and the unjust. Who then can estimate the wonderful influence she exerts! From the present as well as from the past, we can gather an argument in behalf of that wisdom, which set forth “the Church of the Living God,” to be forever “the pillar and ground of the Truth.”

This, then, is the historical view of the Church. We have spoken only of that general witness which she bears for the truth, but we might strengthen the argument, by taking up, one by one, the doctrines which our faith sets forth, and showing how, through the influence of the Church, each one is preserved

alive in the memory of man. But the time would fail us, should we attempt to enter on this subject. We trust, however, that you have already seen how entirely this plan, which has been devised to defend the faith from injury, is in accordance with Infinite Wisdom. It only remains, then, that we should commend this Church to your affections. It is now the same Church which we have followed in her progress through eighteen centuries—the same which our Lord founded, when He trod the hills of Galilee, and taught in the villages of Judea—the same which His Apostles invited their countrymen to enter, when they first preached the news of redeeming love in the streets of Jerusalem. Checkered as her course has been with fearful vicissitudes, she has not only survived, but grown and expanded. The sunshine and the calm have often been withdrawn, and the Church been obliged to make her way through the cloud and the storm. She has gone through periods dark and turbulent, as well as those enlightened and tranquil. Every habit and form of social life has in turn been tried, and at one time she has had to contend against the corruptions of refinement, and at another, with the grossness of barbarism. Dangers have ever encircled her, and her enemies never ceased to threaten her existence. “The Kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against her.” In her early day, however the Roman Emperors might differ in temper and disposition, they always agreed in hostility to the Church. The wise Trajan, and the brutal Nero—the philosophic Antoninus, and the madman Domitian—were alike zealous in the cause of heathenism. In whatever hand the scourge

might be, it always fell upon the Christian. The noble—the pure—the young and the aged—were flung together into the same dishonored grave. One requisition after another was made upon the Church, to send forth her champions for martyrdom ; and the voice of the wailing was ever heard in her courts, as they mourned the loss of leaders in “the Sacramental host of God’s elect,” who had passed into Paradise from the agonies of the stake, or whose spirits had gone upward from the fire. False friends, too, have acted as traitors in the camp of the Lord. Heresies, which deformed the faith, and schisms, which sought to divide it—have caused one party after another to separate from the ancient Church ;* and never yet has the world been able, from the lives of her members, to form a just estimate of the excellence of her doctrines.

But yet, notwithstanding all, the Church survived, while, as she passed down the stream of time, she beheld one nation after another fall, and the most powerful empires suffer extinction. And look at her now. Is her vitality diminished, or her “natural force abated?” Is her strength impaired by the conflicts through which she has passed? Can you point to any evidence of the decrepitude of age? No—she is still in the vigor of her youth. She is unchanged—or rather, she presents herself now to the gathering storm, with a bolder front than ever in ages that are passed.

Are you then a member of this Church, which

* The martyr Cyprian writes—“We have not departed from them, but they from us ; and since schisms and heresies are born afterwards, they left the fountain-head and origin of truth, when they constituted different assemblages for themselves.” *De Unit.* 256.

comes to you sanctioned by such weighty claims? With every promise fulfilled to the letter—every precious hope realized to the full—and enriched with the prayers of generations that have gone—she appeals to your hearts. Thousands, as you have seen, have died, rather than forfeit an interest in her blessings. That branch to which it is our privilege to belong, is no novelty in the world, but looks back through a long line of confessors and martyrs of the Church Catholic, to Christ Himself as her head. She teaches all the grand and cardinal doctrines of our faith. She is wanting in no single point.

We invite you then—if you have not already done so—to take refuge within her walls, before God shall arise to shake terribly the earth. Come, and unite yourself with the bright array of those who have gone before, on whom is resting the Spirit of glory and of grace. They are bending down from their thrones on high—“a great cloud of witnesses”—to see whether you will still sustain that Holy Church, to advance which they considered life itself as not too precious to be sacrificed. They have bequeathed to you this cause, to bear it onward as once they did. You are standing in their places, and are the inheritors of their responsibilities. You are “baptized for the dead.” And now, the host of the elect is pressing onward. Some have already passed into Canaan, over the river of death, and some are still toiling on in the wilderness. Oh, may you, when the dispersed of God’s spiritual Israel are gathered into one, be found again united as members of “the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in Heaven.”

X.

THE TRUE, CATHOLIC CHURCHMAN.

All may save self ;—but minds that heavenward tower,
 Aim at a wider power,
 Gifts on the world to shower.
And this is not at once ;—by fastings gained,
 And trials well sustained,
By pureness, righteous deeds, and toils of love,
Abidance in the Truth, and zeal for God above.

Lyra Apostolica.

HAVING endeavored to bring before you the distinctive principles of the Church—those by which we are separated from the different denominations around us—the question naturally occurs, What is the practical bearing of those truths? We answer—they are to be acted out in the life, and embodied in the daily walk and conversation of those who profess to be members of our Holy Apostolic Church. I know not, therefore, that I can select a more appropriate subject with which to close these Lectures, than a delineation of THE TRUE, CATHOLIC CHURCHMAN.

The very name indeed which he bears—if he walk worthy of it—proclaims the principles by which he will be directed. He has received his title from no human teacher. He assumes the badge of no mere sect. He shares in that jealous vigilance which induced St. Paul so sternly to chide the Corinthians, because one party said “we are of Paul,” and another, “we are of Apollos,” and another, “we are of Cephas.” And this feeling the Primitive believers bequeathed to those who came after them in the

early Church. "We take not," says St. Chrysostom, "our denomination from men. We have no leaders, as the followers of Marcion, or Manichæus or Arius."* "The Church," says Epiphanius, "was never called so much as by the name of any Apostle. We never heard of Petrians, or Paulinus, or Bartholomæans, or Thaddæans: but only of Christians, from Christ."† "I honor Peter"—says another Father—"but I am not called a Petrian; I honor Paul, but I am not called a Paulin; I cannot bear to be named from any man, who am the creature of God."‡ And Bingham tells us that when Sempronian, the Novatian heretic, demanded of Pacian the reason why Christians called themselves Catholics, he answered, that it was to distinguish them from Heretics. "Christian"—he says—"is my name, and Catholic my sur-name; the one is my title, the other my character or mark of distinction."§ Such was the feeling of these early saints. Leaving to the sects which started up on every side, to name themselves after their leaders, they still kept to that general appellation, which was more expressive of unity and relationship to their Lord. The Churchman of this day therefore has inherited these views, and by the name CATHOLIC CHURCHMAN, he expresses both his allegiance to his Divine Master, and to that Apostolic Church He founded.||

* Hom. 33, in Acts.

