

The Church.

VOLUME VI.—No. 39.]

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, MARCH 31, 1843.

[WHOLE NUMBER, CCXCIX.]

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

(From The English Churchman.)

In our first number we instanced the loose, random way in which sectarian bodies were endeavouring, at the present moment, to bring out some sort of unity, as a testimony, were such requisite, to the catholic doctrine of the "one-holy Church, the communion of saints;" and this with more especial reference to the projected union between the great Scotch schism and the motley body of English dissenters. We now resume the subject with some details of the compromise to be effected among the dissenters themselves.

We have already in these columns pointed out the fearful state of schism which reigns in the principality of Wales. In the latter part of the year 1841, the active-minded Bishop of Llandaff consecrated a church at Aberystwyth, and, on this occasion, and in another sermon preached at Newport, he threw out a sort of challenge, like Jewell's at Paul's cross, to the dissenters, to produce scriptural or patriotic authority for "self-constituted teachers, for renunciation of episcopal rule, and for falling into seats each with its peculiar title and its favourite leader." This challenge was answered by Mr. Edward White, a Congregationalist teacher at Cardiff, in a very interesting lecture, "The Union of the Religions."

With this publication we were very much pleased: it is respectful to the Bishop, excellent in temper, candid and kind, and it forms a most pleasing exception to the publications which emanate from the same quarter. The union which Mr. White finds in the New Testament is *subjective* only: he denies the visibility of the Church; and finds true union to consist solely in a common regeneration, justification, sanctification, (of course attaching his own sense to these terms), and christian hope: and, above all, he requires the mark and test of holiness. The only criticism which we intend to pass upon Mr. White, is the earnest wish that he may go on in that obedience which he so warmly and impressively teaches. The road to true unity, and to the full apprehension of all doctrines, lies through holiness alone: he will soon feel the need of that which the Church alone is accredited to give: the better a sectarian grows, the nearer he is to us. That this gentleman is no ordinary dissentist, the following quotations from his interesting lecture will show:

"On the other hand, however, as has been already acknowledged, we are perfectly aware that there is a large body of men in connection with the religious establishments of the country, who are heartily and intelligently convinced of the truth of their opinions, apart from any accidental considerations of influence or interest. There are minds which habitually contemplate the establishment as one vast and glorious Cathedral, spreading over the length and breadth of the kingdom. From south to north their imaginations, as it were, look down one adorned and lofty avenue of sacred architecture, prolonged with sculptured memorials of former generations of the brave and the good, and terminated at the extreme verge by the dim religious light of embowed windows, casting their coloured radiance around. The combined voices of the liturgical priests, in the daily ministrations, fall upon their ears as the deep melodious tones of a mighty organ, whose harmonies linger in the fretted roofs, and float beyond our rocky shores upon the wings of the wind,—and they regard the great high ARCHITECTURE of the Church, as the pillars of the temple, as it is impossible, but that to minds like these, the stubborn nonconformity of the Dissenters should appear even far more odious than the sacrilege of the armies of the Commonwealth, who profaned with tasteless bigotry the structures of the hierarchy, and pillaged the time-honoured tombs of Westminster Abbey. It seems inevitable, that in the view of such persons, our professed desire to dissolve the connexion between the State and the Church should be chargeable with all the disgusting attributes of faction and profaneness. If they speak of us with bitterness, we can hardly be surprised—if they treat us with the shrinking abhorrence due to criminals, and the robbers of temples, it is only that which we had to expect. Strong in the parity of their intentions, and animated by the spirit of joy and respect for love, we esteem the exercises of such affection towards them as an instance of a wonderful liberality, but simply as the natural productions of an enlightened heart. Let us seek to read our own minds, and to be satisfied with the use of the society of all orders of Christians, so far as they may condescend to permit it, hoping thus to banish gradually those chilling suspicions and rivalries which so frequently separate, 'sinfully separate,' the followers of God. As one denomination in Christendom, we assuredly have much to learn, and much to unlearn. Very far distant be the day when the world shall be obliged to depend, for its views of God and of primitive Christianity, alone upon the doctrines and practices which prevail amongst ourselves. Let us hope and pray for better times, for a purer catholicity; and whilst forgotten errors are reviving in terrific power, and all opinions are about to be sifted by the revolutions which are lowering in the horizon, let us display that courageous zeal which is *love in action*, and which will secure the approval of the Almighty at the judgment day."—*Union of the Religions*, pp. 22-24.

