

Poetry.

THE CHRISTIAN MARTYR'S VISION.

What means you blaze on high?
The empyrean sky
Like the rich veil of some proud fane is rending,
I see the star-paved land,
Where all the angels stand,
Even to the highest height in burning rays ascending,
Some with their wings disparted,
And bowed the stately head,
As on some mission of God's love departing,
Like flames from midnight's darkness starting;
Behold, the appointed messengers are they,
And nearest earth they wait to wait our souls away.

Higher and higher still
More lofty stature fill
The Jasper courts of the everlasting dwelling,
Cherub and Seraph pace
The illimitable space,
While sleep the folded plumes from their white shoulders
swelling,
From all the harping throng
Barsts the tumultuous song
Like the unceasing sounds of cataracts pouring,
Hosanna, oh hosanna loud roaring;
That faintly echoing down to earthly ears,
Hath seemed the concert sweet of the harmonious spheres.

Still my rapt spirit mounts
And lo! beside the founts
Of flowing light Christ's chosen saints reclining;
Distinct amid the blaze
Their palm-crowned heads they raise,
Their white robes e'en through that overpowering lustre
shining,
Each in his place of state
Long the bright throne have sat,
O'er the celestial Zion high uplifted,
While those with deep prophetic raptures gifted,
Where life's glad rills roll its tideless streams,
Enjoy the full completion of their heavenly dreams.

Again—! see again
The great victorious train,
The Martyr Army from their toils reposeing;
The blood-red robes they wear,
Embracing all the air,
Even their immortal limbs the signs of wounds disclosing,
Oh, holy Stephen, thou art martyr's pattern;
Art there, and on thy brow,
Hast still the placid smile it wore in dying,
When under the heaviest stones in anguish lying
Thy clasping hands were fondly pressed to heaven,
And thy last accents prayed thy foes might be forgiven.

Beyond! ah, who is there
With the white snowy hair?
'Tis He—'tis He, the Son of Man appearing!
At the right hand of One,
The darkness of whose throne
That sun-eyed seraph best beheld with awe and fearing,
O'er him the rainbow springs,
And spreads its emerald wings,
Down to the glassy sea his holiest seat e'er-claiming,
Hark! thunders from his throne, like steel-clad armies marching—
The Christ! the Christ, who leads us to His home!
Jesus, Redeemer, Lord, we come, we come!

Rev. H. H. Milman.

WESLEYAN METHODISM.

(From *The Eclectic Review* [Dissenting publication], for January, 1843.)

It appears that many Methodists have been very urgently pressed by this argument—"Mr. Wesley was a Churchman, he disowned and condemned dissent. It is true that he apologised for his new establishment, by alleging the corruption of the old one; but he always urged his people to keep in the communion of the Church. Yet modern Methodism has diverged in a variety of particulars from his principles, and has become either a separation from the Church, or a schism in it." Hence the force of the appeal to those who venerate Mr. Wesley, and profess to be guided by his sentiments. "The Church is vastly improved since his day; the pure gospel is extensively preached in its pulpits, and as he never contemplated the permanence of a sect, or the formation on professed grounds of scriptural authority, of a dissenting Church, in reference to the Establishment, you ought now either to merge in the Church of England, or harmonize your societies to it, so as to place them under the government and discipline of the hierarchy."

Our readers will be curious to know how this argument is met by the *Connection*, or what is the substance of their reply. It is in brief this—there is an anachronism in the appeal of the Churchman to Mr. Wesley's opinions, which renders his argument invalid.—It is shown that, though Mr. Wesley commenced his labours, and wrote some of his works, with a full belief in the scriptural authority of the Church of England, and the perfect accuracy of all its principles, yet he subsequently altered his opinion, and though he never avowed himself a dissenter, yet he embraced the doctrine of presbyterian orders, believed in the divine institution of voluntary churches, their government and discipline by presbyters, and consequently left his connection in the state of a separate, regularly organized, and permanent religious community; and that, since his times, the Conference have merely carried on, and acted out, his last matured opinions respecting the Church of Christ. Hence the *Connection* now-a-days discovers no force in the requirement that they should merge in the Church, because they perceive, in Mr. Wesley's later opinions, sufficient grounds to justify them in maintaining themselves independently of all connexion with, and all control from, the Established Church. This is all very well, and so far so good. Let Wesleyanism take its stand upon scriptural ground, in repudiating the doctrine of episcopal ordination, as essential to the validity of orders; let it maintain scriptural authority for government and discipline by presbyters; let it assert the scriptural right to assemble its people, and form them into churches, or a church, or societies, or a connexion, or whatever else they please to call them; and, in all this, let it be conceded that they are acting in strict conformity with Mr. Wesley's last views and directions, they have the most perfect and indisputable right to do so; and with the Bible in their hands, they are assuredly proof against all the assaults of the "intolerant and unscrupulous assailants," whom they profess to meet in these tracts.