† Bing. Orig. Eccles. lib. i. ch. 1, sect. 6. ‡ Greg. Naz. Ora. 31.

§ Orig. Eccles. lib. i. ch. 1, sect. 7.

|| "I wear the name of Christ, my God,
So name me not from man!
And my broad country Catholic,
Hath neither tribe nor clan:

One characteristic of the true Churchman is—that *he receives with humility all the doctrines of the Church, and avows his belief in them.* This must at once be evident. It would be an absurdity for a disciple to call himself by the name of a teacher to whose instructions he did not fully subscribe. As the Jew prided himself on being the follower of Moses, and showed his reverence for the ancient dispensation by observing all its requirements, even the most minute, so does the Churchman proclaim to the world the fact, that he is a disciple of Christ, and a member of His Holy Apostolic Church. He is ready to acknowledge his belief in all that his Master taught, either when, Himself on earth, He acted as the earliest herald of the Gospel; or when, after His ascension, He inspired holy men to enlarge the circle of revelation, and then committed to the Church which He had organized the lofty duty of being a Keeper and Witness of the Truth.

But we are told that there is no necessity for an appeal to the Church, to learn the fundamental doctrines of our faith—that “the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants”—and we need no other intervention to aid us in forming our Creed, or in settling our belief. Look then over the world, and see how this assertion is supported by actual experience. The first sound which strikes the ear is the din of controversy, as the most solemn truths which God has revealed are openly questioned and denied, or banded

Its rulers are an endless line,
Through all the world they went,
Commissioned from the Holy Hill
Of Christ's sublime ascent."

Rev. A. C. Coxe.

about among warring heretics from mouth to mouth, until the reverence even of the believer is insensibly impaired. The first sight which meets the eye, is that of the body of Christ rent asunder, and contending parties using as hostile watchwords those solemn verities, to which man should have listened only with awe and reverence. The present situation of the different Protestant sects around answers but too truly the description which Dante has given:—

“Christ’s host, which cost so dear to arm afresh,
Beneath its ensign moves with tardy step;
Thin are its ranks, each soldier coldly looks
Upon his fellow, doubtful of his faith.”*

Amidst then this changing, shifting sea of opinions, where is the truth? In what can I believe, as the certain teaching of my Lord? The Bible is of course before me, and I may study it for myself, but the same privilege is afforded others also, and yet I behold a hundred varying sects—all holding different Creeds—and all professing to derive them from that Volume. Which then is right? Where can I find a guide to direct me in the right path? I can truly say, like the Ethiopian Eunuch—“How can I understand, except some man should guide me?”

Now, these difficulties are natural, and must be felt by every reflecting mind.† The Church, therefore, has provided a remedy. She does not say to her children, “Each one of you may explain the

* Paradiso, xii.

† “We learn to prize that which is not of this earth; we long for revelation, which nowhere burns more majestically or more beautifully than in the New Testament. I feel impelled to open the original text—to translate for once, with upright feeling, the sacred original into my darling German. It is written: ‘In the beginning was the Word.’ *Here I am already at a stand; who will help me on?*”
Goethe’s Faust, p. 44.

Scripture according to your own fancy"—but she furnishes them with an interpretation. Going back to Primitive times—to the days of Apostles and Martyrs—she unrolls their writings, and inquires how these men, who stood nearest to the fountain of light—who lived when the tradition of all our Lord's words and deeds had not yet faded from the earth—how they understood His precepts? She takes the ground—and surely it is a reasonable one—that doctrines which have been the admitted faith of the Church from the first age down through eighteen hundred years, are probably correct, and therefore she teaches them to her children in her creeds and formularies.

Here then is her rule of faith—SCRIPTURE AS IT ALWAYS HAS BEEN INTERPRETED BY THE CHURCH. The Church of Rome contends that there are two rules of faith, of equal authority; that there is an unwritten tradition, alike definite and alike to be respected with the written word of God. Thus it was asserted in a decree of the Council of Trent—"All saving truth is not contained in the Holy Scripture, but partly in the Scripture and partly in unwritten tradition, which whosoever doth not receive *with like piety and reverence as he doth the Scriptures*, let him be accursed."* The clearly stated doctrine of our own Church, on the contrary, is, that tradition is to be used only to interpret Scripture. "The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, *and authority in controversies of faith*; and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written: neither may it so expound one

* Sess. iv. Decret. de Can. Script.

place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although *the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ*, yet as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so, besides the same, ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.”*

Again—the Church of Rome fetters the judgment, by requiring a blind, unconditional submission to those who, from time to time, occupy the place of ecclesiastical rulers. They constitute the Church, and are to be implicitly obeyed. Thus, an appeal to Catholic antiquity, to verify her doctrines, is practically forbidden, since each one must believe what the Church does now hold.† The different denominations around us, going to the other extreme, give unbounded license to the fancy, by an unrestricted exercise of private interpretation. Our own Church, avoiding either error, “inculcates a liberal, discriminative, yet undeviating reverence for pious antiquity: a reverence, alike sanctioned by reason, inspired by feeling, and recommended by authority.”‡ She adopts the rule laid down by Vincentius of Lerins, who wrote in the year 434. A brief view of his system may, therefore, be useful in illustrating the principles of the Church on this point.

