

The Weekly

COBourg, CANADA, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1844.

[WHOLE NUMBER, CCCLXXX.]

VOLUME VIII.—No. 16.]

Poetry.

ENGLAND.

My ancestors were Englishmen—An Englishman am I,
And 'tis my boast that I was born beneath a British sky;
I prize my peerless birthplace—for its freedom and its fame,
In it my father lived and died; I hope to do the same.
I've heard of foreign countries, that are very far to see,
But England, "Merry England," is quite far enough for me:
And he that on its happy soil is not content to stay,
May leave it when he likes, and find a better where he may.

We may not have the mountains which some other lands may show,
Their sides adorned with vineyards, and their summits crowned with snow;
We may not boast the grandeur or the melancholy grace,
Which tells of time's destroying hand, or war's terrific trace:
But we have fertile valleys, we have hills and dells and dells,
Where peace and plenty smile around, and sweet contentment dwells,
We've tall, tall cliffs that beetle o'er, and battle with the spray
Of a thousand waves, that roll around a shore as free as they.
There's not a sea that on its breast a hostile fleet can bear,
But England's flag is seen to fly in stern defiance there;
There's not a clime, East, West, North, South, but echoes with
The name of England.
Of England's dauntless warriors, and rings with England's name,
Our ancient institutions, and our good old English laws
Have sprung from e'en our bitterest foes their wonder and
admiration.
Oh! 'tis his must be a coward's heart who would not make a stand
For altar, throne, for hearth and home, in such a native land!
—Nottingham Journal.

THE GENIUS OF CAMPBELL.

(From the Christian Remembrancer.)

Another of the poetical brotherhood which adorned the close of the last and the beginning of the present century has just been removed from us. Of all that goodly company but three now remain—Wordsworth, Moore, and Rogers: most dissimilar men, but who most, notwithstanding, turn with strange and wistful feelings to the thought of each other, left, as each is now, without those great fellow-travellers on life's journey with whom his name and the exercise of his powers have been so much associated. He who has just departed from us was, though by no means the foremost, a most conspicuous member of that bright band; less canvassed and discussed, perhaps, of late years, than some of his poetical brethren, just because the exceeding beauty of much of his poetry is felt to be beyond all question. This being the case, it may seem rather superfluous to make him the subject of an article; but we are to loving an occasion, when such presents itself, of pausing on a true poet, and contemplating his poetry; and though we once saw some criticism on our labours in this way, in which the disparaging epithet "lengthy" was applied to them, we are not going to be thereby deterred from pursuing them, at such times and to such "length" as circumstances and our own humour may suggest. Besides, though Campbell be a poet universally accepted and read, we are not sure that his due station on the slope of Parnassus has been assigned to him; many who allow—what none ever refused—him, a position there, would perhaps fix it near the base; we, on the contrary, place him very high; and think it worth while, at present, to show our reasons for doing so.

As the consideration of this latter is the only part of our present task not altogether agreeable, we will betake ourselves to it now, and get it over at once. The phenomenon to which we refer, is the remarkable observation of faculties which must have taken place before the author of "Hohenlinden" could have written such verses as those on the Battle of Navarino, or as that unutterably humiliating "Pilgrim of Glencoe," on which we passed judgment two years ago. Into all the possible causes of that obscurity we will not seek to enter. Some might be suggested on which it were idle, and worse than idle, now, to dwell. It may suffice, perhaps, to say, that when Mr. Colburn placed an indolent man of genius at the head of a very easily-managed Magazine, and gave him a handsome income, he called him off from the life of a poet, and allowed some of the noblest gifts that had been vouchsafed to any man of the age, to be frittered away and dispersed. And the moral we would draw from the melancholy results upon Campbell's poetical powers, is one which never was more needed than in this talent-worshipping time—the moral, that our gifts are not what we fancy them, our own: that as they come from above, so are they bestowed day by day; that, consequently, what we could do at one time may be far beyond our power at another; and a former range and compass of mind and language may give us assurance of our possessing anything similar at present.

This is a humbling truth, but one which it behoves all who feel that they are wielding a power in any way beyond their fellows, seriously to receive and remember. They must not fancy that power which they must not believe that they are sure to have it whenever they wish to exercise it. True, in the order of the Giver's dealings, intellectual gifts are continued, for the most part, in the same channels; and true, also, that even our imperfect insight can discern some wise reasons why this should be, on the whole, the case; we can see, for example, that by certain persons receiving a certain permanent intellectual vocation, the sense of responsibility may be awakened within them. Still, what we call abilities are but gifts, and no more than any other gifts of God are they indefinitely possessed. If misused, if not carefully and humbly and reverently cultivated, they may, perchance, desert those who, at one time, most conspicuously displayed them. He who wrote the noblest battle-ode that is to be found in any modern language, has put forth more imbecile verses than the veriest fool in the country. Let, then, no young poet of our own day, who may be conscious of some God-given power, take to contemplating that power, as an abiding property of himself: it may vanish in the profane and selfish process.