But is this all? No; certain important inferences follow. The Churchman retorts,—you have hereby become dissenters; you have done the very thing, committed the very act, which you know full well Mr. Wesley deprecated and forbid. What is the reply which these tracts furnish to this argument? We must give it in the words of the writers:—

"The Wesleyan Methodists are not dissenters, in the ordinary sense and application of that term; for they do not dissent from the principle of a national ecclesiastical establishment, which derives a measure of protection and support from its union with the state, nor do they dissent from the doctrine and general formularies of the Church of England; and they are not schismatics in the Church, for this plain reason, that, to a considerable extent and degree, they are separated from the Church. They would not affect names which mark parties and distinctions, but they cannot entirely avoid using them; and they are satisfied with the one that has descended to them, indulging the hope, at the same time, of that better day when every schismatic distinction shall cease, and all Christ's disciples are not, then, dissenters from the Church of England, in the customary use of that expression; and they are not schismatics in the Church of England; and they are not Wesleyan Methodists."—*Wesleyan Tracts for the Times*, No. 2, p. 10.

Again we find in the self-same Tract—
"Some one may be ready to ask, WHAT, THEN, IS WESLEYAN METHODISM? It must be a strange anomaly. If it is neither schism, nor schismatical separation, in what light shall we regard it? Our answer,

which we would make with all humility and gratitude, is this, that singular and even anomalous as the present position of Wesleyan Methodism may be, it is doubtless, in itself, the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God. To this our thoughts cannot fail to advert, when we have occasion to speak of the validity of its ministerial orders, and of its other claims as a part of the universal Church of Christ."

On reading this remarkable passage we opened our eyes, and rubbed our spectacles, and read it again and again, asking ourselves at the same time, What can the writer or writers possibly intend by ascribing Methodism, when they have occasion to speak of its ministerial orders, to an extraordinary visitation and work of God? Do they mean to say that its distinctive principles are the result or fruit of a new revelation, thereby designing to remove it beyond the reach of the common revelation and common text? It is confessedly not Church-of-Englandism; it is not dissent from the Church of England, which it would seem to be, by asserting the validity of orders which the Church denies, and the authority of voluntary societies, which the Church repudiates; but it is "the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God." It does not attempt to dispute the validity of Church-of-England ordination; it does not dissent from the doctrine of an establishment of Christianity by the state—it even approves of it as lawful and desirable—and yet it very modestly sets up an independent hierarchy, and yet it very modestly sets up as support from the state; but after it has constituted a priesthood, not episcopally ordained, and a church or churches, not conformed to the pattern of the Established Church, it again very modestly tells the world, "this Methodism of ours is the very best and most perfect, and most strictly apostolic church in Christendom. To be sure it is not, in its platform, episcopacy, and it is not dissent from episcopacy; for dissent from episcopacy we hold, with Mr. Wesley, to be a very abominable thing, and we never will allow ourselves to be guilty of it. We have something among us much better than either episcopacy or dissent."

It is indeed neither the one nor the other, for it is "the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God." This is the only rule by which these tracts direct us to judge of Methodism. Now so far as we have been able to pry into the genuine sense, the obvious intention of this singularly humble statement, it seems to affirm nothing less than the superior excellence and authority of Methodism, over established episcopacy, and over every form of Church government that ranks under the comprehensive epithet of dissent, while it assigns a sufficiently ambitious reason for the preference. We allow that it would have been possible to put a different interpretation upon the words, had they been used in a different connexion, and for a different purpose; but since they are here employed as a reason to show why the Wesleyans are neither Churchmen nor dissenters, they appear to us to be of no force, unless they are intended to annul the grounds of the Churchman's appeal to the same time to set aside the dissenter's argument with them, that they ought to account themselves dissenters of some sort, because they repudiate episcopal ordination, and practically reject the alliance of the state. Hence it is alleged that Wesleyan Methodism does not conform itself to the Establishment, because it originates in an extraordinary visitation and work of God! and it will not allow itself to assume the character of dissent from that Church, for the very same reason. If this does not signify that Methodism claims to be a new dispensation, originating in a new revelation, we cannot understand either its meaning or its pertinence to the case in hand.