He sets out with inquiring how he must decide between truth and error? His language is—“I have

* Art. xx.

† Thus, Dr. Hawarden, in speaking of the Arians, uses this language—“If they be allowed the plea of all reformers, I mean, of appealing from, and against the present Catholic Church, to the times past, the controversy can never be ended, until the dead speak.”

The True Church of Christ, vol. ii. pref. p. 9.

‡ Appendix to Bishop Jebb's Sermons, p. 366.

made frequent and earnest inquiries of a great number of holy and learned men, *how* I might discriminate, that is, what certain and universal rule there was for discriminating between Catholic truth and heretical pravity; and I have ever received something like the following answer, that whether I myself or any other private person, wished to detect the corruptions, and avoid the snares of heretics who were springing up, and to remain sound and whole in the sound faith, there were two ways, by God's blessing, of preserving himself—first, by the authority of Scripture; next by the teaching of the Church Catholic."

But, he continues—"Here some one, perhaps, will demand, since the Canon of Scripture is complete, and in itself more than sufficient for all things, why need I subjoin to it the authority of ecclesiastical opinion?" To this objection, his answer is—"That the very depth of Holy Scripture prevents its being taken by all men in one and the same sense, one man interpreting it in one way, one in another; so that it seems almost possible to draw from it as many opinions as there are readers. Novatian, Photinus, Sabellius, Donatus, Arius, Eunomius, and Macedonius, Apollinaris, and Priscillian, Jovianus, Pelagius, and Celestius, lastly Nestorius, each of those heretics has his own distinct interpretation of it. This is why it is so necessary, viz., in order to avoid the serious labyrinths of such various errors, to direct the line of interpretation, both as to Prophets and Apostles, according to the sense of the Church and Catholic world."

Having thus most conclusively proved the necessity

for some rule of interpretation, he proceeds to state that one which can always give us a sure direction—" We must be peculiarly careful to hold that which hath been believed, IN ALL PLACES, AT ALL TIMES, BY ALL THE FAITHFUL : QUOD UBIQUE, QUOD SEMPER, QUOD AB OMNIBUS CREDITUM EST. This is true and genuine Catholicism, as the very word means, comprehending all truths, every where, and truly ; and this will be ours, if we follow in our inquiries *Universality*, *Antiquity*, and *Consent*. We shall follow *Universality*, if we confess that to be the one true faith, which is held by the Church all over the world ; *Antiquity*, if we in no respect secede from the tenets which were in use among our Holy Elders and Fathers ; and *Consent*, if, in consulting antiquity itself, we attach ourselves to such decisions and opinions as were held by all, or at least by almost all, the ancient Bishops and Doctors."

" What, then, will the Catholic Christian do, in a case where any branch of the Church has cut itself off from the communion of the universal faith? What can he do but prefer the general body, which is sound, to the diseased and infected member of it? What if some novel contagion attain with its plague-spots, not only a portion, but even the whole Church? Then he will be careful to keep close to antiquity, which is secure from the possibility of being corrupted by new errors. What if, even in antiquity itself, there be two or three men, nay one community, or even province, discovered in error? Then he will be careful to prefer to the rashness or ignorance of the few, (if so be,) the ancient decrees, (*i. e.* in Council,) or the Universal Church. What if a case arises

when no such acts of the Church are found? Then he will do his best to compare and search out the opinions of the ancients; that is, of those who, in various times and places, remaining in the faith and communion of the one Catholic Church, are the most trustworthy authorities; and whatever, not one or two, but all alike, with one consent, held, wrote, and taught, and that openly and perseveringly, that he will understand is to be believed without any hesitation." Having thus laid down his rules, Vincentius adds—"By these principles, faithfully, soberly, and diligently observed, we shall, with no great difficulty, detect every noxious error, of all heretics, who may rise against the Church."*

Such was the rule in the fifth century, and it is one by which the Church is even now guided. "I greatly mistake"—says the Rev. G. S. Faber—"if, in any one instance, the wise Reformers of the Church of England can be shown to have exercised an insulated private judgment. In fact, they possessed far too much theological learning, and far too much sound intellect, to fall into this palpable error. Omitting, then, the mere dogmatism of the Latin Church on the one hand, and the wanton exercise of illegitimate private judgment on the other hand, the practice of those venerable and profound theologians who presided over the reformation of the Anglican Church, will teach us, that the most rational mode of determining differences is a recurrence to first principles, or an appeal to that Primitive Church which was nearest to the times of the Apostles."†

In the "Necessary Doctrine," &c., which in 1543

Commonit. adv. Hæreticos. † Difficulties of Romanism, p. 33.

was adopted by the whole Church of England, we are told—"All those things which were taught by the Apostles, and have been by a whole universal consent of the Church of Christ ever sith that time taught continually, and taken always for true, ought to be received, accepted, and kept, as a perfect doctrine apostolic."* With regard to the Articles of the Creed, Christians are commanded "to interpret all the same things, according to the self-same sentence and interpretation which the words of Scripture do signify, and the holy approved doctors of the Church do agreeably entreat and defend." They are directed also to reject all doctrines, "which were of long time past condemned in the four holy councils."†

This was the view of Cranmer. In his Epistle to Queen Mary on the subject of the Eucharist, he says—"Herein I said I would be judged by the old Church, and which doctrine could be proved the elder, that I would stand unto."‡ Bishop Ridley, too, acknowledges the weight of Catholic tradition as a guide in interpretation.§ Bishop Jewell writes—"We are come as neere as we possibly could, to the Church of the Apostles, and of the old Catholike bishops and fathers; and have directed, according to their customs and ordinances, not only our doctrine but also the sacraments, and the forme of common praire."|| And so the rule remains now explicitly stated in our articles. In the XX. Article it is said—"The Church hath authority in controversies of

Formularies of Faith, p. 221. † Formularies of Faith, p. 227.

‡ Cranmer's Works, vol. ii. p. 113.

