

Poetry.

RELIGIOUS PHRENZY.

(From Sweden's Religio Clerici.)

In many a breast there lies,
A stubborn fiend, no charm can exorcise:
Fierce tyrant of the bosom's desecr'd shrine...

cial part of their system to prevent, what in the course of things, must be the abuse.

Is it not the case? In proportion as men deviate from the Church system, in proportion as they draw towards low principles, they fall into all the abuses of subscription-lists, and fancy bazaars; almsgiving becomes venal, the gift becomes a loan or purchase...

Besides, another abuse of Compassion consists in the many hindrances raised in the application of its gifts to objects apparently worthy of it. A man is not the best bestower of his own compassion. He allows feeling to be strongly drawn out towards objects by the counterfeit of sorrow. He is often deceived in his objects; he is imposed upon; a slight circumstance prevents his exerting it as much as he should in particular cases...

Without her system, the feeling of Compassion flows like a mighty stream over soil which does not need, or wastes its gift, and leaves barren spots unfertilized which thirst for nurture. The indigent are not relieved, the false and pretending are encouraged, the compassionate are deceived, and resentment (our safeguard against injury) excited, where no injury was given or intended; the exercise of that feeling, under the discipline of her system, calms the mind, relieving the heart of the compassionate, and leaves it nearer to God in humble obedience and denial, than it found him.

Other systems must, of course, excite pride, vanity, and raising the acts of others as a standard by which to try ourselves; attempt to call into play feelings, which miss their aim, and which are allowed to foster abuse, to leave true objects unsatisfied, or to flow back without having found an end in the moral world; to overwhelm and disorganize the general character of its possessor.

The consequence is, that taking the view of the general exercise of Compassion, we see it is not exercised in any degree as we should expect; although men imagine that the systematic exercise of it will curtail its influence and extent of application: it is not so; the age we live in is a boastful one; a falsely pretending one. Men talk of its benevolence and compassion; the truth is, it is one in which the feeling of Compassion has been, and is less exercised than in any age since the first advent of our Lord: we grant it is one in which the exercise of Compassion meets our eye on every side. But that is all. We grant, subscription-lists are abundant, fancy bazaars and "charitable balls" meet our eye often enough. We grant the rich man of £5000 a-year, takes unwonted pains to let his parish know that he bestows £10 of it annually for the good of Christ's poor, and with all the pomp of charitable dignity stalks into his ancestral pew, or attempts to curb the church-ward tendency of the parish priest in his education of the baptized children of God. If this is a sign of the exercise of Compassion, ours is a charitable age. We must be to differ. We should prefer a Compassion less known and more felt: where the principal marks consisted in the rich giving up their creature comforts, setting down luxuries one by one, taking the lead in lowering the standard of expense in society, and laying their thousands in secret on God's altar. We would prefer judging for ourselves of the exercise of compassion, and not to be told by the giver how much he gives; and when men talk less of the "true kindness of employing servants, and promoting trade, and keeping up station," more excuses, pardon us for saying it, for the vilest selfishness and love of ease. When men do talk less of this, and deny themselves more, we will be more willing to grant the name of benevolent to the age we live in; not till then. Allow us now to turn to the least charitable of days, when men expect more in return than ever before expected; when giving to the poor is looked upon rather as a placing out money to interest, expecting the return of general praise and commendation. Interference in the arrangement of the Church in her parochial system, is not the legitimate expectation to be encouraged in the Church's officers. But our object was not so much to state a fact, as to assign a reason. The low state of the exercise of Compassion in this day, is easily accounted for in the depression of the Church's practical system.

Compassion will deteriorate under the influence of low schools and the treatment of low men. We should expect it, and our expectation is realized. In an age when the Church's voice has been nearly hushed, Compassion has shrunk in to the back-ground, and violent, clamorous counterfeits have protruded themselves into her place. What do we see at this moment? An increased spirit of true, secret, unobtrusive, benevolence; and why? Because the spirit of the Church is reviving.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH IN ITS EPISCOPACY.