Will our readers have the goodness to observe the select phraseology with which this astounding announcement is made? "Our answer, which we would make with all humility and gratitude, is this—that singular and even anomalous, as the present position of Wesleyan Methodism may be, it is, doubtless, in itself, the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God." The definition is placed in italics to arrest attention, and it will no doubt receive, both from Churchmen and dissenters, the attention it deserves.

This is, to be sure, a very short and easy way of deciding the controversy. It was intended to stop the mouth of the Churchman, who believes in extraordinary works and visitations of God; and it equally aims to silence the dissenter, who wishes to view the Wesleyan as placed in the same category with himself.—But then, if Wesleyan Methodism disdains to conform itself to episcopal discipline, because it is the fruit of an extraordinary visitation of God, and yet could not for a moment think of dissenting from that episcopacy and that establishment, because both are scriptural and right; and if, in the next place, it insists that its own platform of church principles shall be considered the fruit of this extraordinary visitation and work of God, exempt completely from the common text, the old rules and principles of the written Scripture, it must be prepared itself to defend rather more fully than has yet been done, or is likely to be done by twopenny tracts, this new and extraordinary claim.—Pp. 67—69.

Let us take another specimen from this master of the Wesleyan Israel:—
"Some have loved to plead that the Wesleyan Methodists must either be dissenters from the Church of England, or schismatics in it. When able men touch upon this notion, and signify their approval of it, they certainly fall into an inadvertency, which was scarcely to be expected in their case; they do not observe the fallacy which lurks in the indeterminate and ambiguous name, *dissenter*."

At this point we really expected, from this censor of the able men who have fallen into so glaring an inadvertency, a complete masterpiece of dialectical skill. We prepared ourselves for a piece of ratiocination which should have deterred the sons of Oxford and Cambridge from ever daring again to risk their character as logicians, in repeating such a fallacious proposition as that ascribed to the able men, or approved by them. Will any man venture again to repeat the proposition, "Wesleyan Methodists must either be schismatics in the Church of England, or dissenters from it?" This writer has affirmed that the ambiguous and indeterminate name contains a fallacy; and, in proof of this assertion, he adds that, "in the ordinary sense and application of that term, (dissenter,) the Wesleyan Methodists are not dissenters." But where is the fallacy? A fallacy in a name must consist in its being false in any given application. The term dissenter is perfectly clear and limited, and unambiguous in itself. It merely expresses a negative in relation to something understood. It does not define the degree, nor the particular point of disagreement. It does not pretend to state the reasons for differing from the proposed proposition; it does not say what kind of a dissenter he is, but merely that he does not agree to something implied and understood. Well then, where is the fallacy? The writer affirms a fallacy, but does not attempt to point it out. He merely alleges that the Wesleyans are not dissenters in the ordinary sense of that term. Granted; but the term is not necessarily limited to the sects that are usually called dissenters. Twenty other new sects might arise, and if they refused to conform to the Church of England, they would be just as logically included under this universal negative, as any of those sects to which it is ordinarily applied. In fact, the term is clearly comprehensive of every party and every

testant in his religious opinions and practice, differs from the Church of England. Wherein, then, consists the fallacy in this name, this hated, ambiguous word, *dissenter*? The learned author of the tract has failed, indeed he has not attempted, to show. He could not do it. He has merely stated that, in its ordinary application, it does not belong to Wesleyan Methodists. They are neither dissenters from the Church, because, observe, they are not such dissenters from the Church as some other people, nor are they schismatics in the Church. This is very much like saying—they are neither out of the Church of England nor in it. Their situation is like Mahomet's tomb; it is neither in heaven nor on earth, but somewhere between the two. But the thing is impossible, where either Churchmen or dissenters. We should rather suspect that the clerical writers who have entered the proposition, which this author professes to prove fallacious, are logicians enough to detect his fallacies, his attempt to obscure the proposition, and his retreat, equally perilous and presumptuous, into the assumption of a new and extraordinary visitation of God, which we have before exposed; and they will certainly not fail to insist upon the proposition, and to make it ring in the ears of the Methodists, till they take one alternative or the other, "you are either schismatics in the Church of England, or dissenters from it. Your pretence to a special visitation and work of God, distinct from the New Testament, and your authority, is open rebellion against Christ and his apostles. It is a blasphemy for which you deserve stoning, unless you repent. And your own tracts will now be swift witnesses against you, that you are, all of you, either in the one or the other of those positions which you have denied." Here, for instance, is one whole tract (No. 4) devoted to the proof that Wesleyan Methodists are true ministers of Christ.

