The Church.

VOLUME V.] TORONTO, CANADA, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1841. [NUMBER 21.

Original Poetry.

THE SLAYING OF THE FIRST-BORN OF EGYPT.

Midnight on the moonless earth,
On the black sky's starless dome,—
Silence on the Bondman's hearth,
On the Pharaoh's regal home!
Wrapp'd in dreams of bigot pride,
Slumber'd Egypt's myriads wide;
Miracle and plague had ceas'd;
Israel's thunder-calling Priest
Waved no more his awful rod,
Ask'd no tempests from his God;
And the Gods of Egypt waken,
Veil'd Osiris' bolt is shaken.
Bondage—tortures—felons' graves
Be your portion, rebel slaves,—
Dupes, that on false hopes relied,
Fools, that Egypt's Gods defied!

Midnight, moonless—starless—black—
Silent—save a low faint shiver,
Floating melancholy back
From the old Nile's restless river.
Is yon spectral light the Dawn
From the Orient journeying on?
Tell to Isis' laggard Priest
Morn is hovering in the East.—
Gods!—The black vault rends asunder,
As if stirr'd with unheard thunder,
And a mass of ghostly light
Floateth down the breast of Night.
Ha!—Within that charnel gleaming,
Looms some form of awful seeming.
Nearer—'tis a war-like Phantom,—
Pale, grey shadows clothe and haunt him:
Death and Terror, hovering round him,
In a battle-garb have bound him:
From his eyes cold lightnings glance,—
Motionless his fire-clad lance.
Hush!—He stays his war-cloud now
O'er the death-doom'd City's brow.
Hear Osiris—Isis hear,
Egypt's Judgment hour is near!
O'er her the Destroyer bendeth,
From his cloud the Shape descendeth—
Gods of Egypt, hear!—

Now the Phantom-Shape is gliding
Slowly down the slumbering street,
Now his ghostly form is biding
By the Pharaoh's royal gate:
Now the death-lance rais'd on high,
Strikes the lintel noiselessly;
And a dirge-like wailing falls
O'er those high and stately halls,
As if royal breath were fleeting,
As if Death with Kings were meeting.—
But the Phantom-Shape is gone,
Silent—slowly—journeying on:
Noble's tower, and peasant's gate,
All in turn his step await—
Where he strikes the death-dart's blow,
There the Mourner's wailings flow.
Now his misty Form's before
The weak Bondman's lowly door,
And the shadowy arm on high
Lifts the death-lance threateningly.
Hath he struck?—Is that the moan
For the young slave's spirit flown;
See—the phantom-shadow bow—
Whence the spell that binds him now?—
There's a token glistening there
In the lance's fiery glare,
Like a flash of bloody light
Streams its crimson on the night,—
See the phantom-shape obey
The red symbol's potent ray—
Go!—The bondman sleepeth well,
'Twas *his* God that fram'd that spell.
Away—pale shape—away!

Morn on Egypt's wailing coast—
Israel—up!—thy God hath won thee,
Call the thousands of thine host,—
Come, with triumph's splendor on thee;—
Warrior, Prophet, Leader, Priest,
Raise the altar—spread the feast.
Shout!—Let Egypt's wailing sound
In your jubilee be drown'd—
Let each tribe its thousands gather,
Wealth and substance,—child and father—
Marshal now your long array,
Follow ye your God to day.
Eastward ho!—your cloudy guide
Toward the desert seems to glide.

Follow—follow—sign and wonder,
Judgment, tempest, sword and thunder,
God hath on your tyrants cast,
Jacob's line is freed at last.
Israel up—away—away!
Victor, slave of yesterday,
Thou art freed at last!

ZADIG.

Toronto, November, 1841.

A PLAN FOR THE UNION OF WESLEYAN METHODISM WITH THE CHURCH.

(*From a Pamphlet by the Rev. R. Hodgson, M.A., entitled "Wesleyan Methodism considered in relation to the Church."*)

We have now brought to a close our observations on the rise, progress, and final establishment of Wesleyan Methodism, as a religious system, considered in relation to the Church. Our object was to explain this singular phenomenon—to show under what circumstances the two parties have assumed their relative position, and upon what grounds they respectively occupy that position.—We have endeavoured to attain that object by a course of fair, candid, and documentary investigation. We have no intention of adding a "moral to our tale;" for reflections would now be useless, and might only lead to still more useless recrimination. That grave errors were committed on both sides must be acknowledged by all impartial inquirers, who are attached less to the cause of party than the cause of truth.