But let us cease to talk of the Campbell who wrote the "Pilgrim of Glencoe," and revert to the immortal Campbell whom all true lovers of poetry must ever love,—the Campbell who wrote "Hohenlinden," and the "Battle of the Baltic," and "O'Connor's Child." His poetry is always felt to be delightful, though an acquaintance with greater poets, and with better models than he followed in his earlier works, is apt to engender in us a distrust of our own delight. This, however, need not be. We can surrender, as good taste requires us to surrender, the "Pleasures of Hope," on the ground of its being cast in a bad mould, and full of vicious diction. We can point out, to such as may require the warning, that the form into which Pope threw the heroic couplet, is only available for purposes similar to his; and that when we attempt to make it contain a greater volume of sound, and to utter higher inspirations, it will almost certainly lead us into redundancy and bombast: we can show them how full the poem in question is of those defects,—how frequently unmeaning are some of its lines and passages on which the young are most apt to fasten; and we can denounce, if need be, the Whig rhodomontade with which it is rife; and yet we shall have left a good deal to admire, and to the beauty of which we shall do well in calling attention. In spite of a defective construction, the verse is richly, wonderfully musical: no unimportant circumstance this; for never yet was rich music produced by nonsense verses; never yet did any but a poet produce it. There are couplets in the "Pleasures of Hope" of which the melody is no chance matter, but indicates the most perfect artistic collo-

cation of words and syllables,—the most harmonious adjustment of vowels and consonants; such, for example, as that exquisite one—
"When Jordan hushed his waves, and midnight still
Watched on the holy towers of Zion hill."

Or that other:
"And solemn sounds that awe the listening mind
Roll on the azure paths of every wind."
Nor, as we might show, by copious quotation, are such artistic and original melodies confined to individual couplets, but extend over whole paragraphs and passages of a poem which, moreover, is not read right except as a boyish production. As such, it has few rivals in the whole catalogue of youthful marvels.—We may add, in its favour, that, as with all its author's best performances, it is characterized by a very pure, amiable spirit.

"Gertrude of Wyoming," will be generally admitted to be a great improvement on the "Pleasures of Hope." We have now done with the bad and boyish model; we have bade adieu to bombast and rhodomontade; and a sensitive and delicate genius is seen to put forth its powers, unchecked either by a defective mould, or by the conventional tastes which held sway in the period of his youth and education. That much which is charming and delightful is the result; that Gertrude of Wyoming is one of the very sweetest poems in the language; and that, in addition to some exquisite home-pictures of love and tenderness, it contains stanzas which are quite magnificent, will be denied, we suppose, by no Englishman of education; however such a person may deplore the feebleness, or the indolence, whichever it was, that strung these beauties so loosely and awkwardly together, and hindered a production full of exquisite and costly materials from exhibiting them in well-proportioned prominence and well-balanced harmony. "The Death-song of the Oneyda Chief," with which the poem concludes, and which is greater than anything else contained in it, comes under another head of Campbell's works—that in which his genius is distinctively put forth and displayed.

"Theocrite," as all the world knows, was anything but an improvement on Gertrude; and, indeed, was the first public and conspicuous display of the great deterioration of Mr. Campbell's powers. Yet it is full of sweetness, and will repay any one for an attentive perusal. Of the "Pilgrim of Glencoe," let nothing be said.

It is not, however, to his longer works, that one looks for the true display of Campbell's genius. It was essentially a lyrical one; and in lyrical poetry reigns supreme and unapproachable.