By showing that they possess scriptural qualifications, and then by openly denying and setting aside the doctrine of the Church of England, that there are three orders of clergy in the Church of Christ; next, by asserting the validity of ordination by presbyters, to the denial of the necessity, at least, of episcopal ordination, and by repudiating with scorn the dogma of apostolical succession. Excellent! but what inference follows? This is literally dissenting from the man who asserts there are not, by divine institution, three orders in the ministry of the Church of Christ, is a *dissenter* from the Church of England. The man who denies or refuses assent to the proposition, that episcopal ordination is essential to the right and orderly ministration of the word and ordinances, is a *dissenter*, because in this he differs from the Church of England. He may not be an independent, a baptist, a unitarian dissenter; but he is, to all intents and purposes, a *dissenter* after his own fashion. It is mere dishonesty, shuffling, cowardice, unmanly evasion, to deny that he is a dissenter. No clearer proof could be supplied of dissentism than is contained in these Tracts, and yet it is affirmed that "Wesleyans are neither schismatics in the Church, nor dissenters from it." They set up a distinct community; they separate from the parish Church; they defend the validity of presbyterian ordination; they prefer their own system of Church discipline to any other; they repudiate the notion of apostolical succession; they celebrate the simple rites of Christianity according to their own notions of apostolic precedent; they disown baptismal regeneration, and abolish the rite of confirmation; they repudiate the divine authority of diocesan episcopacy, assert the parity of all true ministers of Christ, employ lay preachers, and have practically preferred a voluntary system of church-support to a state-establishment; they have licensed their places of worship and their ministers, as not of the Church by law established; they teach their people nonconformity to the Establishment, and conformity to the laws of conference, and then they profess to stand forth before the world with this announcement, "We are neither schismatics in the Church, nor dissenters from it, but just Wesleyan Methodists, who claim as authority for our system, an extraordinary visitation and work of God; therefore touch us not, judge us not. You will be guilty of a fallacy if you call us dissenters of any sort; and you will be chargeable with falsehood if you describe us as schismatics in the Church."

The Wesleyan body may plead that they are not dissenters, because they evince no hostility to the Church, thinking it unseemly to make war upon such near neighbours; yet, in this respect, many others who do not shrink from the name of dissenter are like them; and it does not follow, that to be a dissenter a man must maintain controversy, and evince an uncharitable spirit. But the fact, now obvious to all the world, is, that these Tracts, published in the name of the body, do make open war upon Church-of-England principles. The Puseyite sect or party, now by far the most numerous and powerful, have, in point of numbers and consistency, a just right to consider themselves as the Church of England. Their opinions and interpretations are most in conformity with the entire system. Now the Wesleyan Tracts, although asserting that they will not be an attack upon any body of Christians, are a direct attack upon these Puseyite clergy. Nor is this all. They contain details, as we have already shown, of several cherished and unquestionable principles, maintained alike by all the formularies and all the clergy of the Church of England. The body of Wesleyan Methodists are therefore now written down by their own pen, dissenters.

The clergy who choose to attack them, upon the ground of their pretended approbation of the Church of England, have had, and still have, the better side of the argument. It must be unjustifiable to continue a separation which alleges no grounds of disagreement upon either principle or practice. The law of christian union is violated by such a separation, and pronounces it a schismatical separation. The Wesleyan who can find nothing unscriptural, but all the contrary, in the system of the Established Church, ought to break through all his early association, and show that the name of Jesus Christ and his apostles has more authority with him than the name and opinions of John Wesley. The man who objects to Church principles, and conscientiously practices others, is a dissenter.

It is to be expected that the assailants of Methodism from the side of the Church will be increasingly urgent and increasingly successful. We have seen nothing in these tracts which is adapted to counteract the ironiads of Church-of-England zeal. Certainly, the attempt to defend themselves from the charge of schism or of dissent is a conspicuous failure. A more complete piece of sophistry and special pleading has rarely seen the light. It aspires to be equally learned, critical, and logical, and is altogether one of the least clear, and most inefficient of the series. The writers are, no doubt, able men in their way, and devoted admirers of Wesleyan Methodism; but they have egregiously committed themselves in supposing that they were called to write controversial tracts for the use of the controversial line. We do not perceive how they will ever again venture with seriousness to proclaim the exposition of their opinions which these tracts supply. Every Puseyite may point to the Tract No. 3, entitled "Apostolical Succession," and say, have you not denounced the principles of the Church? Every evangelical clergyman may point to