"Iliacos intrà muros peccatur et extrà."

But beyond this general admission we cannot go; and we leave to more adventurous writers the task of distributing the praise or censure in fair and rateable proportions.

"*Time past*," it has been beautifully observed by a Stoical writer, is as "something consecrated to the gods;" it is beyond the power "of fortune or of man." Regret, therefore, is unavailing; and we must accept this condition of things as a legacy, if not of the wisdom, at least of the errors, of our ancestors.

But though we accept this condition of things with all its difficulties, we need not resign ourselves as the victims of stoical resignation and despair. Nothing certainly need preclude us from "casting about" for some expedient which may assist us in obtaining a practical solution of these difficulties. To us, indeed, it is a matter of regret that the "tide" was not "taken at the flood" at an earlier period. Success would then have been more probable; and we should thus have avoided those "shoals and miseries" on which we have been subsequently stranded.

This, however, shall not deter us from making an attempt; and, if any should consider us as uselessly employed in even doing this, let them consider the grounds of our confidence. The strongest bond of union between Wesleyan Methodism and the Church of England is to be found in the neat, terse, elegant, and imperishable writings of Mr. Wesley himself. And we would recommend to the consideration of both parties one catholic principle enunciated in those writings, and which Mr. Wesley professes to have adopted as his rule of conduct,—"to consider the 'Church of England,' or the 'cause of Methodism,' but as subordinate to the general interests of the Church of Christ." Both parties will certainly acknowledge the propriety of this principle; but will both parties abide by its application?

The first point in favour of those who wish to "close this breach" between the Church and Wesleyan Methodism, is the absence of any irreconcileable difference in matters of doctrine; and what little difference does exist affects rather the *phraseology* than the substance. But when we arrive at "Church Government," then commences the difficulty.

There are only two methods which have ever been proposed for effecting the object we have in view. The one, for the sake of distinction, may be termed the *Theory of Absorption*, and has been clearly explained; the other may be termed the *Theory of Union*, but every person who has mentioned it, has forgotten to state its "elements."

The theory of *Absorption* is certainly simple; but it has the fault of all theories which aim at simplicity without reference to the infinite complications of social existence. It is perfectly visionary and impracticable. The theory has been thus stated,—"Even our enemies must confess, that the clergy, at large, do preach the Gospel in its scriptural integrity to the people; and that there is *no ground accordingly for continuing a system (Methodism) which the present state of the religious world has entirely superseded*."

Now look at the broad facts of the case. With a dense population destitute, to an unparalleled extent, of religious instruction, and amidst a vast superfecundity of socialism, chartism, and every demoralizing agency, this theory contemplates the disbanding of about *five thousand* Methodist ministers and preachers (Itinerant and Local) without any compensating increase of ministers on the part of the Establishment—the shutting up of *three thousand* chapels in England alone, besides other subordinate places of worship, with no corresponding "church extension" to meet the emergency—the withdrawing of *above a million* of "hearers" from the religious ordinances of their choice, with an absolute certainty that the very violence of the change would throw a vast proportion into the ranks of Dissent—the closing of between *three* and *four thousand* Sunday Schools in uneducated and populous districts, and the separation of *three hundred* and *sixty thousand* "Members" of the Society, from a discipline to which they are enthusiastically attached, without the provision of, or even indication of, any analogous system which might occupy its place; to say nothing of a large field of Missionary operations which we are quite incompetent to cover.* No consistent and intelligent churchman, however desirous of theoretical unity and perfection, could even wish for such a consummation as this; and to believe that any person could seriously propound such a theory, as a practicable theory, is certainly levying a large tax upon human credulity.

But if this theory be impracticable, can no principles be laid down which may serve as a basis of *union?* But, here, care must be taken that those principles be consistent with our form of Church-government; for, as it is justly observed by Mr. Jackson, "the Church, with its three orders of ministers, can never sanction the ordination which the Methodist preachers have received."†—We have seen that a Presbyterian ordination was forced upon the Wesleyans more out of necessity than choice; that Mr. Wesley considered the "Episcopal form of Church-government as well agreeing with the writings and practice of the Apostles;"‡ that eminent writers of that body express "no objections to our Episcopacy scripturally understood,"§ and we certainly wish it to be no *otherwise* understood.