Perhaps there is no more effectual answer to the cant, which is continually talking of the decline of poetry, which the facts on the other side being allowed to stand by unanswered the while, ingeniously proves that mechanical progress, and a complicated state of society, produce a temperament adverse to it, than the history of lyrical poetry. If any form of the art ought to favour the desponding theory, it is this; for it is one of the earliest, and in its origin, has always been bound up with circumstances which gradually disappear, as society expands and gets more complicated, till the ode, losing its accompanying music, and its public and national character, is simply read in a book. Yet, though thus deprived of that from which it takes its name, and of all the pride, pomp, and pageantry which once ushered in its existence; though, too, it is distinctively the poetry of emotion; and our theorist holds the progress of society to be fatal to all quick feeling and sudden impulse,—how stands the case in fact? Was there ever an age which has produced more and better lyrical poetry than the present, and that of the most intense burning kind? Even prostrate Italy has given birth to an ode (that of Manzoni on the death of Napoleon) which Petrarch—nay, Filicia might have been proud to own; and were, in the whole compass of poetry, can we find war-songs to compete with those of Campbell? No battle in poetry rivals Hohenlinden; each stanza sounds like a discharge of artillery, and what an exquisite lyrical transition at the end, from "Wave, Munich, all thy Banners wave, and charge with all thy Chivalry!" to "Few, few shall part where many meet!"

Although the world at large is not always delighted with the best poetry, yet it is never delighted for any length of time with bad. It is often wrong in its non-admirations, but never, or seldom in its real, hearty, admirations. Apply this test to Campbell; and the question of his poetical merit becomes a tolerably easy one. There can be no mistake about the world's delight in "Hohenlinden," "The Battle of the Baltic," "Ye Mariners of England," "The Death-song of the Oneyda Chief," and last, and loveliest, perhaps, of all, "O'Connor's Child." Nor is that an illusive pleasure which all unsophisticated people receive from those other and gentler poems, "The Soldier's dream," "The Rainbow," "Lord Ullin's Daughter," and the like; for they are all "beautiful exceedingly," and take a hold on heart and memory, which is irresistible evidence of their merit.

There is another test, however, the application of which not only establishes Campbell's claims as a poet, but places him high in the brotherhood,—the test of originality. There is no mistaking him. His notes are all his own; they are imitated from no one, and no one can successfully imitate them. His is a class of poems, which, had he never been, should have gone without; his are cadences, to which, but for him, our ears would have been strangers. The more this is thought on, the truer it will be found concerning him. Compare him, for example, in this respect, with Byron, who, though he had a far stronger voice, was, on the whole, but a mocking bird. Who, for example, could give, if he did not know it *ab extra*, that the Fourth Cantos of "Childe Harold" was by the same hand as the First? or where, in the more popular part of his works, has Byron written what we should have been loth to have done without, not merely because of the actual merit, but because of the peculiar tone and character of the composition?

We need not say any more on these well-known productions, nor occupy space by quoting what everybody has by heart. Nor need we speak more than we have done of that obscurity of faculty which Campbell latterly manifested more than any other man of genius of whom we ever heard. But it may be worth while to point out a few instances in which the members of his beautiful genius flickered up into something of their former vigour and brilliancy, and to exhibit some of those later beauties of his, which, from people's utter despair over him, may be, as yet, less known than they deserve.

These were the dregs, the dying embers of a Genius; and if this be so, what must have been that genius in itself, and at its best? And with this question, we reverently draw our curtain over Campbell, and breathe a sigh at the thought of the retreating, well-nigh departed generation of which he was so bright an ornament.

THE NECESSITY OF HOLINESS.

(From Bishop Hobart's Sermons.)

Holiness, which, seated in the heart, and purifying and animating all its faculties and affections, controls and regulates the whole conduct, is an essential qualification of the members of Christ's church; it is that cardinal point towards which all its institutions and ordinances tend. That the church may be holy, the Redeemer cleanses it by his purifying blood; that the church may be holy, he illuminates it by his divine word; that the church may be holy, he sancti-

fies it by his renovating Spirit. To quicken its members from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, its divine Head imposes on them, in the initiatory sacrament of baptism, the most awful and affecting vows—binding them to the subjugation of all the passions of corrupt nature, to the acquisition of all the virtues of the new man in Christ Jesus; and he again imposes on them these holy vows, in the apostolic ordinance of the laying on of hands.

To excite and nourish its members in holiness, he subjects them to the instructions and the worship of the sanctuary, where their souls are humbled under a sense of sin, urged to the entire renunciation of its unhalloved dominion, and raised, in vigorous faith, love, and devotion, to the contemplation and supreme pursuit of all the virtues that assimilate them to the holy Being whose glory is unveiled before them, and at whose throne they are prostrate, and to the practice of whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are lovely and of good report. To quicken in its members that immortal seed which will spring up and bring forth the fruits of piety and virtue, he, the divine Restorer of the soul, waters it by his life-giving blood, and strengthens and supports it by his spiritual and invigorating body; demanding and accepting the presentation of the whole man a living sacrifice to him—requiring and receiving the solemn pledge to abound in all those good works which he hath prepared his faithful members to walk in.