Mr. White, however, developed no systematic plan of union; indeed, we venture to say, that his avowed experience of the imperfections of the various schismatical bodies in that especial note upon which he insists—viz. personal holiness, would alone have prevented him from mooting any scheme of comprehension. This, indeed, is our own point; that we must first be good, and then we shall be one: "first pure, then peaceable." However, other and more reckless talkers have no such misgivings.

Last Autumn, "the representatives of the Congregational Union of England and Wales," a sort of caricature of a synod, met at Liverpool; and part of their business, we humbly think not the least onerous portion, was to listen to a sermon, "The Intercommunity of Churches," by Mr. Richard Winter Hamilton, a dissenting teacher of Leeds. Were we in a merry mood, or did we desire to make our readers laugh, we should need no better materials than a few extracts from this choice composition. To admirers of "originality" in English, and to the curious in scholarship, we commend very heartily this remarkable specimen of "congregational" eloquence and taste: in his way, though somewhat an erratic one, Mr. R. W. Hamilton is quite a curiosity. Hear him, for example, discussing the corporate nature of the Church, the members of which, our Lord's mystical body, he has discovered to be Churches (that is, self-opposed and contradictory sects), and not persons, as we have always been taught:

"Where were the body? The contrivance which we now behold? the sentient and the muscular? the featured countenance, each feature an inlet or an egress for the indwelling soul? the eye, sending up a beam to mingle with the stars? the brow, piled into its sovereign throne; the ear, that arch vibrating to every sound? the tongue, voicing the endless inflections of language? the lever arm? the hand which grasps a weapon and waxes a tear? the whole firmly set, and majestically poised, upon the foot which spins the earth?"—*Intercommunity of Churches*, p. 4.

And then a vast deal about "filaments, vesicles, ducts, pores, articulation," &c. &c. And for his scholarship, the discovery that the angels of the seven churches mean only "the messengers by whom each letter was conveyed" (p. 18), will perhaps be sufficient.

Mr. Hamilton does not condescend to develop a scheme of union; indeed, as far as we can make him out, he only wishes to cultivate more friendly and brotherly intercourse between the separate sub-sections

of that section of schism to which he belongs; for, from his own showing, these "congregational churches" have been hitherto, in the widest sense of their name, Independent—independent, that is, of each other, as we fear that they are of Christ—and have been mixed up with (we quote the preacher's own words) "scandalous impositions," "an itinerant mendicancy," and "certain deterioration of character," p. 41. But he enunciates principles upon which "all who love the Lord Jesus" may unite; they are these:

"There is, we believe, a just intercommunity to be carried on among all who may be placed in most different relative circumstances of denomination and party,—intercommunity of kindly approaches, loving offices and generous aids,—intercommunity of brotherly sympathy, mutual faith and reciprocal worship,—intercommunity of mutual regard, mutual respect, mutual confidence, and seeking with ready solicitude each other's good,—intercommunity as much ashamed of exacting compromise, as determinedly refusing it,—intercommunity without crossing another's chosen path, or abandoning our own discipline, for why should worship, conducted in our own way, be considered as breaking up Christian unity any more than worshipping in different places?—why should Christian unity be destroyed by worshipping in more than one form; and not by worshipping in more than one place?"—*Methodist Magazine*, Jan. 1843, pp. 38, 39.

So also that hybrid body, the Wesleyan Society, or, as they call themselves, "the Methodist Church," (a term against which Mr. Hamilton stoutly reclaims,) advocates the same licence:

"The Bishop of London ought to have hailed as fellow-labourers all the ministers of all the congregations regularly appointed according to their respective forms of discipline, for why should worship, conducted in a different manner, be considered as breaking up Christian unity any more than worshipping in different places?—why should Christian unity be destroyed by worshipping in more than one form; and not by worshipping in more than one place?"—*Methodist Magazine*, Jan. 1843, pp. 38, 39.

If ever dissenters are to unite, it will be on the principle of the Bible Society; and if our readers wish to assure themselves how irreligious and heathenish such a principle is, we refer them to a little tract just published, "Is the Bible Society contrary to the Bible and hostile to the Church?" and it may be sufficient to remind these persons, that one mark of the pentecostal church, was that they "continued steadfast in—the prayers, προσευχαι, προσευχαι, προσευχαι, τας προσευχαις,"—that the apostolic prayer was, "that they all speak the same thing, that they all be perfectly joined together, that there be no divisions among them," and that "they might with one mouth glorify;"—above all, where, among these discordant elements, is the "one faith," the apostolic condition of unity?