In order then to preserve the uniformity of our Episcopal form of Church-government, let us be permitted to clear away the difficulty by suggesting a slight extension. We propose, therefore, the creation of a "Wesleyan Bishop," who shall ordain the Wesleyan ministers, presenting themselves for ordination‖ at the annual Conference, and who shall exercise the other functions of Episcopacy as far as may be compatible with the discipline of Wesleyan Methodism as at present constituted.—We propose further, that the nomination of this bishop be vested in the Wesleyan Conference,¶ and that the eligibility shall be restricted to such individuals as have filled the office of "President of the Conference;" not merely because this proviso would secure sufficient gravity and experience on the part of the individual selected, but would serve as a guarantee that such an individual possessed the affections and regard of the whole Methodist Body.** The *veto*, of course, would rest with the Archbishop of Canterbury; and, in case of its being exercised, we propose that the Conference proceed to the nomination of three individuals, belonging to the order specified.—From these a selection will be made, and the appointment final.

This is the only concession we solicit at the hands of the Church; for it is impossible that we should co-operate with those whose ordination she does not sanction.—Neither do we know of any interest of the Establishment, whether temporal or spiritual, that would suffer detriment from this relaxation. If we cannot extend the terms of our communion so far as to admit within the pale of the Church all who do *not dissent from her doctrines and renounce her service*; even rational men must at length begin to entertain doubts respecting her ultimate stability. When we reflect upon our singular position, the species of hostility which is constantly waged against us, and that, as a Church, we have, at least, in bygone times, "left undone those things which we ought to have done," we are reminded of an observation which has fallen from a high authority: "Permanent usages are suited to a peaceful state; but those which are compelled to engage in vast undertakings, require a corresponding degree of inventive power."††

At the hands of the Wesleyans we request the following concessions. In large towns and populous districts we have no desire to extort from them the closing of their chapels during the hours of service in the parochial church (unless on very special occasions;) for that would be inconsistent with the principles we have already advocated, (p. 24,)‡‡ as well as with the relaxation of Mr. Wesley himself. But in rural and thinly peopled districts, we would suggest the propriety of recurring, as far as circumstances will permit, to the practice of the founder of Methodism.

The next concession relates to the use of the "Liturgy." It will be observed that the plan of pacification "*strongly recommended*" the use of the Liturgy. We wish this recommendation to be made "absolute." On this head we have with us the suffrage of many eminent Wesleyans. "The fault," says Mr. Watson, "in the 'plan of pacification' lay in not making the use of the Liturgy the *sole and peremptory rule*, as a condition of opening their chapels during the hours of service. That improvement is indeed greatly to be desired; for the Liturgy *secures* the reading of a large portion of the Scriptures; it *secures* what Mr. Wesley has properly called the "four grand parts of public petition," (p. 64;) and besides the aid it affords to the most spiritual and devout, a great body of evangelical truth is by constant use laid up in the minds of children and ignorant people"......"furnishing them with suitable, sanctifying, solemn, and impressive petitions."§§

With respect to the administration of the sacrament, we wish to withdraw none of the privileges conceded in 1795. We propose, however, this concession, that "members of the Wesleyan Societies" shall attend the administration of this rite at the parochial church, at least *once a quarter*. This is the strongest bond of union that can subsist between us; it draws a strong line of demarcation, as Bishop Copleston remarks, between the "Wesleyans and those organized communities" (of dissent) "which exclude from their society any that communicate in the blessed sacrament of the Lord's Supper with the National Church." At the same time, it is a homage to the Establishment and to the memory of John Wesley, which, we are assured, no true Wesleyan will ever grudge.