§ Jebb's Sermons, Appendix, p. 395. || Apology, p. 156.

faith ;” and afterwards in the XXXIV. it is added—
 “ Whosoever, through *his private judgment*, willingly and purposely doth openly break *the traditions* and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly.”*

It is by this safe test, then, that the Church decides

* That this is the rule of the Church of England, and consequently of our own branch of the Church, cannot be doubted by any one who will read the records of the past, and the opinions of all of the most eminent English divines. See, for example, the *Appendix to Bp. Jebb's Sermons*, with the testimonies there collected ; and *the Rev. E. Churton's Sermon*, “ The Church of England, a witness and keeper of the Catholic Tradition.” Did our limits allow, copious extracts in support of the rule of Vincentius might be given from the following Divines and Authors : Jewell, Bilson, Hooker, Overall, Morton, Field, White, Hall, Laud, Montague, Jackson, Mede, Usher, Bramhall, Sanderson, Cosin, Hammond, Thorndike, Taylor, Heylin, Commissioners (to review the Prayer Book,) A. D. 1662, Pearson, Barrow, Bull, Stillingfleet, Ken, Beveridge, Patrick, Sharpe, Potter, Grabe, Brett, Hicks, Collier, Leslie, Waterland, Bingham, Jebb, and Van Mildert.

A writer, indeed, who takes the ground that the Bible alone is his rule of faith, will find it impossible at the outset to prove the authority of that Book, and is, therefore, at the mercy of any infidel who attacks him. Bishop Milner thus states this argument — “ By what means have you learned what is the *Canon* of Scripture, that is to say, what are the books which have been written by divine inspiration ; or, indeed, how have you ascertained that *any* books at all have been so written ? You cannot discover either of these things by your rule, because the Scripture, as your great authority Hooker shows (*Eccles. Pol.* b. iii. sec. 8,) and Chillingworth allows, cannot bear testimony to itself. . . . You have no sufficient authority for asserting that the sacred volumes are the genuine compositions of the holy personages whose names they bear, except the tradition and living voice of the Catholic Church ; since numerous apocryphal prophecies and spurious gospels and epistles, under the same or equally venerable names, were circulated in the Church during its early ages. . . . Indeed, it is so clear that the Canon of Scripture is built on the tradition of the Church, that most learned Protestants, with Luther himself, have been forced to acknowledge it.” *End of Controversy*, Letter ix.

at once upon those countless controversies, which are rending in bitterness all who surround us. For example, let us apply this rule. We hear some denying the Divinity of our Lord—degrading him down to a merely inspired prophet—and when we endeavor to establish the truth of his Godhead by an appeal to Scripture, they reply by rejecting our interpretation of its words.* What, then, is our safest course? Why, we turn to the testimony of the Church. We find that through all ages the great body of the faithful have rendered those passages as we now do, and bowed in reverence to our Lord, as a Person of the Triune God. We will, therefore, be the inheritors of their faith, and with them acknowledge—“This was the Son of God.”†

* Socinus boasted that he acknowledged no master; Sed Deum tantummodo præceptorem habui, sacrasque literas. He accordingly denied the authority of the Fathers, Councils and Primitive Church. (*Palmer's Treatise on Church*, v. ii. p. 59.) It is said in the life of Biddle, the founder of the English Socinians, that “he gave the Holy Scripture a diligent reading; and made use of no other rule to determine controversies about religion, than the *Scriptures*, and of no other authentic *interpreter*, if a scruple arose concerning the sense of Scripture, than *reason*.” (*Ibid.* p. 64.) It would be easy to show, that those who abandon the authority of the fathers, generally end by forsaking the truth. The infidel Rationalists of Germany who have thus disowned all ancient authority, boast that they alter their belief “as often as any new views require it.” *Rose's State of Protest. in Germany*, p. 24.

† “Doctrines received through the medium of only two or three links from the Apostles themselves, and with one consent declared by all the various Churches then in existence to have been thus received, cannot be false. Thus, for an instance, Irenæus, himself the pupil of Polycarp the disciple of St. John, bears witness to the *fact*, that in his time, *all the Churches in the world held the doctrine of our Lord's divinity*; each professing to have received it, through the medium of one or two or three links, from the Apostles; and his testimony is corroborated by Hegesippus, who, about the middle of the second

Again—we hear others denying the necessity of infant baptism, and thus, in the words of our Lord, “forbidding little children to come to Him.” We appeal once more to the voice of the Church. We read the history of the past. We discover that even from the Apostles’ days, she has commanded her members thus to dedicate their children to Him who had redeemed them, and we are therefore contented to walk in the footsteps of those who have gone before us. When, too, the Romanist comes to us with his exclusive claims, we make the same appeal to antiquity. We show that our doctrines are older than his, and adopt for our motto that declaration of Bishop Ridley—“I prefer the antiquity of the Primitive Church to the novelties of the Church of Rome.”*

Thus it is that we decide on all disputes. Instead of trusting to the feebleness of individual reason, we obey the command which our Lord gave when He said—“Hear the Church.” We thus free ourselves from doubt. We lean upon the recorded wisdom and opinions of eighteen centuries, and feel, that if we are wrong on these points, then must the whole Church have been so through all her generations. Is not this, to say the least, the safest way to understand

century, travelled from Asia to Rome, and found the same system of doctrine uniformly established in every Church. Facts of this description form the basis of the reasoning adopted by Irenæus and Tertullian; and the conclusion which they deduce from it is, *the moral impossibility of the Catholic system of theology being erroneous.*” *Faber’s Difficulties of Romanism*, p. 27.