It is but little to the purpose to say, that, with all their differences, "all the denominations" agree in fundamentals. This is not true, for there is not a single article of the creed, not one point of faith upon which Christians, so called, existing at the present moment as detached and separate bodies, do not differ: there is not—it would not be too much to say—one single text of scripture, saving, of course, mere historical narrative, upon the interpretation of which all parties, or all "Churches," would or could agree. To prove that separation is, after all, only for non-essentials, it would be satisfactory to see a list of Christian doctrines upon which all men are agreed; not upon which all should be agreed, but upon which all are agreed. Are Mr. Hamilton and Dr. Hannah prepared with this? granting even that it were true that each separate body were wrong only in one single point, yet taking them all collectively, which is the only test of the projected union, they are wrong upon all. If they are to meet, it can only be by a general surrender of every so-called fundamental doctrine successively.

But let us take courage: if Satan is marshalling his hosts, if evil men are combining against the Church, let us rather realize the "great dangers we are in from our unhappy divisions," and if discussion be our punishment, and the secret poison which pollutes everything which we touch, which blasts all our best energies, which cripples every missionary scheme, let us learn to "live after God's commandments," and then, but not till then, we may count upon being more one. Anyhow, dissenters are now passing through a solemn sifting; Christian unity is not a thing to be handled as a mere theory; men cannot take up and apply our Lord's last and holiest prayer (John xv. 20, 21), as every one of the writers before us has done, and not be either much better or much worse for it; much worse, certainly, if they only use it as a mere catch-word to defend themselves; much better, if they are content to follow where He leads. May God help them in this their hour of trial! they shall, at least, have our prayers.

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

IS IT "PUSEYISM"?

(By a Correspondent of The Dublin Christian Examiner.)

Dear Sir,—I am convinced that there are many who will most abatingly reply to the above query in the affirmative; yea, some who will feel extreme surprise that the matter should be supposed to admit of even the shadow of a doubt.

Now, Sir, it was because I believe that there is a great deal of misconception abroad on the subject, that I proposed to your readers, in your number of last October the question—"What is Puseyism?" And I was in hopes that some person more competent than myself would have come forward in reply, and would have afforded a sound and useful answer to my query. Were information as to the real errors of the Puseyite school more widely diffused, it would save many a sound and consistent churchman—sound in doctrine and consistent in practice—from the opprobrious nick-name so unsparingly applied by the uninitiated.

Perhaps there is no doctrine which is more generally looked upon as a sure and infallible mark of Puseyism, than the doctrine of APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION. That dissenters and schismatics of all shades and hues should object to it, and write against it, is hardly to be wondered at (though I believe very few among them, who recognise any orders at all, will allow the layman's right to ordain); but that clergymen who have signed the twenty-third article of the church, or that even well-instructed lay members of the church, should object to the doctrine in question, is to me a matter of no little surprise. However, as it is objected to, and not seldom styled Puseyism; and as it seems to be very generally imagined, that any man who holds it, must necessarily be unsound on the great and vital point of JUSTIFICATION, I shall, with your kind permission, endeavour—first, to state what is meant by apostolic succession, and—secondly, proceed to prove that the very highest degree of that doctrine—for it admits of degrees—may be held in connection with that sound view of justification put forth in our Articles and Homilies.

I. Mr. Faber's has given five different possible meanings of the term—apostolic succession—of which the following are sufficient for my purpose. He says—"It may mean the succession of the clergy,

carried on from the time of the apostles by commissions mainly and generally derived from the bishops, viewed as a distinct order by the presbyters. Though the power of ordination be not so exclusively confined to the episcopate, but that in case of some inevitable necessity, the function may be exercised by the presbyterate." Or, "it may mean the succession of the clergy, carried down from the apostolic age, by commissions derived from the bishops exclusively; the power of ordination being so absolutely and simply given to the bishops alone in their special episcopal character, that no circumstances, of whatever sympathy, or of whatever apparent necessity, save a miraculous call from heaven, like that of St. Paul, can make any other ordination valid; and consequently, that without episcopal ordination, there can be no apostolic succession, no legitimate clergy, no beneficial sacraments, no real church."

The first of these definitions Mr. Faber says, "is that which is apparently favoured by the Church of England;" the other, "that which is prominently and rigidly advocated by the tract writers and their adherents."

II. The second of the above meanings, that which Mr. Faber states to be the doctrine of the tract writers (but from which, I may as well mention, I myself differ, preferring the former one), is the very highest degree of the doctrine in question; and it is that view of the doctrine, which if any view of it is opposed to a sound conception of the doctrine of justification, must be the most opposed. It remains then to examine, whether this rigid view is opposed, or incompatible with, a sound judgment on the vital point of justification.