Such are the principal concessions on the pat of the Church of England and Wesleyan Methodism which have suggested themselves to our mind, in no light or inconsiderate mood, as forming a basis for their mutual *union*, and, subsequently, for their more effective co-opration.—Whether any practical result may ever flow from these or similar suggestions, to re-unite us with our brethren, it would be in vain for the writer to conjecture. He has endeavoured to execute, to the best of his ability, what he conceives to be his part of the duty; and, if he only succeeds in making the question better understood by all parties, he will not consider his time mis-spent or his labour misapplied. Nothing would afford him greater pleasure than to see members of the Church of England reciprocate the same feeling towards the Wesleyan Methodists as one of their writers has evinced in the following passage towards us:—"The prevalent sentiment of the Methodists, as a body, towards the Establishment has been that of friendship. We rejoice that she has great influence with the mass of the population. We wish her prosperity and perpetuity, as we wish all other Christian churches; and the *more so* as we recognise in her the 'mother of us all,' and can never contemplate, without the deepest admiration, her noble army of confessors and martyrs, and the illustrious train of her divines, whose writings have been, and still continue to be, the light of Christendom."‖‖

* "Such a formal union (of the Methodists) with the Established Church as implies an abandonment of their own Ministry, and their peculiar form of discipline, would be equally a violation of Mr. Wesley's design.....Nor have the Methodist preachers any right so to trifle with the consciences of mankind as to withdraw from more than a million of people the religious ordinances and means of salvation which they prefer before all others. There are principles concerned in questions of this nature more deep and momentous than superficial declaimers ever imagine."—*Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism*, by the Rev. T. Jackson, President of the Conference, 1839, p. 256.

† Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism, p. 256.

‡ "Unless I see more reason for it than ever I yet saw, I will not leave the Church of England, *as by law established*, while the breath of God is in my nostrils." Wesley, (Jackson's Church and the Methodists, p. 26.)

§ Watson's Life of Wesley.

‖ At present the term "ordination" is not used by the Methodists; it is expressed by the phrase "received into full connexion,"—another instance of the reluctance frequently manifested by Mr. Wesley, "to invade no man's right," on light, or, what he conceived, insufficient grounds.

¶ It consists of "one hundred senior preachers."

** There is one man whom we cannot pass over in silence. He has at all times acted in defence of the Church—opposing himself to every democratic tendency in the Body, and even co-operating with the Conference in the expulsion of a Methodist Itinerant preacher, who persisted, during the late crisis, in attaching himself to a "Church Reform Society" near Manchester. In this he executed the true Wesleyan principle.—"As to those of the people called Methodists," observes Mr. Wesley, "whom you suppose to rail at and abuse the clergy, and to 'revile and censure their neighbours,' I can only say, which are they? Show me the men, and if it appear that any of those, under my care, habitually censure or revile others, whether CLERGY or Laity, I WILL MAKE THEM AN EXAMPLE FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL THE REST." (Works, vol. viii. p. 489.) It is hardly necessary to state that Dr. BUNTING is the individual to whom we allude, or that his manly proceedings in this case "drew down upon him the obloquy of a licentious press." If the "reciprocity system" were insisted upon, where we might ask, would the "Vicar of Gedney" appear? [This remark is unjust. Mr. Escott, the Vicar of Gedney, refused to read the burial service at the interment of a child, who had been baptized by a Wesleyan minister, considering that such baptism was invalid. Why should he be sneered at for acting upon an opinion, entertained by several of the best and most learned divines of the Church? If in maintaining his principles, he has behaved harshly, let him be censured for that,—but not for adhering to what he conceived to be his duty. The case has been decided in the Court of Arches against Mr. Escott, but he has appealed, we believe, to the House of Lords.—ED. CH.]

†† Thucyd. lib. i. § 71.

‡‡ Wesleyan Methodism may put forward some claim to the peculiar honour of the Establishment as the "poor man's church." "Several of the chapels," observes Mr. Jackson, "in the principal manufacturing towns, such as Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, and Huddersfield, are of very large dimensions. In Leeds alone the chapels contain *four thousand free sittings*; and in many other places the spiritual necessities of the lower classes of society are met in the same liberal manner.—*Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism*, p. 247.

THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY.