the Tract No. 4, entitled, "Wesleyan ministers true ministers of Christ," and say, have you not written against the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons? Is not the whole conference committed to a species of dissent? Fie upon you! You are endeavouring to write down our Church, as much as any dissenters in the land, and you are as determined in your separation, and as ready to defend it by argument, as any sectarian. You are as clearly guilty of setting up a peculiar Church-system as any of the sects, and you claim as full a measure of divine authority for your doctrine, discipline, and ministry as ourselves. You affirm as full a validity in your administration of sacraments as we do in ours. And yet you have the effrontery to tell us all the world, that you are neither schismatics in the Church nor dissenters from it. Now the only difference we can discern between you and others, is in the frankness with which others admit their dissent, and the flattery, equivocation, and pretended agreement with which you palliate yours. But, henceforth, your dissent is branded upon you, absolutely burnt in by your own hands. Every Churchman will view you, cannot but view you, in spite of your sophistical argumentation, mere downright dissenters from Church-of-England principles.

THE PAPAL SUPREMACY.

(By the Rev. Samuel Farner Jarvis, D.D.)

We hold the equality of the Episcopal order. Even at a late period in the fourth century, St. Jerome could boldly say, that the Church of Rome was not to be put in equipage with the whole world beside. "We must not estimate the Church of the city of Rome as one, and that of the whole world as another, Gaul and Britain, and Africa, and Persia, and the East, and India and all the barbarous nations adore Christ, and observe one rule of truth. If authority be sought for, that of the world is greater than that of the city. Whosoever there may have been a Bishop at Constantinople or at Rhegium, whether at Alexandria or at Taxis, he is of the same worth, and the same priesthood. The power of riches, the lowliness or poverty makes not a Bishop more elevated or more depressed. All are successors of the Apostles." The very antithesis between Rome and an inconsiderable city of Etruria; between Alexandria, and a village of the smallest cities of the Egyptian Delta; all owe the independence and equality of the Episcopate, to the modern doctrine of the papal supremacy, connected with it. Infallibility properly speaking, or an exemption from error, but only in its more confined prescriptive meaning, why not that of the world, rather than of a single city? Better appeal to a General Council as a last resort, than to the Pope and his consistory. Let a representation of the whole world by its Bishops and Doctors be that tribunal. How dangerous to give to the Bishop of one city with his chief clergy, and a temporal prince, the power of controlling and deciding all controversies and questions of any kind which may affect the welfare and happiness of whole states and empires! Why not go back to the original system of legislation in the Church, by Provincial Councils; all bound to hold the analogy of faith, but all competent to decide, without appeal in matters of discipline, or of forms and ceremonies, in matters of doctrine to the faith? There never was a not repugnant till the enormous power of Constantinople could effect it by bringing together at the expense, and by the force of the Roman Empire, a proper representation of the Church Catholic. And in that sense the Council of Nice, (A. D. 325) is the only really General Council, which has ever existed. No subsequent Council has been a representative body of the whole Church. That of Constantinople, (A. D. 381) consisted only of 150 Eastern Bishops. The Council of Ephesus, (A. D. 431), originally consisted of more than 270 Bishops; but it was soon reduced to 200, by the defection of the Bishop of Antioch and his adherents; and even all that remained, did not sign its decrees. The Council of Chalcedon, (A. D. 451) was more numerous attended; but the strongest representation was from those provinces, which had been the least represented at Ephesus. Why then, it may be asked, have the decrees of Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, been received as to doctrine? And the answer is easy: Because they were subsequently assented to by the great body of the Catholic Church. To these four General Councils, the Church of England, and the Protestants of the Confession of Augsburg, have solemnly given their assent. With regard to the Church of England, the fact is too well known to require any proof from me. As to the Protestants, I refer to the express declaration of Melancthon, in his answer to the seventh of the Bavarian Articles, (Opp. Tom. 1, p. 365,) and to the Corpus doctrine in the Kirchen-Ordnung of Strasburg, 1670. In the latter, it is said of these four Councils, "We acknowledge the same as pure and conformable to God's Holy Word."