It will be at once allowed, that the more this examination is removed from writers of the present day, the better; and, therefore, as I intend to produce but one witness, he shall be one who departed this life more than a century ago.

The eminently learned and pious Bishop Beveridge, in his valuable work on the Thirty-nine Articles, recently re-published, writes thus on the twenty-third article:—"Now though there be but one God men are called to this office by, yet there be two ways which he is pleased to call them in. Some he calls immediately from himself, without men; others, immediately from himself, by men. The first manner of calling to this sacred office, the prophets and apostles had; and as they were called immediately by Christ, so were others called immediately by them. So that Christ called the apostles; the apostles, by the appointment of the same Christ, called others to succeed them; they again others; and so there hath been a succession of lawful ministers ever since, which, though they were not all called immediately by Christ, yet they were all called by him; yea, and all others are their successors, who had their immediate call from him. So that none are now lawful ministers, but such as are thus called by him; and all that are thus called by him, are lawful ministers—I mean all such as are called by such as succeed them in the ministry, who were called immediately by Christ himself."—Vol. ii. p. 187. Ed. 1840.

In the above extract—which, owing to the style, requires to be read attentively—the necessity of succession from those who were immediately called by Christ, is strongly stated; but the question still remains, by what channel must that succession flow? May it come through a Presbyterian channel? or must it come through an episcopal channel?

On this point the bishop seems very decidedly in favour of the necessity of an episcopal channel. The whole of his comment on the thirty-sixth article, which is far too long to be quoted, is in support of this rigid view. He asserts his willingness to abide by the decisions of the early church, and then proceeds to prove that the only ordination allowed, or accounted valid in the primitive church, was episcopal ordination. To the same effect, in his sermon on the words, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." He says that these words "cannot possibly be fulfilled, unless there be apostles, or persons vested with the apostolic office, always unto the end of the world;" and then proceeds to show that the bishops, who have, and who alone have the power of ordaining, are the successors of the apostles. And further on, he makes two remarks worthy of attention: First—that "we should be thankful, who 'live in a church, where the apostolic line hath, through all ages, been preserved entire, there having been a constant succession of such bishops in it, as were truly and properly successors to the apostles, by virtue of that apostolic imposition of hands." And, secondly—respecting schism, he says, "in the private meetings, where their teachers have no apostolic or episcopal imposition of hands, they have no ground to pretend to succeed the apostles, nor by consequence any right to the Spirit which our Lord here promises; without which, although they preach their heart out, I cannot see what spiritual advantage can accrue to their hearers by it."

Were such sentiments uttered from the pulpit now, sir, what an outcry would there be raised at the Puseyism of the preacher! And, doubtless, some Christian recorder of the calumny, would tell us how the congregation left the church, and how properly they acted in so doing. For it would be taken for granted that no man holding such opinions could also hold correct Church-of-England views on that test of a standing or a falling church, JUSTIFICATION. Let us then once more consult the worthy bishop, and hear his opinions on this truly vital point. In his comment on the eleventh article, he says—"There (in article tenth) we see we could not be made righteous, but by God's grace imputed to us: here we see we cannot be accounted righteous, but by Christ's merits imputed to us." Are we accounted righteous by Adam's sin imputed to us? Are we accounted righteous by Christ's righteousness imputed to us? Are we made righteous also by Adam's sin inherent in us? Are we made righteous also by Christ's righteousness imputed to us? His Spirit being ours for the sanctification, as well as Adam's sin was ours for the corruption of our natures; and his merit ours for the justification, as well as Adam's transgression is ours for the condemnation of our persons." "It is not by *inherence* of grace in us, but by the *imputation* of righteousness to us, that we are justified; as it is not by the *imputation* of righteousness to us, but by the *inherence* of grace in us, that we are sanctified." Again, in a note, referring to Rom. iv. 3, he says—"Therefore the righteousness that is here said *λογισθηται*, is not any thing in ourselves to whom it is imputed, but in him who doth impute it." Further on, he says, "He was accounted as a sinner for us, and therefore he was condemned; we are accounted as righteous in him, and therefore we are justified." "The acts of justification and sanctification are two distinct things; for the one denotes the *imputation* of righteousness to us, the other denotes the *imputation* of righteousness in us." "By our sanctification we are made righteous in ourselves, but not accounted righteous before God; but by our justification we are accounted righteous by God, but not made righteous in ourselves."