To remain then in error when these sacred lights are shed around us; to cleave to the world, and its sensual passions, and its sensual enjoyments, when the most solemn obligations, the most powerful aids, the most persuasive motives call on us to renounce them; to remain in subjection to sin, in thralldom to the great adversary of God and holiness, when the powerful grace of the Redeemer hath begotten us to the means of the most exalted virtue, to celestial and immortal hopes,—is to display the most perverse folly, and the most criminal insensibility and presumption, and to incur the most aggravated guilt.—Unholy members of the church, they who name a divine and holy Master, and do not depart from iniquity, but give themselves up to the suggestions and sway of their corrupt passions, are guilty of renouncing the most solemn obligations, and of rejecting the most exalted privileges and hopes. They who, regenerated in baptism, admitted into a state of salvation, marked with the blood of Christ, set apart by the seal of his Spirit, adopted as God's children, yet fail to acquire the renewing of the Holy Ghost, the renewing of the mind, shining forth in all holy affections, in all virtuous acts, are guilty of trampling under foot the blood of the Son of God; they are guilty of doing despite to his Spirit; they are guilty of casting from them the glories of their heavenly birthright.

"Be ye holy, for I the Lord your God am holy," is the language which may be addressed with more awful and impressive force to Christians, now the "elect of God, than it was to the Israelites, God's chosen of old. Blessed with a purer and more spiritual dispensation, in which all those divine truths and promises which the types and shadows of the law faintly set forth, shine forth in the most splendid lustre; beholding in that precious blood which flowed from the divine victim on the cross, the most tremendous display of divine wrath, and the most splendid, and affecting, and endearing discovery of divine mercy; possessing, in the almighty energies of the Holy Ghost dwelling in them, the abundant, unfilling means of spiritual life, the celestial armour with which to defend and to conquer; and looking to heaven, their home, the great recompense of reward,—Christians are urged to holiness and virtue by the most solemn vows, the most powerful aids, the most impressive and persuasive motives. For that heavenly kingdom, where they are to be for ever kings and priests of God—for that church triumphant, where God, the Judge of all, and Jesus, the Mediator of the covenant, unveil their full glory, where the hosts of angels and glorified spirits unceasingly present their hallowed adorations,—holiness is an indispensable qualification. Into this holy place of the Most High nothing can enter that is unholy and unclean.

"Who then shall ascend into that hill of the Lord? or who shall rise up in that holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; and that hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn to deceive his neighbour." He who is pure in the thoughts of his understanding, in the resolutions of his will, in the purposes, and wishes, and exercises of his affections, and in the acts of his life—his whole "heart" is thus the seat of purity, and whose "hands" never defile themselves with iniquity—he who hath not "lifted up his soul" to those "vain" and deceitful enjoyments which too often occupy the place of God in the heart, as the idol of its affections; but who under a habitual reverence of the Lord whom he serves, cherishes the sentiments and strictly observes the rules of piety and justice.

This is that happy man who shall "receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of his salvation." This is the man who, having, under the guidance and grace of God his Saviour, preserved his heart pure and his conduct upright, shall finally participate in the everlasting blessing and favour of the Lord. "This is the generation of them that seek him," this should be the character of all those who "seek the face," who aspire to view, in the heavenly sanctuary, the lustre and glory of the God of "Jacob." Oh, my soul, with what ardour of desire, with what supreme vigour of exertion shouldst thou seek those holy graces that alone will render thee meet for these eternal and glorious rewards!

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

IN ITS EPISCOPACY.

CHAPTER VII.

Church of England obedient to Scripture in an adherence to Episcopacy—Episcopal authority not of man, or any number of men—Veneration for the name of "Apostle," the cause of its being discontinued—Succession of office and person—The term "bishop" settled—Bishopric of Matthias—Bishops successors of the Apostles—Fixed and limited dioceses—The apostolic dioceses—Sad effects of schisms in foreign missions—Bishops do now what Timothy and Titus did—Duty of the Bishop of London—Bishops of Nova Scotia, New Zealand, Gibraltar, &c.—Authority of bishops not confined to single congregations—Country presbytery—Bishop Hall's sketch of parochial juntas—Fatal argument to secretaries—Extract from the Rev. John Venn—Answer to the question, Why St. Paul in so many epistles writes nothing about Church government?—Succession of presbyters and deacons—Election of deacons—Testimony of ecclesiastical history—Claim of the Church of England—Venn—Schism allowed followed by errors—Leele—Hoadley's definition of a truly Christian spirit.