There is much diversity of opinion with regard to the fifth and sixth General Councils, and the Council in Trullo, which Balsamon calls a Supplement to them; but with regard to the seventh, the second Council of Nice, (A. D. 787), which established Image-worship, the fact is undeniable, that it met with great opposition. Notwithstanding that Council was approved by Pope Adrian I., and defended by him in writing, all the Bishops of Germany, Gaul and Aquitaine, assembled in the Council of Frankfort, (A. D. 794) unanimously condemned and rejected the proceedings at Nice, touching the adoration of images. This fact proves two things. It shows that the Fathers at Frankfort, under the protection and influence of Charlemagne, were averse to Image-worship; and it also shows, that they would not submit to the decree of a Council, summoned and approved by the Pope, when they considered it as inconsistent with their duty to God.

All the following councils to that of Trent, claiming to be general, cannot be admitted, and in fact have not been admitted by any but those who are in communion with the Roman See. Even they were not agreed as to all of them, especially the Councils of Constance and Basil. The Council of Trent consisted mostly of Italian Bishops and Doctors; and an impartial man who compares the histories of Palavicini and Sarpi with the subsequent history of the Spanish Inquisition, will find that the few Bishops who dared to be independent were sacrificed to the implacable resentments of Rome.

The Court of Rome acknowledges no council to be general, but such as is called by the Pope; and taught by the example of Constance, it dreads to call, and never will call another, unless by compulsion. Such is the impression made upon my mind by what I have seen and heard. Hitherto it has obviously been the policy pursued by the principal powers of Europe to sustain the tottering and feeble throne of the Pope's temporal sovereignty; and with that, as Pius VII. himself declared in 1814, are "essentially connected."

See *altera Romani Urbis Ecclesia, altera totius Orbis existimanda est.* Et Gallia, et Britannia, et Africa, et Persia, et Oriens, et India, et omnes Barbararum nationes, unum Christum adorant, unum observant regulam veritatis. Si auctoritas quatuor, major est recte. Digibimus sancti Episcopos, sive Romae, sive Egerubii, sive Constantinopolis, sive Blagovestis, sive Alexandriae, sive Taxis, quidem merito, quidem est Saeculorum. Potentia divitiarum, et paupertas humilitatis, vel sublimiorum inferiorumque non facit. Ceterum omnes Apostolorum successores sumus. Hieron. Epist. c. ad Evangelium. Ed. Bened. Tom. iv. pars 2. col. 603.

his independence and spiritual supremacy.† So long, therefore, as his temporal power continues, there can be no hope of union. Rome will not come to us, and we cannot go to her.

THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST.

(From the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Dutch Church, revised in the National Synod held at Dordrecht in the years 1618 and 1619, used in Holland and America.)

ARTICLE 35.—OF THE HOLY SUPPER OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

We believe and confess that our Saviour Jesus Christ did ordain and institute the Sacrament of the Holy Supper, to nourish and support those whom he hath already regenerated and incorporated into his family, which is his Church. Now those who are regenerated, have in them a two-fold life, the one corporal and temporal, which they have from the first birth and is common to all men: the other spiritual and heavenly, which is given them in their second birth, which is effected by the word of the gospel, in the communion of the body of Christ; and this life is not common, but is peculiar to God's elect. In like manner God hath given us, for the support of the bodily and earthly life, earthly and common bread, which is subservient thereto, and is common to all men, even as life itself. But for the support of the spiritual and heavenly life, which believers have, he hath sent a living bread, which descended from heaven, namely, Jesus Christ, who nourishes and strengthens the spiritual life of believers, when they eat him, that is to say, when they apply and receive him by faith in the spirit. Christ, that he might represent unto us this spiritual and heavenly bread, hath instituted an earthly and visible bread as a sacrament of his body, and wine as a sacrament of his blood, to testify by them unto us, that, as certainly as we receive and hold this sacrament in our hands, and eat and drink the same with our mouths, by which our life is afterwards nourished, we also do as certainly receive by faith, (which is the hand and mouth of our soul) the true body and blood of Christ our Saviour in our souls, for the support of our spiritual life. Now, as it is certain and beyond all doubt, that Jesus Christ hath not enjoined to us the use of his sacraments in vain, so he works in us all that he represents to us by these holy signs; though the manner surpasseth our understanding, and cannot be apprehended by us, as the operations of the Holy Ghost are hidden and incomprehensible. IN THE MEAN TIME WE ERR NOT, WHEN WE SAY, THAT WHAT IS EATEN AND DRUNK BY US IS THE PROPER AND NATURAL BODY, AND THE PROPER BLOOD OF CHRIST. But the manner of our partaking of the same, is not by the mouth, but by the spirit through faith. Thus then, though Christ always sits at the right hand of his Father in the heavens, yet doth he not, therefore, cease to make us partakers of himself by faith. This feast is a spiritual table, at which Christ communicates himself with all his benefits to us, and gives us there to enjoy both himself and the merits of his sufferings and death, nourishing, strengthening and comforting our poor comfortless souls, by the eating of his flesh, quickening and refreshing them by the drinking of his blood.