CHAPTER VI.

The Angels of the Book of Revelations—meaning of the word "Angel"—Argument on the subject—Timothy not fallen—Onesimus Bishop of Ephesus—Archbishop Potter's strong and lucid argument from the evidence of the Primitive Church—Those who reject antiquity, censured—Corroboration of ultra reformers, and remark of the Rev. Francis Good—Rev. Hugh McNeil, lecturer of the Rev. Dr. Buchanan, a Scotch Presbyterian—Eastern churches, modern anecdote of—Original and interesting communication from the Rev. Joseph Wolff, D.D.—Strong argument from Hooker.

CONSISTENTLY with the arguments mentioned in our last, as derived from the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, as well as from other portions of Scripture, we have much corroborative evidence regarding the institution of bishops, in connexion with the Church of Ephesus and other Churches, given in the first chapters of the Book of the Revelations of St. John. This is to be found in letters addressed by our Lord to the seven Churches in Asia; and these letters are addressed to the bishop, therein called by the name of "Angel," of each Church; the word "Angel" evidently denoting the presiding minister of each Church, whether he be called by the name of "bishop" or by any other name.

This name was borrowed, says Bloomfield, from the synagogue, where the chief officer was so called, and also Episcopus or bishop. The Christian Churches are thus addressed as we shall find on reference to Ezekiel, xxv. 4; xxxiv. 2; xxxv. 2; xxxi. 2; xxxi. 2, the various nations were addressed through their kings or chiefs. From the address on these letters, then, we learn that the presbyters of the Churches were not all equal. Let us take the case of Ephesus in particular. We remember that the Church of Ephesus consisted of many presbyters, for we read this in the Acts of the Apostles, xx. 17, and in 1 Timothy, i. 17; but here our blessed Lord does not address his letter to the body of the presbytery, but to a single individual, namely, the Angel of the Church of Ephesus. That the Angels are addressed singly, appears from the fact that they are constantly spoken to in the singular number: I know thy works; I have a few things against thee; Remember how thou hast received and heard; Thou hast kept the word of my patience. But when our Lord writes what equally concerns the people, He changes the style and speaks in the plural: The devil shall cast some of you into prison; Thou hast not denied my faith, even in those days when Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you; I will give unto every one of you according to your works; That which ye have already, hold fast till I come.

Moreover, the term "Angels" did not signify the whole Churches, because the Churches are represented by seven candlesticks, which are all along distinguished from the seven stars, which are the emblems of the Angels. Neither did they denote a select body of men, for they are mentioned as single persons, and in the Epistle to Thyatira, instead of "the woman Jezebel," we read "thy wife Jezebel," (επιστολη σου Ιεζεβελ) as it is in St. Cyprian, (Epist. lv. p. 100. Ed. Oxon) the Syrian version, the Alexandrian, and several other manuscript copies, then the Angel of Thyatira was a married man, and consequently but one person. The matter of the charges is also personal, and such as could not be addressed to all the members of the Churches; for who can say that all those of the Church of Ephesus were to be praised for their labour and patience; that none of them fainted; that all left their first love; that all hated the deeds of the Nicolaitans? Who can aver that all of the Church of Smyrna were either poor or rich? That none in the Church of Pergamos denied the faith?

How then could one person be selected for this prime distinction, if all were equal? And how, if all were equal, could this individual be easily and at once discerned so as to admit of no mistake? Does it not plainly appear that the superior station of the individual at once pointed him out, and that the Angel of the Church was its presiding minister, and one who stood distinguished from his brethren by the episcopal dignity or official eminence which he held? If all were equal, who was the Angel? And would not any doubt on the subject have led to a difference, and most probably to a contest? But it may be asked, was not Timothy the Bishop of Ephesus, and had he fallen from his first love of Christ, as is here alleged of the bishop of the Church of Ephesus? It may be answered, there is no proof that he was bishop at this time; and it being thirty years since St. Paul wrote his second epistle to Timothy, various changes had doubtless taken place during that period. Bishops were evidently translated from one diocese to another; and St. John himself is recorded to have abode at Ephesus, and to have superintended that and the neighbouring Churches for several years. Every thing tends from these letters to confirm the institution of the office as now handed down to the present times.