From the proofs adduced from Scripture in the preceding chapters, it must be clear that the Church of England, as a veritable branch of the Church Catholic, best obeys and teaches the Scriptural pattern by adhering to the institution of bishops, and holding the belief that the Church, that is, the ministerial portion of the Church, and hence the congregational (for the latter is derived from the former) must be appointed from the powers entrusted by Christ and his Apostles to the bishop. It cannot emanate or spring from the private will of any man, or any number of men, but from one fountain head, who is appointed to try the spirits and lay hands suddenly on no man; yet to ordain elders, presbyters, or priests, for the propagation of the Gospel within the bounds of his diocese or spiritual empire allotted by the law of the land, or it may be by ecclesiastical law, and sanctioned by the Holy Scriptures. The Church thus best increases the extension of the operations of the spirit, under God's guid-

ance and will, by adhering as closely as possible to the revealed declarations and injunctions of the Holy Spirit.

When the Apostles had departed this life for their crowns of righteousness in the next, we find that their name almost ceased upon the earth. In some cases their immediate successors were called apostles, but this not for any length of time, so that it seems there was something peculiarly venerable in the very name, and above the ordinary meaning of "sent" or of "missionary," which took upon themselves the full power and authority which Apostles had enjoyed. Why the name "Apostles" was not continued in the Church we cannot conceive, unless reverence for the name as connected with men miraculously inspired, prevented others, not in the same degree miraculously inspired, from adopting it. The office could not cease, neither has it ceased, but still the name was placed in abeyance by the early Christians. Another name then must be at once strictly and definitely applied to the office, and this name, we find by reference to all ecclesiastical history and all genuine writers of the earliest times of Christianity, to be the word "bishop." One man in each Church, and one only, in virtue of his succession to the apostolic office, was to be designated a bishop; and this bishop alone exercised the duties before executed by an Apostle only. This was done by bishops appointed by the Apostles themselves, men who worked familiarly with the Apostles.

Moreover, we learn from Scripture that the office to which Matthias was elected and ordained was called a bishopric (Acts, i. 20); and if it was a bishopric with him, it must also have been a bishopric with the other Apostles, for he was elected to precisely the same office; and the holder of a bishopric is of course a bishop. We may also say, that since it is plain that Jesus Christ was the first and only bishop, and the only one who could ordain and govern the Church, and since He committed these powers to others, (John xx.) so were they indeed bishops; and if they were bishops in act, there could be no impropriety in calling them bishops by name, excepting that "Apostle" was given as their more common name, associated with the higher dignities of the Christian Church.

If we ask then, who now in the Church are the true successors of the Apostles, one only answer can be given, and that must be, bishops. Bishops now exercise in virtue of the episcopal institution by Christ and his Apostles the very same power as the Apostles did in relation to the government of the Church, and in regard to pastoral duties. The Bishop of London, he who may, is precisely the successor of any Apostle with a fixed habitation and diocese such as St. James possessed at Jerusalem. But were not the Apostles to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature, (Matt. xxvii.) and does the Bishop of London do so? It may be answered, that he takes his full share in the commands, and does as much as an Apostle did actually perform, inasmuch as the Apostles as individuals, did not go into all the world, neither could they have done so; but since the command was given to them as a body of men, each took his separate part in the business in a separate sphere of evangelical labour. We prove this from Scripture. St. James was always found at Jerusalem by St. Paul. In each of the visits which he paid to Jerusalem, during the first three years, and the second fourteen years after his conversion, he found St. James there (Galatians, i. 18, 19; ii. ix.) On another occasion, when he went up to Jerusalem, St. James was there; and he is mentioned in this special way, the day following Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders were present. Why do we meet with the words "James and the elders," unless St. James was the superior? (Acts, xxi. 18.) Again, St. James spoke in a tone of decidedly official authority at the first council of Jerusalem, when he wound up business after the others had spoken, with the words, My sentence is, &c. (Acts, xv. 19.) We have no record of St. James having acted the part of a missionary to any foreign parts, but his office and home seem to have been fixed in Jerusalem.