(*From the Rev. T. H. Horne, B.D.*)

That our Saviour founded a church or society, which was to subsist to the end of time, is universally admitted by all professing Christians. No visible society can exist, without order and government, nor without some terms of admission to its privileges. Where *every one* is left to do what he pleases, there must be confusion, and every evil work. No sooner, therefore, had our Saviour laid the foundation of his church, but he chose TWELVE of his disciples, whom he named Apostles, to whom he committed the administration of it. These, while he continued with them, he laboured to instruct. He gradually enlarged their views, respecting the nature of his spiritual kingdom: he removed their prejudices, and corrected their ambitious desires. After his resurrection, he passed forty days with them, *speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God*. (Acts i. 3.) He invested them with *equal* powers, and delegated to them that mission, which He himself had received from God, saying: As *my Father hath sent me*, EVEN SO *send I you*. (John xx. 21.) Subsequently, he commanded them to go, *and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; and promised that He would *be with them alway, even to the end of the world*. (Matt. xxviii. 18—20.) But, as the persons, to whom this mission was delegated, were mortal, the promise of our Saviour's continual presence with them, in the exercise of their spiritual functions, could only be completely fulfilled in their successors. That they were to be succeeded by others, is evidently implied in these words of our Lord. By virtue of this commission, the Apostles assumed the direction of the newly constituted church; and in their turn ordained *faithful men, who might be able to teach others also*. (2 Tim. ii. 2.) And, if we "diligently read holy scripture and antient authors, it will be evident," as stated in the ordination service of our church, "that from the Apostles' time, there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's church, bishops," presbyters or "priests, and deacons."—(*Preface to the Office of Ordination.*)

When the church increased, and the care of the poor demanded more time than the Apostles could give, consistently with their important duty of preaching the Gospel, they deemed it necessary to select from the multitude of the disciples, seven brethren, to whom the name of *deacons* was subsequently given; and to whom certain specific duties were assigned. These deacons were specially set apart by prayer, and by imposition of hands, of the Apostles. (Acts vi.) About ten years after the institution of deacons, we read incidentally, that there were presbyters or elders in the church at Jerusalem (Acts xi. 30); that Paul and Barnabas ordained presbyters or elders in every church (Acts xiv. 23); and, subsequently, that Paul *sent for the* presbyters (or *elders*) *of Ephesus to come to him at Miletus*, to whom he delivered the admirable and pathetic charge, related in the twentieth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. At a still later period, during his imprisonment at Rome, Paul wrote his epistles to Timothy and Titus, containing special instructions for their direction in the ordination of presbyters and deacons, and in the other duties of their episcopal office*: together with such exhortations, as plainly imply, that they had *received*, not assumed their authority. With regard to Timothy, in particular, before Saint Paul took him to be his companion and assistant in the Gospel, not only did the Apostle himself ordain Timothy with imposition of hands, but also the *presbytery*—or a number of presbyters—laid *their* hands on him,—not to convey any authority, but merely to express their approbation. *By the putting on of* MY *hands*, are Saint Paul's words in his second Epistle to Timothy (i. 6); and, he says in his first Epistle, WITH *the laying on of the hands of the* PRESBYTERY. (iv. 14.)† In our Reformed Episcopal Church, as well as in other Protestant episcopal churches, at the time of ordination, a certain number of presbyters lay *their* hands on the heads of candidates for the ministry, *together with* the Bishop, not for the purpose of conveying authority, but merely to denote concurrence.

§§ Watson's Observations on Southey's Life of Wesley, p. 144, note.

‖‖ Watson's Life of Mr. Wesley, p. 361.

During their lives, the Apostles had the sole charge of the churches. Their office is expressly termed an episcopate or bishopric, in the first chapter of the Acts: and, after their death, those who succeeded to their office, left the name of "Apostle" to the *Apostles* strictly so called; and gave the name of "*Bishop*" to those, who succeeded the Apostles in superintending churches, and ordaining ministers.

And thus it is evident, that the lineaments of that gradation in the ministry, which subsists among us, may be plainly discerned in the writings of the evangelists and apostles. The orders of deacon, presbyter, and bishop, which were thus established, we know from the testimony of the antient fathers of the church, and from other ecclesiastical writers, continued in uninterrupted succession for fifteen hundred years, in ALL Christian churches, and it still exists in our own church, and in the protestant episcopal churches in Scotland, on the continent of Europe, in North America, and among the antient Greek and Syrian churches, in the East. The existence of the Syrian church in the centre of India,—a church which never submitted to the papal anti-christ, retaining episcopal government, and a scriptural liturgy, and deriving her episcopacy from the earliest and best days of Christianity,—furnishes one of the strongest proofs of the apostolic origin of this mode of church government. *No* ANTIENT *independent church*, indeed, can be named, in which episcopacy was not found, nor any, in which it was interrupted, until the time of the Reformation; when the most learned and pious of the original framers of the presbyterian form of church-ministry,—especially the venerable Calvin, and the learned Beza, the chief founders of the Protestant churches at Geneva and in France,—pleaded NECESSITY alone for their rejection of episcopacy, of which they at the same time strongly avowed their veneration. Calvin, in particular, declared those to be worthy of every anathema, who would not reverence and submit to episcopacy, where it was to be met with in its legitimate form: and Beza expressed his deliberate opinion, that it was hardly possible for a man in his senses to reject episcopacy. He considered that England had retained her episcopal ministry by the peculiar blessing of God, and expressed his wish that she might long continue to enjoy it.