(From the Reformed Dutch Church Catechism.)

29. LORD'S DAY.

Question 79. Why then doth Christ call the bread his body, and the cup his blood, or the new covenant in his blood; and Paul the "Communion of the body and blood of Christ?"

Answer. Christ speaks thus, not without great reason, namely, not only thereby to teach us that as bread and wine support this temporal life, so his crucified body and shed blood are the true meat and drink, whereby our souls are fed to eternal life; but more especially by these visible signs and pledges to assure us, that we are as really partakers of this true body and blood, (by the operation of the Holy Ghost) as we receive by the mouths of our bodies these holy signs in remembrance of him; and that all his sufferings and obedience are as certainly ours, as if we had in our own persons suffered and made satisfaction for our sins to God.

From the Presbyterian Confession of Faith.

CHAPTER 28.—SECTION 7.

Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this Sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death: the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are, to their outward senses.

From the Larger Catechism of the Presbyterian Church.

Q. 170. How do they that worthily communicate in the Lord's Supper feed upon the body and blood of Christ therein?

A. As the body and blood of Christ are not corporally or carnally present in, with, or under the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper; and yet are spiritually present to the faith of the receiver, no less truly and really than the elements themselves are to their outward senses; so they that worthily communicate in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, do therein feed upon the body and blood of Christ, not after a corporal or carnal, but in a spiritual manner; yet truly and really, while by faith they receive and apply unto themselves Christ crucified, and all the benefits of his death.

CATECHISING.

(From *The Christian Remembrancer*.)

That we, of the present day, have failed in the duty we have just mentioned, is apparent at a glance. We take our children to Church, no doubt, as soon as they are old enough to remain quiet during the service; and in this remaining quiet, we suspect most parents consider their whole part to consist. And a preliminary of course it is most useful to be learned. But what we complain of is, that we rest on it rather long.—Take a child from six to twelve, and what does he find ever done in church which has any immediate relation to him, in which he, just as he is, in reference to his age and condition, is especially concerned; or which may be naturally counted on as interesting to him. We do not say, God forbid! that parents may, and do not often succeed in interesting their children in the services of the Church as they are now performed; but it must surely be allowed that no special facilities are given them for this. And yet such ought to be given, for it is one of the distinctive glories of the gospel dispensation, that under its praise and strength are ordained out of the mouth of very sucklings; and it is here, in the services of religion, that a place may be assigned them free from all the evils which we have hitherto been considering; a place which need neither elate the religious child with a sense of peculiar distinction, nor fail to give scope to those wants and feelings—to the enthusiasm, the sympathy, the wonder, the awe, and yet rejoicing—which may be demanded by his temperament, and to the exercise in some form of which his baptism may be considered as entitling him.

It is obvious that our Church both contemplates the presence and supposes the interest of her younger

members in the public services of the sanctuary. The injunction to sponsors to call on their god-children "to hear sermons," presumes, as has been well argued, that sermons are at least frequently such as they can understand, and feel themselves concerned in. But how few clergymen are at any pains that this should be the case! How few sermons are preached in which it would be at all reasonable to demand of our children that they should be interested! Would not many of our popular preachers think it too great a condescension habitually to address the children before them in such wise as that they should listen and enter into his meaning? Would not many fear that by doing so frequently they would alienate and disgust their adult congregations? How far the clergymen who are unwilling to preach the gospel, and the laymen who are unwilling to hear it preached, to Christ's little ones, can be said to have become like little children, we must leave themselves to determine. But we think that a clergyman who feels the icy fetters of a doctrinalism brought on, it may be, by his necessary occupations, but still no healthy consequence thereof, may be glad to avail himself of this, as one special way of freshening religious truth in his mind, of ceasing for a while to view it in its logical and antagonistic relations, and of announcing and making himself to feel it in its liveliness and its power. And what applies to the preacher applies to his congregation likewise. In an age of controversy and doctrinalism, they, too, may be benefited by having heavenly truth presented to them, not only in the liveliest, but in the universally true and applicable form, the form in which we should look at them supposing there had been no controversies about them. And that this effect may be counted on, is perhaps to be inferred from the sudden and earnest attention of the whole congregation whenever the preacher tries the experiment. May it not be thought, too, that by insisting on the duties of children, we can hardly fail to call attention also to those of their parents towards them, correlates as these for the most part are? Surely, then, the experiment is worth trying; surely, too, it is not very hard to try. The festivals of the Church give abundant materials for addressing ourselves to children from the pulpit, granting that doing so may not at present be generally convenient on ordinary Sundays. Christmas, the Holy Innocents, the Epiphany, the Annunciation, the Ascension, and All Saints give obvious facilities, and supply abundant thoughts to lay before the young.