Again, St. John took Asia for his diocese, or fixed charge, and he was afterwards alone called governor of the Churches in Asia. St. Peter confined himself with James and John to the preaching the Gospel to the Jews, while St. Paul and Barnabas went forth to preach to the Gentiles. This agreement is stated in Scripture thus: James, Cephas, and John gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision. (Gal. ii. 9.) Surely in this agreement there is undoubtedly a systematic determination, as individuals, not to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. We learn from this, especially when coupled with St. Paul's remarkable resolve not to build on another man's foundation, that the Apostles had particular portions of the world assigned to them for their labours, such as were afterwards called dioceses in the same way as the Church of England owns, after the Apostolic pattern, dioceses and diocesan at home and abroad. And this arrangement could not have been violated without serious injury to the peace and usefulness of the Church; that is, could not have been violated by the Christian Church itself, for alas! we see incalculable mischief and ruin to the Christian cause effected by this violation of Apostolic rule in secretaries that cut themselves off from the true Apostolic Church of Christ; as though Satan, in the guise of an angel of light, was determined that the heathen mind should be distracted, and made infidel by not knowing what to believe or what to practice.

The Bishops of London, Chester, Sodor and Man, Nova Scotia, Barbadoes, Gibraltar, New Zealand, &c., are true representatives of the missionary and resident Apostles: they are just doing what Timothy and Titus were empowered and commissioned to do. The Bishop of London ought not, according to Scriptural arrangement and practice, to exercise official authority in another bishop's diocese without leave or commission to do so. A contrary plan to this would effect entire confusion, and be productive of unimagined disorder and disturbance; so that he is necessarily curtailed in the extent of his spiritual operations. Nor ought he to go to foreign parts, either as a missionary, presbyter, or bishop. He is a home missionary, and at the peril of his soul he must not forsake either his office or post. He has vast duties to perform, and in London he is the means of the Gospel being preached to thousands upon thousands more of his fellow-creatures than if he went out to the South Sea Islands, Nova Scotia, &c.; and if he went out, some one other must be appointed to be resident in his place. If Jerusalem required a Bishop, surely London does; and the only question that can be, is, whether London does not require more bishops than one?

The same rule applies to all bishops, whether at home or abroad; and thus the Bishops of New Zealand, Nova Scotia, Montreal, &c., dare not leave their dioceses, and come and exercise episcopal power in any dioceses at home. Let a bishop travel fifteen thousand miles from home, still he is not preaching the Gospel to every creature one whit more than a bishop may do at home, for no part of the world must be forsaken, and continued preaching of the Gospel is necessary to those who have already heard and known the Gospel for ever so long a time. Even in the first ages of the Church, with the command of our Lord so freshly impressed on the minds of Apostles, and with whole regions unpenetrated by the bearer of the Gospel tidings, we find Apostles limited in their operations, and also those bishops who were immediate successors of Apostles in the Primitive Church. The three first chapters of the Book of Revelations inform us that the

bishop of each Church and diocese was addressed by our blessed Lord, each bishop at his allotted post and surely resident.

While the authority of a bishop cannot consistently with common sense be exercised over every diocese and all congregations, it is very clear also that the authority of the bishops in ancient Churches was not confined to single congregations, as some have supposed. For besides the instances from the Roman, Ephesian, and other Churches in Scripture, we may learn this—first, from the frequent mention of country presbyters and religious assemblies in such places for which no bishops were specially appointed, but which were reckoned under the superintendency, with other Churches, of one and the same bishop. Secondly, from the multitude of presbyters in one city, it not being credible that forty-six presbyters in the city of Rome in the time of Cornelius, and sixty at Constantinople, with a greater number both before and after Justinian's constitution, and a numerous company in other Churches, should be designed, with a bishop and many deacons for the service of God in a single congregation! Thirdly, because the greatest cities in the world, with the parts lying near, when Christians were not numerous, had but one regular bishop; and he who can imagine that in the most flourishing times of Christianity there were never more Christians there than made a single congregation, though many Churches were built at Jerusalem and other places, may as well think the same of the present diocese of London! Fourthly, how could the issuing a decree from the Church at Jerusalem to all the other Churches, be reconciled with that system which declares every congregation to be independent of all others (Acts, xvi. 4—5)? A due consideration of the above facts will be fatal to all those secretaries who place all ecclesiastical government in single congregations only; and clearly shew, as in a glass, that the Church of England is in true and operative possession of the apostolic and primitive plan of Church government and general arrangement.

The bishops themselves, being in proper succession, continued the other ecclesiastical orders also in the Church, as it was their bounden duty by divine command to do. Thus they continued the order of presbyters or priests, as successors of the Seventy who never undertook episcopal duties; and we find that they were ministers in the apostolic age of the Church, until they received an outward commission from the apostolic bishops, or those deputed by bishops, and the Church dares not now to act in opposition to Scripture and the practice, founded on Scripture, of the Primitive Church. That the elders, either individually or as a body, had not the power of ordaining elders, and thus commencing or continuing a presbyterian succession, appears from the fact, that the Apostles, in all their Epistles, never gave one single direction to them respecting the exercise of such a power.