* See an admirable sermon, entitled, “The Novelties of Romanism, or Popery refuted by Tradition,” by W. F. Hook, D.D., of Leeds, published in England in 1840, and lately reprinted in this country by D. Dana, 20 John-street, New-York.

the Word of God? Let us not, then, bring into the Church an arrogant, questioning, carping spirit, but rather that humility which Bishop Wilson shows in one of his prayers—"Grant, O Lord, that in reading Thy Holy Word, I may never prefer my private sentiments before those of the Church in the purely ancient times of Christianity."*

Again—the true Churchman is devoted in his attendance on the services of the Church. To this, indeed, he will be prompted by a regard for his own spiritual advancement. The Church knows the difficulty of leading your thoughts heavenward in this worldly age, and therefore calls you often to join in her solemn rites. Yet not too often is this summons given. Oh, we may rather say, would that it were more frequent, and men could be induced, as in the olden time, to sanctify every day by devotion; nor feel that they should go forth to their worldly business, until they had first visited the house of God, there to gather spiritual strength for the coming hours.† But the times have become intensely worldly, and men now care for nothing but heaping up wealth, or gaining honors, or pursuing pleasures,

* Sacra Privata, p. 93.

† "In foreign climes, mechanics leave their tasks

To breathe a passing prayer in the Cathedrals;

There they have week-day shrines, and no one asks,

When he would kneel to them, and count his bead-rolls,

Why are they shut?

Seeing them enter, sad and disconcerted,

To quit those cheering fanes with looks of gladness—

How often have my thoughts to ours reverted!

How oft have I exclaimed, in tones of sadness,

Why are they shut?"

Stanzas written OUTSIDE a country Church,

By HORACE SMITH.

with as desperate an energy as if they were to live here forever. The Church, therefore, is scarcely able to enforce her rules of regular, systematic devotion in public services, and is often obliged to trust, that in private her members will use her daily lessons and solemn prayers, and thus there shall be unity of spirit among them all.

But whenever her courts are open, her true children will feel, that nothing shall prevent their attendance there. All are engaged in a fearful struggle against the world, the flesh, and the devil, and *they* realize it, although those about them do not. Happy are they, therefore, to break away even for a single hour from the engrossing cares of business, here to refresh their spirits, where God dwelleth. They would thus strengthen their immortal hopes, that the bright yet transitory things around them may have no influence over their hearts. They would have solemn voices from the land of spirits sounding in their ears, that thus they may be indifferent to the siren-song of enchantment by which this earth seeks to mislead them.

With him who has truly imbibed the spirit of the Church, the want of time is never urged as an excuse. He knows that a willing mind can make time, and that if he will attempt it, he can now and then snatch a single hour from this world to give to the next. He will not let the things which "perish with the using" hold him constantly captive, but remembering that with him there must come a time to die, he is earnest to prepare himself for that solemn hour. Feeling that the next life is but a continuation of this, only on a higher stage of action, and with every feel-

ing more fully developed, he realizes, that if he cannot rejoice in the worship of God's earthly sanctuary, he is not prepared to join in the services of the Heavenly Temple—that temple above, not made with hands.

But we may carry this farther. He will not only be regular in his attendance on the services of the Church, but will seek nothing beyond her ministrations. This is a duty which he owes to the Church herself. It is not a matter of mere feeling, but should become one of principle. If the Church furnish sufficient instruction, all that is necessary for his spiritual welfare—and none surely can say that she does not—then he should confine himself to her services, and not be unsettling his mind and dissipating his thoughts by wandering elsewhere. And if he believe the truth she inculcates, and which we have been endeavoring in previous lectures to set before you—the necessity of the Apostolic succession in the ministry—then the appeal is made to him on still higher grounds, and the Church has a claim to be his authorized instructor, which none other can advance.*

* Mr. Wilberforce is often quoted for *liberality* in his Church views. The following extracts, however, from his Diary, will show that on principle he abstained from attending Dissenting meetings. We quote from *Life of Wilberforce by his Sons*. 5 vols. Lond. 1839.

“In the year [1786] Mr. Wilberforce dissuaded a relation, who complained that in her place of residence she could find no religious instruction in the Church, from attending at the meeting-house. ‘*Its individual benefits*’—he writes in answer to her letter of inquiry—‘*are no compensation for the general evils of Dissent. The increase of Dissenters, which always follows from the institution of unsteepled places of worship, is highly injurious to the interests of religion in the long run.*’” Vol. i. p. 248.

“Mr. Hughes of Battersea dined with us—dissenting minister.

“But”—you may say in reply—“I am so well settled in my principles that I cannot be injured by any teaching I may hear, even though it should conflict with the instructions of the Church.” This may indeed be the case, although the influence which error exerts over the mind, is often so insensible in its progress as to be almost unmarked until it gains the supremacy. Yet may not your example produce an effect upon others, who are not so well established? Suppose that the Churchman thinks there is but little harm in yielding to his curiosity to hear a new voice, and visit some other place of worship; may he not be giving a lesson of irregularity to numbers around him, who believe, that if *he* will do so, *they* may also? If he, who is supposed to understand the principles and regulations of his Church, may indulge his taste for novelty, and wander about from place to place, his weaker brethren will conclude that they may with safety follow in his footsteps. Thus, he has the responsibility of countenancing what he knows to be error, and of spreading abroad an influence which may keep others from the means of grace, or from listening, as they should, to the calls of the Gospel. His irregularity furnishes

He is a sensible, well informed, pious man; strongly dissenting in principle, but moderate in manner. *He confessed, not one in twenty of Doddridge's pupils but who turned either Socinian, or tending that way; (he himself strictly orthodox;) and he said that all the old Presbyterian places of worship were become Socinian congregations.*” Vol. iii. p. 24.

“L. off to Birmingham to hear [Robert] Hall preach to-morrow. I should have liked it, *but thought it wrong.* In attending public worship we are not to be edified by talent, but by the Holy Spirit, and therefore we ought to look beyond the human agent.” Vol. v. p. 140.

them with a ready argument for their remissness ; and thus, when he sometimes wonders at seeing the seats around him untenanted, were the truth fully known, it would be found he had himself aided in producing that result. Those who wish not well to the Church can quote him in support of their views, and thus his moral influence is enlisted against her cause. Instead of quietly and silently aiding in training up those around him to a constant and devout attendance on her services, he is showing them that it is immaterial where they go. He certainly cannot be said to be "steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord."