Now, sir, if the essence of Puseyism be (as I believe it to be, and as Bishop M'Ilvaine has proved) an erroneous view of justification—a putting made righteous for accounted righteous—the prelate who wrote the foregoing extracts, cannot be considered as a

† [We must take the liberty of differing from Mr. Faber, and of agreeing with Bishop Beveridge. The view cannot be "right," if true—for rigorous injustice, and injustice cannot spring from truth. Neither do we think that Mr. Faber correctly represents the judgment of the Church of England on this point. See an able article, in our last number by the Rev. A. B. Chapin.—Ed. Ck.]

Puseyite, by anticipation, even though he held the most rigid view of APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION; and therefore I think, that in reply to my query, is apostolic succession Puseyism? I am fairly entitled to answer—no.

KIAKAN.

THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT.

(By a Correspondent of The Irish Ecclesiastical Journal.)

Sir,—I have never seen the principle of Teetotalism (as it is absurdly called) discussed, as it bears upon the practice and principles of the Christian religion. In the present times, when Teetotalism is so popular, and those of the clergy who conscientiously disapprove of the principle, are so violently assailed, it may be of some use to examine the question. This I propose to do as concisely as I can; stating my objections, and answering the arguments of the advocates of the system. It can hardly be said that Teetotalism ought not to be opposed, because it is productive of so much physical good; yet this is a favourite argument of its advocates. But what does it amount to? to nothing more or less than this, that the end sanctifies the means. That the means are unsound, it will not be difficult to prove.

In the first place, by this system religion is thrown overboard indirectly. The members of this Society practise a Christian virtue, because they belong to this Society, instead of doing so upon the grand and only valuable principle, that the not observing it is in direct opposition to the commands of God. Their answer to this, that they attach themselves to the Teetotal Society as a help to obey this command of God. Against this it may be said, that if a man gives up a sin when he joins a society, though it may be impressed upon him, that his doing so is meant as a help to keep God's commandment, yet in his mind, (I allude more particularly to the lower and less educated orders,) the joining the Society, and the giving up the sin, become inseparably connected, and in this particular case the Teetotal Society gets the credit of effecting that, which should be attributed to the grace of God.

Again, in asserting that they cannot give up the sin without the help of a society, they strike at the root of God's preventing grace, which is sufficient to overcome any sin. St. Paul, when in an agony of despair, he exclaimed, "wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?" that is, probably, from the lusts of the flesh, and more particularly, perhaps, some besetting sin, exclaimed, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." We can avoid deadly sins, such as fornication; disgraceful sins, such as theft; and, in fact, all the more notorious sins, without the aid of anti-fornication, anti-stealing societies; and yet we are told that we cannot resist smaller sins, so to speak (I mean sins so not disgraceful in the world's eye), without the aid of a society. "And can a man by the spirit of God, and right reason, by fear and hope, conquer (viality, and beat the sons of the giant; and cannot he overcome the little children of Gath, or is it harder to overcome a little sin than a great one—are not the temptations to little sins very little? and yet are they greater and stronger than a mighty gale? could the poor demagogue, who lived in the graves, by the power of the devil, break his iron chains in pieces? and cannot he who has the spirit of God dissolve the chains of sin." "Through Christ who strengtheneth me I can do all things," says St. Paul.

Another great objection is, that this system is not supported or recommended by the Church. The only legitimate guide of any moral system, if that can be called such, which only produces physical good.

Another objection is, that no man is obliged to abridge his Christian liberty by binding himself totally to abstain from one of God's gifts, the use of which, as well as of food, may be sanctified by prayer. Here, again, the Teetotalist's argument is unavailing; for he argues against the use of a thing from its abuse. If we were bound to abstain from the use of every thing that is abused, we must abstain from the whole system of life; we must all at once put an end to ourselves! They say that intoxicating liquors, i. e. things, the abuse of which, produces evil, are unnatural. What are not tobacco and snuff unnatural, in a degree far beyond that of the juice of the grape? The most zealous advocates of the Teetotal Societies that I know live in an atmosphere of smoke, and use an excessive quantity of snuff.

One of the worst features in the system is to be found in the length that these over-zealous men go in supporting their favourite system; in actually denying the first miracle performed by our Saviour, the changing the water into wine at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee. They say it was not fermented liquor! Profane quibbles! If it was not, where was the miracle? An infidel might say, that any juggler, who knew a little of chemistry, could produce from water a liquor of the colour of wine. Oh! is not this blaspheming the word of God?