But, besides that our preaching was obviously designed to take their interests into consideration, there is an ordinance of the Church expressly appointed for her younger members, and neglected (most sinfully we think), by a fearful majority of the clergy—that of catechising. The ends of the Church Catechism are by no means accomplished, nor the consciences of the priesthood clear in regard to it, merely by taking order that it be learned by the young of our flocks, or even explained up to the usual amount by masters and Sunday-school teachers, as we trust now to show.

If we wished to vindicate the English Reformation from the all but unmitigated censure to which it is now sometimes subjected, we might, out of a copious selection of materials, be contented with appealing to the Church Catechism as one of its results. That surely could have been no such unathletic time, as we have heard it pronounced, which produced so noble a digest of catholic truth, so comprehensive a summary of saving knowledge. Never before was any branch of the Church entrusted with so wonderful an organ of her prophetic office as the Anglican received in the fifteenth century, when this invaluable document was placed in her hands. The theology of the Catechism will, we are sure, be found to grow on us in proportion as it is studied; and whoever will be the devout and earnest catechist himself. Now here is a post assigned to the young, and provision made for them, in the services of the sanctuary, of which they are shamefully defrauded. It is not enough to say that the children of the poor learn their Catechisms at school, and those of the rich at home; for good that may be in itself, it is no substitute for what the Church intended the ordinance of catechising to be.

In the first place, what we want is to find a place in church for our children of whatever rank. Simply as Christian children, there would, as we think all will admit, be little use in sending those of the rich to a Sunday-school; for no real union between them and those of the poor would be effected thereby, and no instruction imparted such as they would not probably receive far more satisfactorily elsewhere. And—shall we confess the truth?—Sunday-schools are not special favourites of ours. We deny not their necessity in populous places, where the principles and habits of parents are often such as to make it desirable for their children to pass the Lord's Day anywhere but under their roof. But this argument for them, valid though it be where it applies at all, prestimes anomaly and evil. It is itself false in principle to separate a child from his parents and family during more than half the Sunday. And then what a strain on his attention! He is at school or at work six days of the week, and at that which ought to bring rest and refreshment we make him come twice to another school, and demand two attendances on the full services of the Church. Is this the way to make religion attractive to him?

Now, leaving for a while those unnatural populations which we have sinfully allowed to amass themselves neglected and untalented, till their whole condition and our relation to them has become an aching perplexity, let us suppose an ordinary rural parish, neither better nor worse than the majority of such. Of course its Pastor will not find it the Arcadia he pictured to himself, whilst ground down by the marriages, churchings, burials, register-searchings, and committees of a large town, or whilst picking his steps through its noisome alleys. Of course he will not find the fresh pure air that now surrounds him a type that may be relied on of the moral purity of the place. Of course, he may lay his count on difficulties and discouragements enough. But still in such a place, there will be no need of anomalous expedients. The great laws of nature may require reinforcement, but they have not altogether given way. Family feeling is still strong, and a judicious pastor will hold it his duty to strengthen it yet further. What, then, can he do in furtherance of our present aim?

We really think that the rubric and canons will supply him with all the guidance for which he need ask. Let him, instead of the evening sermon, catechise after the second lesson. Of course it will be found important that this ordinance, being public and liturgical, should be conducted gravely and without untoward accidents. The children, therefore, whom he questions, should be those on whose answers he can safely account; and he will be enabled to make the selection by his observations in the previous catechising before evening prayer, enjoined by Canon 59, in addition to his general knowledge of them. He will also put leading questions in following up the hints of the Catechism, such as shall win the answer from an ordinarily intelligent child, and by forcing him, notwithstanding, to a slight exercise of thought, shall fix the truth brought out firmly in his recollection. He will also make remarks himself, read passages of Scripture illustrative of the subject in hand, and in short, really preach directly to the children, but virtually to all present. Those who have observed the interest which the poor sometimes take in listening to catechising, will feel little doubt that the benefits of this particular ministration of God's holy word, are not likely

* All but the last section of the Catechism was produced during the crisis which we call the Reformation.

† Equissus sur Pie VII. et sup. p. 132