We know that there were presbyters (or elders) in every Church to which the Epistles were written; and if they had had the power of ordaining additional presbyters or successors in their office, surely some directions would have been given for the discharge of such an unspeakably important duty; some allusion would have been made to it. When St. Paul wrote to Timothy and Titus, who had the power of ordaining presbyters, a large portion of his short Epistles is taken up with directions, and cautions, and admonitions on this head; but when he writes many letters to the Churches, more especially two very long letters to the Corinthians (among whom were so many disorders) and a very long letter to the Romans, and another to the Hebrews, he does not once mention or even allude to the subject. We may, therefore, infer that this was a higher rank than the presbyters, or kept entirely in his own hands; and as "the care of all the Churches" (planted by St. Paul) came upon St. Paul daily, so we may suppose that the other Apostles provided in the same way for the ordination of the presbyters in the Churches which they had planted.

As to any power possessed by the people of ordaining presbyters, Scripture affords us no evidence, as we have shewn, whatever—not even the most indirect intimation—that it was ever exercised, or even claimed in any Church throughout the world. And equally destitute of all Scriptural foundation is the assertion, that presbyters were ever ordained by the immediate act of God. The inspired Apostles were all ordained immediately by the Lord (Mark, iii. 14; Gal. i. 1; Acts, i. 24), and were enabled to prove their commission by peculiar miraculous powers (2 Cor. xii. 12), and all the presbyters, whose Ordination is related, were selected and ordained by man, either by the Apostles or by individuals of higher rank than the ordinary presbyters.

The succession of deacons also is duly preserved as an apostolic constitution. Those are deacons who are on trial in our Church previous to their Ordination as priests (1 Tim. iii. 13), and who cannot exercise the offices of a priest in pronouncing the absolution, or in administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; but who can assist a presbyter or priest in all things, even at the mysteries of the holy table. The deacons are first selected by the people, or rather ask the people's choice, as is done for three Sundays in the open congregation where the candidate is best known; and then they must be ordained by the bishops, because they were instituted and ordained by bishops in the early Church, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles, vi. 1—6; and no man was ever a Scriptural deacon who was not duly ordained by a bishop who had himself been duly consecrated to the apostolic office of a bishop.

It is wrong to assert that the people have the power of appointing deacons; for though the people, on the direction of the Apostles, selected them, yet the Apostles laid their hands on them and solemnly invested them with their office. No man thus, to be plain, in the early Christian Church might usurp the apostolic duties of a bishop, and no man act either as presbyter or deacon without due and visible appointment; for it would have been out of due decency and divine order to have done so, and might be like Simon Magus who did attempt to purchase and assume a portion of the apostolic and ministerial office.

Let us ever bear in mind that the constitution of the Christian Church in the early days of the Apostles, and throughout their time was this: the Apostles were acting in the Church as its overseers or bishops; the presbyters, as ordained by Jesus, and increased in their number by apostolic Ordination, were discharging only the duties of ordinary pastors or priests; and the deacons, an inferior order by apostolic direction and Ordination, were preaching and baptising; but as it would seem, not confined to any fixed charge, (Acts, vii. 5—26—21—8) but to be advanced to a higher office, that of presbyter, if performing well the duties of the lower office, which was then a probationary state. If the visible Church was to continue, its visible constitution must continue also; and we find all ecclesiastical history bear witness to its faithful continuation in the Christian Church, even down to our days when the threefold offices of bishops, priests, and deacons, demonstrate the apostolic and primitive pattern of spiritual order and government in the Church of Christ.

There is a most important circumstance which must have struck every one whilst reading the portions of Scripture bearing on this subject: namely, that all the Christians, without exception, living in any city or district, were subject to the same spiritual jurisdiction.

The Apostle, whether inspired or uninspired, was over the whole flock; and not over such only as chose to put themselves under his pastoral charge. The presbyters were the shepherds of the whole flock, and were themselves an united body in subjection to the Apostles. The deacons were the assistants of the presbyters, and equally acknowledged the authority of their superiors. All who believed formed one society; one body with one government; even as they had one Lord, one faith, and one baptism; for there were no various "denominations" of Christians in those days, either in Corinth, Ephesus, or any other Church or diocese. And such is the position assumed by our Church, and therefore is she according to the pattern of Scripture. She calls herself the "Church of England," and scripturally considers that all professing Christians throughout England ought to be in communion with her, and subject to her bishops, priests, and deacons.