* *On the Functions of Bishops, as stated in the New Testament.*

The peculiar office of a Bishop consists in these four particulars:—1. In ordaining presbyters and deacons;—2. In superintending the doctrine of these ministers;—3. In superintending their conduct;—4. In regulating those matters in the church, which are not settled by divine authority.

Now these duties of a superintendent or bishop, were committed by the apostle Paul to Timothy and Titus.

1. THEY WERE APPOINTED TO ORDAIN OTHER MINISTERS, AS THE APOSTLES HAD DONE *before them.*

For this cause, says the apostle to Titus, *left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest ordain presbyters in every city, as I had appointed thee.* (i. 5.) So, likewise, special directions were given to Timothy respecting the choice of those whom he should ordain presbyters or deacons.—(1 *Tim.* iii.)

2. THEY WERE APPOINTED TO SUPERINTEND THE DOCTRINE OF THESE MINISTERS.

So says the apostle to Timothy:—*I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine.*—(1 *Tim.* i. 3.)

3. THEY WERE APPOINTED TO SUPERINTEND THE CONDUCT OF OTHER MINISTERS.

Against a presbyter receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses.—(1 *Tim.* v. 19.) He who is authorised to receive accusations, and hear witnesses against any person, is authorised to be the judge of that person.

4. THEY WERE APPOINTED TO REGULATE SUCH MATTERS IN THE CHURCH, AS WERE NOT SETTLED BY EXPRESS DIVINE COMMAND.

For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting; that are left *undone*, as the margin expresses it.—(*Tit.* i. 5.) This was a branch of apostolical authority which is here delegated to Titus, as appears from 1 Cor. xi. 34. For when the apostle Paul had rectified the erroneous manner of receiving the Lord's Supper, into which the Corinthians had fallen, by stating to them the nature of that ordinance, according to its original institution, he adds, that he would regulate inferior matters when he should be present with them. *And the rest will I set in order when I come.*—(Hey's *Tracts and Essays, Moral and Theological*, pp. 594, 595.)

† These two passages of Saint Paul's Epistles to Timothy are of equal authority, and therefore prove, that the Presbytery joined with the Apostle in the imposition of hands.

SEPARATION FROM THE CHURCH.

(*From a Sermon, by Dr. Copleston, Bishop of Llandaff*)

IT IS NOT WE WHO HAVE CHOSEN HIM, BUT HE HAS CHOSEN US. Let this truth be ever present to the mind of every disciple. The Church of God is no work of man's making,—no self-created body of representatives and their constituents,—no voluntary assemblage of men, associated by their own will and authority, and imparting, by their own act, authority to those set over them. It is a household not of man's but of God's forming. All power in it emanates from Christ who founded it; who, upon leaving the world, appointed governors and teachers, commissioned by himself, to extend and propagate it through the whole world, according to the model which he himself prescribed. By his first Apostles, and by those who in succeeding ages were from time to time called to the ministry, this visible body has been perpetuated down to our own times;—deriving not only its origin from him in the first instance, but being continually sustained, and quickened, and invigorated by him, as its invisible head, through the abiding influence of the Holy Spirit.

To that Church which he thus founded he gave authority to maintain order and discipline; to preserve soundness of doctrine and purity of manners; and to pour forth, as from a living fountain, the waters of life to all who would become his disciples, and submit to the rule of his Church.

These are simple truths, familiar to most of you my Christian brethren, and to many of you it may seem almost superfluous to dwell upon them. Yet I believe that no error is more prevalent among Christians, than that which springs either from an utter ignorance of the true constitution of Christ's Church, or from a disregard of the fundamental principles on which it was first established.

