

tial to the well-being and safety of the soul, that without them, we "cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

ADDITION TO THE RE-PRINT.

"Can you prove from Scripture, that separation from the true Church of Christ, is sinful and odious in the sight of God?"

In proof that it is, are quoted, Rom. : xvi. 17—1 Cor. i : 10.—1 Cor. xi—19—2 Tim. iv : 3—Titus iii : 10, 11—Jude v : 11.

Separation from "the true Church," is doubtless "sinful and odious in the sight of God," but then we must be careful to understand what is meant by "the true Church." The approvers of this Catechism will doubtless say, the phrase means "the Church of England." After all we have written we should esteem it a work of supererogation to expose this erroneous interpretation. It is neither "sinful" nor "odious in the sight of God" for us or others to belong to a *true Church*, not in union with the Established Church.

Jude v : 11, one of the above mentioned proofs, reads thus :—"Woe unto them ! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core."

On this verse the following question is proposed and answered—

"Wherein did 'the gainsaying of Core' consist, in which St. Jude says that some Christians of his time perished?"

"In attending the ministrations of those who had no lawful appointment from God, for performing the priest's office. Numb. xvi, read the whole chapter."

If this be not a *stretching of episcopal authority* we are free to confess we know not what would constitute such a circumstance. The term "*perished*," we suppose is used by this *Author*, in the sense usually understood by Christians, as being synonymous with *punishment* in the eternal world, styled by our Lord "the damnation of hell." If not we shall be happy to have our mistake corrected, on the condition that another meaning consistent with the connection in which it stands be assigned. As here used it certainly is employed to designate a punishment adequate to a very heinous offence, that of separation from "the true Church of Christ," which taken in its just and proper sense, excludes from salvation—a crime which is by this same writer described as "sinful and odious in the sight of God." For this crime—for separation from "the true Church of Christ"—no punishment short of the "vengeance of eternal fire" can be inflicted. Here then by this *Christian Author*, damnation is dealt out against all who attend the "ministrations of those who have no lawful appointment of God for performing the priest's office;" that is, according to the doctrine of this tract, the ministrations of persons not episcopally ordained—and this *liberal* sentiment is attempted to be palmed upon St. Jude !!! O where is charity? Where is brotherly kindness? Where is the religion which these persons profess to teach? Really did we belong to a Church, the Ministers of which presumed to give utterance to such awful speeches, on such grounds, we should feel it our duty to withdraw from its pale and attend the "ministrations" of those whose *spirit* and *conduct* are more, in accordance with the requisitions of the Gospel of Christ.

What seems to us strange in this account is, that, "*Christians*" thus "*perished*" in the days of Jude for attending the ministrations of unqualified men! We have been at a loss to ascertain what kind of Christians these were who were so punished:—the only hypothesis we can adopt is, that they were such as the Indians in Georgia once described—*devil-christians*. If godly christians, can, as such, "*perish*," well may be asked, "who then can be saved?" Now

St. Jude himself describes the characters in question thus :—"For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were of old described, with regard to this condemnation, *ungodly men*, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ. (4 v. Wesley's Translation.) Are not these rather queer characteristics of Christianity? That such persons should perish we can readily believe, and that, too, whether they attended the ministrations of those who had been episcopally ordained, or those who, according to the writer, "had no lawful appointment of God for performing the priest's office." Among other sins, they were guilty of "despising authority" and "railing at dignities." Understand this, if it be pleasing, of the *ministers of Christ*. How careful then ought persons to be that they "despise" not and "rail" not against, those Ministers called of God to the work of saving souls, who belong not to Established Churches. Such conduct, even in a dignitary of an Established Church, we fear, is somewhat "sinful and odious in the sight of God." It is one thing to rise up and rebel wickedly against the known servants of God, which was the sin with Korah and his company, and on account of which they "*perished*,"—and another to attend upon the "ministrations" of pious ministers of non-episcopal and non-established churches, whose labours are *owned of God* in the awakening and conversion of souls and building up God's people on their holy faith. Spirit of St. Paul! Whither hast thou fled? Thou couldst rejoice that Christ was preached, though out of contention! But these thy *professing successors* are denouncing "wrath and indignation" and vengeance against members of the *real successors*, because they have not had the hands of bishops on their heads!—and minister not in Churches established by law! Meek and blessed Jesus! when will they that bear thy name, imitate thy catholic example? "And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us; and we forbade him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us, is on our part. (Mark ix : 39—40.) "A spirit of bigotry has little countenance from these passages. There are some who are so outrageously wedded to their own creed and religious system, that they would rather let sinners perish, than suffer those who differ from them to become the instruments of their salvation. Even the good that is done they either *deny* or *suspect*, because the person does not *follow them*. This also is vanity and an evil disease." (Dr. A. Clarke in loc.) The Doctor adds,—"*There is a parallel case to this mentioned in Numb. xi : 26—29*, which, for the elucidation of this passage, I will transcribe. The spirit rested upon Eldad and Medad, and they prophesied in the camp. And there ran a young man, and told Moses, and said, Eldad and Medad do prophecy in the camp. And Joshua—the servant of Moses—said, My Lord Moses, forbid them. And Moses said unto him, Enorest Thou for My sake? Would God, that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them. The reader will easily observe, that *Joshua* and *John* were of the same bigoted spirit; and that *Jesus* and *Moses* acted from the spirit of candour and benevolence." And oh! how many *Joshua's* and *John's* are there in the Christian world at the present day! How few act up to the advice of the Venerable and Catholic Wesley, who in his Notes on the passage in Mark, observes—"*Neither directly nor indirectly discourage or hinder any man, who brings sinners from the power of Satan to God, because he followeth not us in opinions, modes of worship, or any thing else, which does not affect the essence of religion.*" Had the

persons concerned been free from occasions referred to by Moses and Jesus, the direction of Joshua would have been dictated by the influence of the Catechism, which would have been strictures upon As it is we hope an antidote to the

In concluding the unity of stating been dictated by England, as a Of this we are our high-church that the exclus the support of demnatory and against their denominations at this time sincerely regret ministerial office reduced to preserve rest of the P course they selves, prejudice, alienation, nor and none fundamental standing this on terms of influence to the Romish advocacy of the land by Their natural the English influence to this remark

"At a visit interesting conversation between the clergy, a hope the latter has been licensed to attend the episcopal the usual whether it the Rev. gentleman after Sabbath after the congregation of the "I d astic, with to his great Lordship, the canonicals been conde forbid his so what is this deacons of order." "T ancient usage and I am ings of you desk?" "Y phite. "T tions forbid "St. Ambro think foolish the bishop, your bishop have decid modern fol to priest's