Another objection is, that the temperance vow is virtually a superseding of the baptismal vow. "They vowed by their godfathers and godmothers, in the august temple of God, with the utmost solemnity of ceremony, and the direct agency of the Holy Ghost; and at confirmation with equal solemnity, they took it upon themselves to renounce the devil and all his works." (Many a victim has drunkness given to the devil.) Yet, in spite of this solemn vow, do they say, "unless we bind ourselves by a fresh one, we cannot be sober, and we will try and do by the help of this one, what God did not enable us to do by the old one." Their answer to this, that human society is cemented by pledges of every kind. Such as those in bonds, indentures, promissory notes, and matrimony. The cases are totally dissimilar. In one set of cases the pledges are exacted to bring the parties within the limits of the civil law; and in matrimony, the parties entering upon a new sphere of life, and placed in novel positions, pledge themselves to observe the conditions required by their new circumstances. Why should a man join a society to practise one particular virtue, and not another? If he intends to become sober, why need he go and proclaim it in the market-place, and tell all the town or village, "I am going to keep one of God's commandments?" In God's name let him keep it: let him abstain entirely, if he cannot take a little without being tempted to exceed: but with the retiring humility of a true follower of the lowly Jesus, let him not trumpet forth, with cards and medals, banners and green ribbons, that he acts as his Lord commands him: let him not at temperance Teetotal tea-parties uncharitably denounce every one who conscientiously disapproves of such a wholesale manufacture of Christian-firt-me, and drink strong tea till morning.

I will now briefly consider an argument confidently brought forward by its admirers. It is this, that a sober man is more likely to hear reason, and to profit by it, than a drunkard. This is the case, no doubt, while the individual is under the influence of intoxication. But I would answer, that in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred, the Teetotalist becomes sober, without the religion of the thing ever once entering into his head. Its temporal evils are, no doubt, vividly brought before his notice. It was asserted at a temperance party meeting, "that before the temperance movement com-

menced, no peasant sat down to his dry potato without a naggin of spirits before him to wash it down." But I never heard (and from my avocation I am much in the way of such matters) of such an inducement as this, being pressed home to the drunkard urged to take the pledge: "if you continue drunk you will go to hell." Drunkards shall not inherit the Kingdom of heaven. And is not religion injured by this? For, the individual sees the good results of sobriety, I mean its temporal and physical ones, and he attributes all, if he be a Romanist, to Father Mathew, the Apostle of Temperance,—as he is blasphemously called by many of all persuasions,—and if he be a Protestant, so called, he ascribes it to the Temperance Society movement, of which Father Mathew is the main power. And what becomes of religion? The Bible tells us, that it is better to be hot or cold than lukewarm: that is, that a man who is living willfully in sin, cannot but know, unless he pretends to be an infidel, that if he so continues, he must eternally perish; and so has some motive to arouse him: but that if he lives in no special willful sin, he may say, "I am not as other men, I am no murderer, no adulterer, no drunkard!" he may thus live on, fancying himself secure, without a religious principle at all actuating him. And is he not more likely thus to live on thinking himself safe, than the man who knows that he is insecure? May not the drunkard, in his sober moments, be more likely to hear reason, and to feel it, than the sober man (sober from a worldly motive) who sinks it, thinking that he has no need of it?

Lastly: let it not be forgotten that there is a Temperance (properly so called) Society, which was founded some eighteen hundred and forty-two years ago, the members of which, at their admission, bind themselves to be temperate, not in one thing, but in all things, to abstain from every thing sinful. We all, I trust, are members of this Society, at the head of which is no frail mortal. No! it is our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and under his guidance and grace, are in existence to this day, his officers, appointed in unbroken succession from himself, to rule this Society, and declare their master's will, and preach universal temperance. I have confined myself entirely to the bearing of this movement on religion, omitting its political complexion, and leaving untouched Roman Catholic Teetotalism. G. F. G.

THE VISITATION OF THE SICK.

(From a Charge delivered in 1710, to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. Asaph, by Bishop Fleetwood.)

This is so tender a part of the office of a Parish Priest, that even good nature and compassion are as ready to excite him to the due discharge of it, as the sense of duty and the injunctions of authority can be. But when they join, no considerations can be wanting to enforce the carefullest attention to this good part of Visiting the Sick. Surely men are never more in earnest, never more truly sensible of their everlasting concern, than when they lie upon the bed of sickness, and believe they are going to give an account to God of all their past life. Then, therefore, is the time when they will gladliest hear your prayers, attentively consider your advice, bear your reproofs, and hearken to your admonitions, exhortations, and instructions; then are they readiest to confess their sins, promise amendment, and submission to the laws of Christ. Then, therefore, is the season of applying to them, with most success, in such discourses as you find most proper for their state and condition; whether it be to bring them to a sense and acknowledgement of their past offences, to work in them such shame and sorrow as befits them; such purposes of satisfaction and amend, (where it can possibly be done,) as will testify they have brought forth fruits meet for repentance, and such firm resolutions of amendment for the future, that they and you may have great comfort in them, whether they live or die; or whether it be to strengthen them in their faith, clear up their doubts, and encourage them against all causeless fears, distrust of their condition, and despondency.