It is the more important to point out the danger of this error, and to warn men loudly against it, because most of the persons who are influenced by it seem not to suspect that they *can* be acting wrong in what they are doing.—The very gratification and delight they experience is apt to be considered by themselves as a proof that they are right,—as a sanction from heaven, which no human authority can supersede. And what error is so dangerous as that which carries with it the semblance of a *duty?*—which approves itself to the conscience of the party in proportion as it gratifies his desires.

It will readily be understood that I speak now of those hearers of the word who choose for themselves their own teachers; deserting the communion to which, according to the ordinance of the Church, they should adhere, and following any new guide who may present himself, provided his language and manner be fervent, and his doctrine such as excites and interests their own minds.—Such, I believe, is the ground of preference with many thousands of those who profess to be dissatisfied with the regular ministry,—and they seem to think it enough to say, that they are better *pleased* with another mode of preaching, whoever the person may be they choose to follow, however authorised, or by whomsoever appointed.

Undoubtedly there are many who, upon mature deliberation, are convinced that the doctrines they hear in this manner are more agreeable to the Gospel of Christ, and that the persons to whom they listen have equal authority with those who derive their Ordination in due succession from the Apostles. Against such I would be far from advancing any reproachful language, much less from wishing that their liberty of judging and acting should be restrained by any coercive measures. The conformity which is purchased by these means is a mere outward show, without any spiritual benefit or any real value.—Unless it be the result either of judgment and conviction, or of a pious and humble mind impressed with a sense of duty, and relying upon the instruction of those who are sent to teach him, it is nothing worth.

In all cases then, where a man is thoroughly and soberly convinced that our Church is in error, and that he hears the truth more soundly taught by other ministers, equally commissioned to perform that office, it is our duty, even if we fail of convincing, still to respect the motive, and not to call in question the sincerity of those who appeal to their own conscience, however sure we may be that they are greatly deceived.

But to *all* the followers of Christ we are bound to represent that the question, at least, is one of high importance—that it is not a matter of indifference, or one of slight moment—nor, again, a thing to be weighed in the scale of each man's own *inclinations*;—that although no human power can deprive him of the right of judging for himself, yet that he himself, when he leaves his appointed guide, is deeply responsible to God for the judgment he forms; and it is more especially the office of Christ's ministers to awaken men to a sense of the serious risk they run in exercising such a choice.

That there *is* such a sin as schism, hardly any reader of the New Testament will deny. If there be one duty which St. Paul inculcates more frequently than another, it is that of firm union and concord in the Church. "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 among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment." (1 Cor. i. 10.) He then condemns that party spirit which had crept in among the Corinthians, and led to their separation into different congregations, saying among themselves, "I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, I of Christ." The last of these appellations teaches us that it was not so much false and heretical doctrine, as the spirit of party and disunion, which St. Paul had in view. The name even of Christ, assumed as an exclusive title by one congregation, and distinguishing themselves from other Christians, is declared equally blameable with the assumption of human names as badges of distinction.

Indeed, if there be no difference of doctrine,—nothing we can allege as a cause of separation, besides the love of something peculiar, or the preference men give to the manner or person of some individual, there is less to be said in defence of this step, than where they complain that the true doctrine is not taught by the established ministers. It becomes then the *mere* spirit of division—a spirit which infects, more or less, all human society—and which, though often productive of good in worldly affairs, is most opposite to the character of genuine Christianity in the concerns of religion. It is against this spirit and this practice that the Apostle speaks so earnestly. It cannot be imagined that St. Paul himself preached any thing but the best and purest doctrine, and yet he forbids the use of his own name, lest it should lead to such an evil consequence.

In the same strain he addresses the Church at Miletus, forewarning them of these afflictions. "Yea of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them," (Acts xx. 30); and to Timothy he observes that in future all these disorders shall even increase. "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears, and they shall turn away their eyes from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables," (2 Tim. iv. 3.)

Other authorities to the same effect might be addueed from the writings of St. Peter, St. John and St. Jude; but enough has been said for our present purpose, which is, not to direct these passages against any particular sect or denomination of Christians in the present day, as specially denoted by these censures, but to point out to your serious attention that there undoubtedly is such a sin as groundless division—for which sin those who are guilty will be called to a severe account—that the sin began early in the history of the Church—and that we have every reason to think it continues to exist, and *will* continue as one of the weapons of our spiritual adversary to the end of time.