In all the history of the Church, be it remembered, whether under the law or the Gospel, there is not one instance of a schism against that priesthood which God has appointed, but great errors in doctrine and worship followed it. Thus the priesthood which Michael set up in opposition to that of Aaron, both ended in idolatry. Thus the Novatians and Donatists, who made schisms against their bishops fell into grievous errors, though they did renounce the faith. See what a horrible fate pursued Arius, the first opponent of the episcopal order, and in what deadly errors the Arians are involved to this day. Into what gross errors, both as to doctrine and worship, had the Church of Rome fallen since her bishop set up for universality, and thereby commenced that grand schism against all the bishops of the earth whom he sought to depress under him!

What hydra heresies, and monstrous sects, fifty or sixty at one time of which we have the names, some bent on murder, sprung up and spread over England after episcopacy was for so short a while depressed! And now in these days it is impossible to close one's eyes on the extravagant doctrines, unholy conduct and temper, with the variety of errors that are promulgated, so much in contrast with the calm and sacred demeanour of the Church in her deep views of faith and reverence, and not see proclaimed to the world that a mark of widely different spirit is set upon each. It is well told us by St. Paul in the thirteenth chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, that the most exalted, spiritual, or even miraculous gifts, not only could not excuse any schism to be made in the body, that is the Church, but if any who had such gifts did not employ them for the preservation of the unity of the Church, which is very properly expressed by charity, that is, love for the whole body, such gifts would profit him nothing, lose all their virtue and efficacy as to the possessor, and be rather an aggravation against him, than an excuse for him to withdraw his obedience from his lawful superiors, and usurp the office of his head, and so make a schism in the body upon the account of his gifts.

Bishop Hoadley says well, and let it be here repeated, "Our duty is to do all lawful things for the sake of peace, and to promote love among Christians; and yet may act as if they thought it their duty to do every thing possible in order to encourage divisions and hatred in the Christian Church. Why else do they rather choose to find out such new duties in the Gospel, never heard of before in the Christian Church, than to practice the old? And why do they refuse to walk in that path which leads plainly and directly to greater degrees of unity and concord? A true Christian spirit cannot direct us to such behaviour, any more than it can direct us to disturb the peace of society, and to render all designs of accommodation ineffectual." And to this effect writes Vincent of Lirin, "We forsake the truth of the universal doctrine, and follow the novel error of some one man," while "it is most proper to Christian modesty and gravity, not to leave unto posterity our own inventions, but to keep that which our predecessors left us."

Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

JERUSALEM.

The Bishop of Jerusalem writes in his letter of May 4: On Good Friday evening I preached and made a collection of 5l. for the Society, which is forwarded herewith as forming a part of our remittance for last year.

Baptism of a Jewish Family.

On Easter Sunday I baptized Rabbi Judah Levi, and the following Monday his two children. I have appointed him, on my own account, to take charge of the depot, which we have opened in front of my house for the sale and distribution of Scriptures and tracts.

Depot for Scriptures and Tracts.

I rejoice to say, it is likely to become a means of great usefulness. Nearly 300 have already been received from the sale of Bibles. This is particularly encouraging when we consider that the Bible is sold at a more trifling price than a very poor place. Numbers of Jews also resort thither with whom Rabbi Levi is quite capable of conversing in Hebrew, &c.

Celebration of the Society's Anniversary.

We have celebrated the Anniversary of the Society, as we did last year, by my preaching on the evening of the 2d, and our having a Meeting yesterday, which was addressed, in addition to myself, by Messrs. Veitch and Ewald, also by Sir Cecil Bishop, who happens to be here with his lady and family. We almost fancied ourselves in England. The Earl Montebello has been here for some time. He took the sacrament with us on Sunday last, when we had no less than fifty-seven communicants. We have also had the Rev. Lord Thomas Hay and Lady Hay with us; likewise his Prussian Majesty's Consul-General from Beyroot, with his lady and family. We felt, therefore, the comfort of more enlarged church accommodation, as we can now seat nearly 150 persons.

JOURNAL OF THE REV. F. C. EWALD.

The following extracts are taken from Mr. Ewald's journal for the month of May:—

Departure of the Pilgrims.

The pilgrims have left us and the streets of Jerusalem are again passable. There have not been so many pilgrims here this year as the last. As this year Easter was celebrated by all the various churches on the same day, some fears were entertained, that a collision between the members of the different churches might occur; but all went off quietly.

The Greek Fire.