Again, another characteristic of the true Churchman is—*that he regards the Church, with her institutions, as the grand instrument for reforming the world.* Look abroad over society, and see its present state of feeling with respect to benevolent enterprises. It is distinguished for outward activity and bustle. The followers of our Master seem to be ever engaged in furbishing up their armor, and in preparing to take part in that great contest which is waging against sin. But we think it will be evident even to a casual observer, that the lofty expectations formed are not realized—that the result is sadly disproportioned to the noise made in the conflict. And the reason of the failure is equally evident. It is because the strength of the Christian world is so much wasted in visionary schemes, in which a little more wisdom would have taught it never to engage. There is a degree of ill-directed earnestness abroad, which, while it produces no valuable fruits, at the same time prevents those exertions which might truly aid the great

cause of man's redemption. It is "a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge," and which therefore is often running in the wrong channel.

And even when the object is a good one, the manner in which the attempt is made, is often such as to defeat the desired end. The hurry and bustle which mark every department of life, have been transferred also to the efforts of benevolence. If an evil is to be rectified, instead of having it done by the gradual progress of truth, the community must at once be wrought up into a fever. The entire work must be immediately accomplished. Ingenuity is exhausted in devising new and human means of triumphing over sin. A mighty machinery is set in motion. Men, becoming wiser than Scripture, and improving on the example of their Lord, forget "in patience to possess their souls," and cannot wait for great principles to be inculcated, which are afterwards slowly yet surely to develop their influence.

But mark the result. Behold it on every side of us. Thus earnestly laboring without any guide but their own zeal, men begin to take distorted views of truth. They attempt to act upon the prejudices of those around them by questionable motives and arguments; for in their eagerness to attain the end, they forget to be scrupulous about the means. In this way, no matter how wild a scheme may be, or how evil and unhallowed are the passions which urge it on, they resort to the Word of God, that its sanction may seem to be given to their excess. Thus, Scripture is constantly perverted by ignorance and fanaticism; and the holiest subject—themes of which an Apostle could not speak without the

deepest reverence—are flung before the multitude, to be jeered and scoffed at—to be fiercely debated by unhallowed lips—until every association of sanctity is lost, and the sublime mysteries of our faith are blasphemed with a recklessness which might make an angel weep.*

The limits of human responsibility also seem lately to have disappeared. Few are contented to labor in the particular spheres in which Providence has placed them, but the general rule of conduct is that every one must do every thing. Even woman, whose brightest ornament is that of “a meek and quiet spirit,” must step forth from the domestic circle which God has made the sphere of her usefulness, to seek for other and unauthorized fields of labor. Deserting the bedside of the sick, and the lowly habitation of the poor, where, when she came in her gentleness and meekness, she was welcomed as a ministering angel, and sacrificing that shrinking delicacy which is her most beautiful attribute, she must lift up her voice as the public teacher, or else gird on the armor of the Reformer, and be seen in the arena of strife.

The natural consequence of all this is, that a spirit of bitterness is engendered. The world is not going to be driven, and some who under different measures might have been the advocates of these objects, are forced, in stemming the current, to oppose them. Thus, in reality the great cause of human well-being suffers by the ill-directed zeal and ultraism of its friends.

* For instance—the discussions on the subject of the Holy Communion, growing out of the agitation of the Wine Question by the Temperance Society.

Now what is the remedy for these manifold evils? I answer, without hesitation, it is to return to the principles inculcated by our Lord. The same forms of sin which now prevail, were in the world when He was here, and yet He only founded His Church as the corrective for all. Here is the authorized channel, through which He appointed blessings to be conveyed to fallen and apostate man. He endowed her with power for every situation in which she should be placed. He commissioned her to be a perpetual witness for him in the earth—ceaselessly by her voice to reprove sin, and sustain the cause of godliness. She takes no partial view, but looks over the whole field of human misery, and in a spirit of love to the sufferer, yet with the voice of authority, rebukes the demon, of whatever kind it may be, and bids the victim go free.

Do you wish, then, so to labor that you may discharge your duty to your God, to the world, and to the interests of suffering humanity? The Church opens to you unnumbered paths by which you may attain this object; while at the same time she so guides you, that your zeal cannot but be directed aright. For instance, are your sympathies excited for the distant heathen—for the thousands in your own land who are perishing for lack of knowledge—or even for the temporal suffering which is around? She instructs you in what way to relieve this wretchedness, or else herself acts as the almoner of your bounty. While, then, we are bound to strive for the diffusion of truth and purity, let us learn to “strive lawfully.” Let us look with some little reverence to the experience of eighteen centuries which have pre-

ceded us, and not imagine that light has now, in our day, for the first time burst upon the earth.

Once more, then, I would say to you, in the language of our Lord Himself—"hear the Church." Be as earnest and as active as you can in the cause of human benevolence—do all in your power to relieve a sinful and apostate world—but let the Church guide you as to the manner in which your efforts are to be directed. Live as she bids you—pray in the spirit with which she would have you—urge on the holy principles of the Gospel in the old way which she points out—and you need not fear being wrong. An excited world may revile you, but the rule is—"judge nothing before the time." When the day of requital comes, it will be seen, that he acted not only with the truest wisdom, but also with the best effect, who was willing to be an humble follower of that Church to which his Master committed the work of human reform—for which He shed His blood—and which an Apostle has called, "the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."