ADVICE TO THE CLERGY.

(*From Archbishop Secker's Charges*).

Our predecessors, that their abstaining from indiscreet levities might be notorious, wore constantly the peculiar habit of their order. And certainly we should be more respected, if we followed their example in this more universally. They complained of no inconveniences from it: nor did I ever, in a course of many years, find any worth naming. In the primitive and persecuting times indeed Clergymen wore no peculiar dress: and long after were distinguished only by retaining a greater simplicity of garb than others. But gradually superiors discerned reasons for enjoining a different sort: and surely others may well pay them so far the obedience promised to them, as always to shew, by some evident and proper marks, (for nothing more is expected), of what class of men they are. If you do not, it will be said, either that you are ashamed of your cause, or conscious of your unskilfulness to defend it, or that you conceal yourselves to take occasionally unfit liberties. Indeed some external restraints of this kind, merely as an admonition against unseemly discourse and conduct and company, would, though not prescribed, be very advisable for young Clergymen: amongst whom they, who dislike them the most, might sometimes perceive, that they have the most need of them. And we that are older, should keep up the custom for their sakes, though unnecessary for our own. Besides, we may all prevent, by such notification of ourselves, a great deal of unbecoming talk and deportment in others: and so escape both the disagreeableness of reproving it, and the impropriety of not reproving it. Or, if after all it cannot be prevented, they who are offended with it, will immediately see in us a refuge from it.

But then a habit, visibly a Clergyman's, must be such in every part as befits a Clergyman: have no look of effeminacy or love of finery in it. For we had better put on the lay dress entirely, than disgrace the clerical one. And it is doubly contemptible, first to shew what a fondness we have for things utterly beneath us, and then how poorly we are able to indulge it. Therefore let us be uniform: and as our character is a truly venerable one, let us think we do ourselves honour by wearing the ancient badges of it. I need not add, that our whole demeanour should be answerable to our clothing: that softness and delicacy of manner, skill in the science of eating, and the perfection of liquors, in short, every approach to luxurious gratification, is strangely out of place in one, who hath devoted himself to *endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ*—(2 Tim. ii. 3).

Still we ought to judge very charitably of those, who take greater liberties, than we dare: never blame them more, seldom so much, as they deserve; and confine our severity to our own practice. Only we must watch with moderate strictness over our families also: not only keeping up the joint and separate worship of God in them, which I hope no Clergyman omits, but forming them to every part of piety and virtue and prudence. St. Paul requires, that not only *Deacons*, but their *wives* be *grave*: (1 Tim. iii. 8, 11); and that the higher Clergy be such, as *rule well their own houses, having their children in subjection with all gravity: for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?* (1 Tim. v. 4, 5). Whence we have all promised at our Ordination, to *frame and fashion our families*, together with ourselves, *according to the doctrine of Christ, and to make them, as much as in us lieth, wholesome examples and patterns to his flock.*—They are naturally the first objects of our care: we have peculiar opportunities of instructing and restraining them. If we neglect them, we shall never be thought to have much concern for others: if we are unsuccessful with them, we shall be deemed very unskilful; and bid to look at home before we reprove the rest of our flock. But exhibiting instances of goodness and happiness, produced under our own roofs by the methods to which we direct those around us, must needs add singular weight to our exhortations.

For the importance of the rules hitherto laid down, we have the judgment of a most able and subtle and determined enemy, the Emperor Julian: who, designing to re-establish Paganism, and accounting, as he declares, the strictness and sanctity, professed by Christians, to be a principal cause of the prevalence of their faith, in two of his epistles gives directions, undoubtedly copied from the injunctions observed by the Clergy of those days, that the heathen priests be men of serious tempers and deportment; that they neither utter, nor hear, nor read, nor think of any thing licentious or indecent; that they banish far from them all offensive jests and libertine conversation: be neither expensive nor shewish in their apparel; go to no entertainments but such as are made by the worthiest persons; frequent no taverns; appear but seldom in places of concourse; never be seen at the public games and spectacles; and take care that their wives and children and servants be pious, as well as themselves. Let not, I entreat you, this apostate put us to shame.

But Clergymen, who are serious in their whole behaviour, and the care of their families also, are often too unactive amongst their people: apt to think, that if they perform regu-