I would not have the Clergy to be busybodies nor meddlers with other people's matters, especially their temporal and domestic concerns; because it gives men great distaste, and does disservice to them in the main; but yet, unless they be most diligent and heedful observers of the lives and manners of their people, they will neither preach pertinently to them in their churches, nor discourse properly in their houses, nor rightly apply to them on their sick beds. To do these patients the best service, one must thoroughly know, and be well acquainted with, their condition. If shame, or pride, or vanity, or other reason, should cause them to conceal their state, and talk in general only (as the case too often happens), yet your acquaintance with their practice will help you to speak plainly to them, and your duty will oblige you to be particular, in all points that are necessary. Whereas, if the sick be silent, or conceal himself, and the minister be ignorant how things have passed, the visit will be mere formality, and useless to them both. I would not, therefore, have the practice of sending for a strange or neighbouring minister, on these occasions, encouraged beyond what is necessary. The parish priest is much the fittest person to be used in this service, because he is presumed to know the parties best, and consequently can best fit his exhortations to the present necessities. In cases, indeed, where the sick have something secret to impart, and would unburthen their conscience, and receive either satisfaction of some doubts, or absolution, I cannot but believe they are at liberty to send for whom they please, and the Clergy at liberty to go, and serve them to their utmost. But in all other cases, which are ordinary, where neither secrecy nor greater skill are required, I should be glad the people would always send for their own ministers, and that the Clergy should make some scruple of invading their brother's office on these occasions, when they know he is in the way, and within reach, and ready to do his duty. They will, I hope, be ever tender of each other's credit, and will contribute nothing (which they can avoid) to the bringing any disrespect on any one; nor should the people be encouraged in the opinion, that one man's service is so preferable to another's, in matters of this nature, where all depends upon the grace of God, and the good disposition of the recipients, or the parties administered to, and nothing at all upon the goodness of the minister, though he were holy as John the Baptist. But can I slip this opportunity of saying, that, though I know this is an error of the people, and wish the prejudice were wholly rooted up out of their minds, yet I believe it never was, nor ever will be otherwise! The Clergy who live best, will not only evermore be best esteemed by all men (that is their due, and always will be paid), but men will always think their ministerial service to be much more efficacious than that of others, and will be always more desirous of it, and in the time of sickness more than any other.

I know not how to rectify this error, but I know how it may be turned to God, and made subservient to the best of purposes, and that will be by living holily; for then the people will desire our prayers, and covet earnestly our spiritual service, and believe us more effectually when we apply to them: and though they should be mistaken, yet we shall be the better, and reap the fruits and rewards of being so. But where will those unhappy ministers appear, who, by their wicked and licentious lives, have given such

scandal and offence to their congregations, that they abhor the sacrifice of the Lord, and know not how to send for them, or ask their prayers.—*Do have themselves tried, as it were, without God in the world?* What a discouragement must it needs be to poor people from calling for the minister to dispose them for death, when they have known him live as if there were no after-reckoning to be made? But with what face, what heart, can he prepare them for the sacrament, by exhorting them to a lively faith, and most sincere repentance, who seems, to them, to have no sense of either? The people are, in truth, too slack in calling for the assistance of their pastors, upon these occasions, even when they are sober, virtuous, godly men, and every way qualified to do their service; but who can bear the burthen of that guilt that makes it seem so reasonable for people not to send for, or admit that service? Some few there are, I doubt, of this bad class; God, of his goodness, shorten, every day, their number, by giving them the grace of true repentance; that they may save themselves and those that hear them. But where the people are slack and negligent, there I advise the minister to find his opportunity, and visit without being sent for, for fear he should not be sent for at all, or sent for, as the manner often is, when it is too late. The friends and relations of the sick are, indeed, obliged to give the minister notice when it is most convenient he should come: when are the intervals of greater ease, from pain or sickness; when they are most awake and sensible; and when the operations of medicines best permit: want of this information may make a visit troublesome; if not entirely useless, besides the loss of time and pains, which in some cases is not inconsiderable. I do not, therefore, judge a minister to be always in fault, when some of his parishioners have died without his visiting them: it may be he had no notice of their illness, or was not called by those who should have done that good office for their friend or relation. He must be always ready and disposed to go, and he must do it freely, without asking, and without expecting any manner of reward, for fear that consideration should hinder poor people from requiring his prayers and assistance in their last extremities, which they want, and would be glad to have, but cannot bear the charge of. This is an age of such corruption, that though I hope nothing like it has reached so far as Wales, yet I cannot choose but give warning of it to all with whom I have anything to do.