One other characteristic of the true Churchman which we would briefly mention is, *that he walks worthy of his high calling.* We may not only most accurately understand, but also fully believe all that our Lord has taught, and be numbered among the members of His Church; yet if His religion has not performed its appropriate work upon our hearts, we shall be "as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal." To receive these sublime truths into the intellect will be nothing, unless they act also as a light to our feet to lead us on in the way of holiness. To be enrolled

in the Church on earth will be worse than useless, if we do not imbibe the spirit which she inculcates, and thus suffer her to discipline us for Heaven. Our Master designs, that by her constant services and her solemn lessons, she should recall us from this fleeting world, and make us remember what we are and what we may be. Here is the standing, perpetual testimony of our God, to train us up to be the children of immortality. Her ordinances must be to us effectual signs of grace, not mere forms and shadows. We must be temples of the Holy Ghost, having in our faithful hearts the shrine which the Spirit of Grace may inhabit. The true Churchman, who worthily bears that holy name, will be ever looking upward to the Cross as his source of safety and strength, and onward to eternity as his home and abiding-place. His religion must be "one of visible holiness and self-denial, that willingly takes on itself the sorrows which to the multitude are inevitable, and enlightens their suffering by its own pain and privation." It must be a faith, whose aims are lofty—whose efforts are untiring—and whose spirit is evidently that which our Lord would inculcate, when he declared—"Whosoever will lose his life for my sake, shall find it." It is such that the Church needs for her followers. She asks not for those who are merely fascinated by her outward beauty, but recognize not her sterner features, and shrink from self-denial in her cause. She wishes not those, who delight to be with her in the hour of glory on the Mount of Transfiguration, declaring, "It is good for us to be here," but leave her side as soon as she descends to the conflicts of this lower world, or points

to the Cross. Far different is the standard of devotedness to which the true Churchman, through God's Holy Spirit, must be trained. He must image forth in his life, the beauty of the faith in which he trusts. By partaking of that solemn ordinance, which is provided "for his spiritual food and sustenance"—by holy employments—by daily benevolence—by frequent prayer—he is to reveal the sacredness of his profession, and let the world see that he is indeed a member of the Holy Catholic Church.

I have thus concluded a consideration of the topics, which I wished to bring before you in this course of Lectures. For ten successive Sunday evenings I have addressed you, on the distinctive features of the Church; and imperfectly and briefly as the subject has been brought forward, I still trust it will not be without its fruits, in causing you to understand why you are Churchmen. At all events, if only the spirit of inquiry is excited, it is all we ask. We court investigation, well knowing that the principles on which the Church is based, can stand the test, and commend themselves to the reason.

And now, before I close, let me ask you for a moment to look once more over the world around us. See how trouble is abroad—how earnest and restless the mind of man has become, as with perfect recklessness he rushes on from one experiment to another. The wisest are at fault, and confess themselves unable to interpret the signs of the times, or to prophesy whereunto all this will grow. Even the religious feeling of man is ever seeking some strange form in which to develope itself, and each year gives birth to

new sects, and untried ways of advancing the truth.*

The scene around us is shifting with the rapidity of a drama. And we know from the history of the past, that so it must be, and these new creations which are thus constantly starting into existence,

* Bishop De Lancey, in a note to his sermon preached in Boston, Jan. 1843, at the consecration of the Bishop of Massachusetts, makes the following statement :

“As far as can be ascertained, there are now prevalent, among the leading denominations in the United States, as independent organizations—

BAPTISTS.

Calvinistic Baptists,
Free-Will Baptists,
Free-communion Baptists,
Seventh-day Baptists,
Six-principle Baptists,
Emancipation Baptists,
Campbellite Baptists.

METHODISTS.

Methodist-Episcopal,
Protestant Methodists,
Primitive Methodists,
Wesleyan Methodists,
Associate Methodists.

PRESBYTERIANS.

Old-School Presbyterians,
New-School Presbyterians,
Cumberland Presbyterians,
Associate Presbyterians,
Dutch-Reformed Presbyterians,
Reformed Presbyterians.

CONGREGATIONALISTS.

Orthodox Congregationalists,
Unitarian Congregationalists,
Transcendental Congregationalists,
Universalist Congregationalists.

“No Christian man can contemplate the above statement, without feelings of sorrow. No Churchman can view it without feelings of humble thankfulness, that the Providence of God has thus far preserved the unity of the Church, and overruled the occasional excitements and diversities of opinion in it, to the prevention of any disruption, or rending of the body of Christ. Among the thousand evils, which result from the endless subdivisions of Christian men into independent organizations, is a miserable waste of ministerial efficiency, and augmented expensiveness in sustaining religion. In most of our villages, one half the Church edifices and one half the clergy would supply ample accommodation and better instruction to the people, at less expense to them and with increased usefulness to the clergy. Is there any effectual cure for this waste of means, energy and talent, but a return to the ‘one body of Christ?’ Surely, Christian men should ponder this subject.”

must live out their brief day, and then pass into nothingness. They contain within themselves no elements of perpetuity. Out of nearly one hundred sects which were flourishing in the days of Charles I., and whose names are recorded on the page of history, but two or three are now in existence, and these so altered, that they could not at present be recognized by their own founders. And thus it is, in this ever-changing world, that the Ecclesiastical writer of the next century will make the record of our day.

Is there then nothing fixed and stable? Is there no City of Refuge for those who are wearied with this strife of tongues? Is there no Holy Ark to which the Christian may flee and be at peace, when over the broad earth he finds no resting-place for the sole of his feet? Yes—it is in the ancient Apostolic Church, to which we have pointed you. Unaltered in her doctrine and ministry for eighteen centuries, she passes calmly and quietly on her way, unaffected by the worldly changes around her. Other religious bodies endeavor to adapt themselves to the spirit of the times, and thus are drawn into the current; but the Church does not. She has her own old paths, and goes forward unfalteringly, whatever the world may do. Around her are the whirlwind and the storm, and the multitude, as they are swept along by every wind of doctrine, at times look up to her venerable towers and deride as antiquated her time-honored services. But within her fold—cut off from all this excitement—her children are quietly training up against the day of account, until one by one they pass from her courts to the Paradise of God, “meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in

light." And thus, age after age, she alone remains unaltered, while all else is changing. The Romanist falls off on one side,* and the Dissenter on the other, but she simply bears her DOUBLE WITNESS against them, and goes on as of old.