As to the business of Absolution, in this office, as it is a matter of great moment, so is it also thought of some difficulty to know when it is to be applied. The conditions of it are, the truly repenting, and unfeignedly believing the gospel. The difficulty of applying it arises from the difficulty of knowing when men truly repent, and when they unfeignedly believe. And I must needs say, that it is not in any man's power to know, with any certainty, when this is truly done; we must take men's words for it, and depend upon the professions they make; and though we may pass a wrong judgment, and pronounce a sentence that will not stand before the great Judge, yet we shall do it without hazard to ourselves, provided the sick penitent make, at that time, a special confession of his sins and humbly and heartily desire the priest or minister to give him absolution. These are the directions the Church gives in the Rubrics of this office, which, if carefully read and well observed, I know not what great difficulty the priest will find about pronouncing the absolution. I will end this article with a short charge, that the performance of this office, with such a serious, grave, and compassionate concern as the sick person's case requires, does usually draw with it a greater degree of esteem and love, from those who behold and hear it, than the performance of other offices is wont to do; and I have known it engage men in a very serviceable friendship to their minister for ever after. Under this head, I think it proper to say, that the minister remind such people as have in their sickness desired the prayers of the congregation, to return their thanks as publicly to God, for his restoring them to their health.

LENT REFLECTIONS.

(From The Philadelphia Episcopal Recorder.)

"The burning bush" was not so "GREAT A SIGHT" as that to which the eye of every believer is especially directed during this Holy Lenten Season. The Church calls upon her children now to turn aside and contemplate the MAN OF SORROWS, and gather from what they behold lessons of self-abasement, of contrition, and renewed devotion to the blessed Saviour. Let us look awhile at the Burning Bush, and see if we cannot derive from the view important instruction. Occasional retirement from the world seems indispensable to the promotion of true piety. We have always felt that the religious character of Moses probably derived some of its most rare and mature graces from the long period he spent in the peaceful scenes and engagements of the pastoral life—where he had abundant leisure and opportunity for prayer, meditation, and heavenly intercourse. While the retirement he thus enjoyed was favourable to the cultivation of a devout frame of mind, and of deep piety, the magnificent scenes that encompassed him were calculated to expand his views, and enlarge his conceptions of the power and perfections of the Divine Being. Though he had gazed upon that wild mountain scenery in which Horeb's lofty top forms a conspicuous part a thousand times, he always found, there, something new to interest him. He had seen it embosomed in the stillness of hushed repose, and under the soft shades of the evening hour; he had seen the sun in its richest noonday splendour pouring down his rays of brightness upon those dark cliffs—he had seen the sable clouds gather, and the storm cradled there—he had heard the murmur and the swell of the wind as with tempest fury it swept over that rugged scene of awful and frowning sublimity—he had listened to the roar of God's thunder, as it burst peal after peal from the sky, and heard those mountain rocks give back the echo in a thousand prolonged reverberations, while the whole of Horeb's top was lit up with sheets of vivid flame and fabled lightning—he had seen and heard all this without surprise. But now, while attending his fleecy charge, an object far more strange and wonderful than any of these sights or sounds attracted his attention, and led him to say, *I will turn aside and see this great sight.* And what was this sight? It was a humble thorn-bush, in the midst of which a flame was kindled and continued to burn, and yet the bush was not consumed. One of the great laws of nature was suspended. Surely the hand of God was there! It became Moses to turn aside, and gaze with wonder and with awe! From that burning bush Jehovah revealed himself to his servant, and opened the commencement of a series of divine communications, in which were involved the interests and salvation not only of the Hebrew nation but of the world.

This we touch not at present, but ask you to see, in that great sight which Moses saw, a lively type and shadowing forth of those sufferings which the incarnate Son of the Highest endured for man. In the burning bush we may see an emblem of Israel in Egypt. God's people at that time were cruelly oppressed, and every effort was made to destroy them. In themselves they were weak, and impotent, and had no more power to withstand their enemies than a dry thorn-bush has to resist the action of fire;

Jeremy Taylor.