Learn then to prize your privileges as members of this Church, and live up to your high responsibilities. The conflict which she calls her children to wage is no trifling warfare, but "an earnest, endless strife." It is in self-denial, and toil, and often in suffering, that she bids them accomplish their work, and thus form and mature those elements of Christian character, which in the coming world can alone fit them for immortality. Despise not, then, her instructions, for they are the words of holy wisdom which her

* Palmer gives the following brief account of the beginning of the Roman schism in England. "The accession of the illustrious Queen Elizabeth was followed by the restoration of the Church to its former state. The clergy generally approved of the return to pure religion, and retained their benefices, administering the sacraments and rites according to the English Ritual. In 1562 the Synod or Convocation of England published a formulary of doctrine, divided into 39 articles, in which the doctrines of the Catholic faith were briefly stated, and various errors and superstitions of the Romanists and others were rejected. This formulary was again approved by the Convocation in 1571, and ordered to be subscribed by all the clergy. *There was no schism for many years in England: all the people worshipped in the same Churches, and acknowledged the same pastors.* . . . At last, in 1569, Pius V. issued a bull, in which he excommunicated Queen Elizabeth and her supporters, absolved her subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and bestowed her dominions on the King of Spain. *This bull caused the schism in England;* for the popish party, which had continued in communion with the Church of England up to that time, during the eleven past years of Elizabeth's reign, now began to separate themselves. Bedingfield, Cornwallis, and Silyarde, were the first popish recusants; and the date of the Romanists in England, as a distinct sect or community, may be fixed in the year 1570." *Church History*, p. 163.

Master hath taught. Shrink not from avowing your allegiance, alike in good report and evil report; for you must suffer with the Church here, if you will reign with her in the hour of her triumph. You may be misunderstood and misrepresented. A captious world may ridicule your adherence to the old customs of generations which have long since gone, and when arguments are wanting, bestow upon you an opprobrious name. But what of this? Remember the stirring words of the Martyr Ignatius—"Stand like a beaten anvil. Let not those who seem to be worthy of confidence, and teach other doctrine, put thee to confusion. It is a part of a great Champion to be stricken and conquer."^{*} How noble this destiny! "To be stricken and conquer." To pass through life as if it were a battle-field—ever contending earnestly for the truth—and then, when death comes, to be able to look back, and feel that the great end is attained, that the principles for which you waged the warfare are beginning to triumph! And soon with all of us this conflict will be over. Soon, this fleeting life will melt away into eternity, and the contest and the agonism passed, nothing will remain but the victor's reward. Then, the spiritual and the heroic, which here were formed in the breast by suffering and toil, shall be developed in their own heavenly shape, and brighter than the poet's dream shall be the living glory in which they are arrayed. Wait, therefore, until the end. Follow in the footsteps of your Master and His Apostles, leaving consequences to Him. In the words of one of the

* *Epis. ad Polycarp, § 3.*

living poets of our Mother Church in England, I
would say to each one of you,

“Thy part is simple. Fearless still proclaim
The truth to men who loathe her very name
And if thy night be dark—if tempests roll,
Dread as the visions of thy boding soul—
Still, in thy dimness, watch, and fast, and pray ;
And wait the Bridegroom’s call—the burst of opening day.”
Lyra Apostolica.



Lately Published.

THE
CHURCH OF THE APOSTLES.

BY THE

RT. REV. WM. INGRAHAM KIP, D. D., LL. D.
BISHOP OF CALIFORNIA.

This work was written at the request of many Churchmen, as a continuation of the "DOUBLE WITNESS," on a higher plane. It is a picture of the Primitive Church in its purity, tracing it until infected by mediæval errors.

12mo, 174 pages, \$1.25.

THE REV. F. W. ROBERTSON'S SERMONS.

NEW EDITION. WITH PORTRAIT ON STEEL.

Complete in one volume, large 12mo, 838 pages. Cloth, \$2.00.

“When Mr. Robertson died his name was scarcely known beyond the circle of his own private friends, and of those among whom he had labored in his calling. Now every word he wrote is eagerly sought for and affectionately treasured up, and meets with the most reverent and admiring welcome from men of all parties and all shades of opinion. . . . To those that find in his writings what they themselves want, he is a teacher quite beyond comparison — his words having a meaning, his thoughts a truth and depth, which they cannot find elsewhere. And they never look to him in vain. . . . He fixes himself upon the recollection as a most original and profound thinker, and as a man in whom excellence puts on a new form. . . . There are many persons, and the number increases every year, to whom Robertson’s writings are the most stable, satisfactory, and exhaustless form of religious teaching which the nineteenth century has given — the most wise, suggestive, and practical.” — *Saturday Review*.

“Here is a book which has gone through as great a number of editions as the most popular novel. . . . A fine, tender, and lofty mind, full of thoughtfulness, full of devotion, has herein left his legacy to his country. . . . Save for the charm of a singularly pure and lucid style, their almost sole attraction consists in their power of instruction, in their faculty of opening up the mysteries of life and truth.” — *Blackwood’s Magazine*.

“The Sermons are altogether out of the common style. They are strong, free, and beautiful utterances of a gifted and cultivated mind.” — *Eclectic Review*.

“We welcome a new and popular edition of the Sermons of Mr. Robertson. He was a preacher of rare powers, both mental and spiritual. His Sermons have produced a powerful impression on both sides the ocean. For earnestness of purpose, fervency of spirit, originality of thought, depth of experimental piety, and eloquence of language, we know not where to look for superior ones. The character of the man, the holy enthusiasm of his nature, his profound travail of soul with doubt, and temptation, and sorrow, his supreme devotion to his high calling, and his exquisite mental and moral organization, impart an indescribable charm and a rare power of impression to his sermons. We are not surprised that thoughtful minds find a fascination in them which they cannot resist.” — *Am. Presbyterian Review*.

* Sent by mail, postage paid, on receipt of price.

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY, Publishers, New York.







Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01032 5936