A further proof, and no mean one, of the episcopal office of the seven Angels in their several Churches is gathered from the fact, that the most early account of the Primitive Church shows that bishops were settled in all the seven Churches, at or near the time when this letter, recorded in the Revelations of St. John, was sent to them. This is an historical fact of the highest importance, and one that in all reason cannot be overlooked, but claims to be taken into account. This letter, with the rest of the Revelation, if we may believe Irenæus and Eusebius, was written towards the end of Domitian's reign, when St. John lived an exile in Patmos. And we are told that in a very short time after Domitian's death, being recalled from banishment by Nerva, he went to Ephesus and took upon him the care of the Church of that city in the presence of seven bishops. And to descend to particulars; it can scarcely be doubted but there was a bishop in Ephesus when the Revelation was written. For in the next age after this, Polycrates, who was born within a short time after St. John's death, is well known to have been Bishop of Ephesus; and to come nearer to the time we are speaking of, Ignatius, who suffered martyrdom about the tenth year of Trajan, which was at the most not above twelve years after St. John returned from Patmos, in his Epistle to the Ephesians speaks of Onesimus, their bishop, whom he exhorts all of them, presbyters and deacons, as well as private Christians, to obey. And to carry this account yet a little higher, Timothy was made Bishop of Ephesus by St. Paul; and there was an uninterrupted succession of twenty-seven bishops from him to the time of the great Council of Chalcedon, as may be shewn from the public acts of that council. So that here was a bishop mentioned a little before the Revelation was written, and again not long after, besides a constant succession of many bishops from the foundation of the Church for several ages afterwards.

Then, if we proceed to the rest of the seven Churches, shortly after St. John's time Sagaris was bishop of Laodicea. He is spoken of by the forementioned Polycrates in his epistle to Victor, as one who suffered martyrdom in the past times; that is, when Servilius Paulus was Proconsul of Asia, as we learn from Melito's tract about Easter, who was himself Bishop of Sardis in the reign of Marcus Aurelius; and if the Roman martyrology may be credited, Sagaris was one of St. Paul's disciples; so that very near the time we are speaking of, we find a bishop in Laodicea; and, not long after this, another in Sardis.

When Ignatius wrote his epistle to the Philadelphians they had a bishop, whose gravity, modesty, and other virtues, Ignatius commends, and exhorts the Philadelphians to be dutiful to him. The old Roman martyrology speaks of Carpus, Bishop of Thyatira, who suffered martyrdom under Antoninus, who was emperor in the next age, after the book of Revelations was written. If the commentary of Aretas, in the Revelation, compiled out of the ancient Fathers, may be credited, Antipas, whom our Lord calls his faithful martyr (Rev. ii. 13) was Bishop of Pergamos. And if we may judge of the rest of the Church of Smyrna (and there is no reason why we should not, since the Angel of this city is not described under a different character from the rest), we shall no longer doubt whether they were governed by bishops in this

* Adversus Hæres. lib. v. cap. 30.
† Euseb. Hist. lib. iii. cap. 18. The above argument is taken from Archbishop Potter, on Church Government: an inconvertible work.
‡ Milner's Eccles. Hist. vol. i. edit. 2, p. 138. Hey, on Episcopacy.
§ Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. lib. v. cap. 24.
¶ Euseb. Hist. lib. iv. cap. 26, p. 188.
‡ Martyrologium Usuardi Monachi, ed. J. B. Sollerii, Antw. 1714.
‡ Ditto.
‡ Archibishop of Caesarea, A.D. 540. Eusebii Opp. tom. 2, p. 668.

first age of Christianity: it being certain that Polycarp, who is allowed by all to have conversed with the Apostles, was Bishop of Smyrna. He is so called by Polycrates, in his above-mentioned epistle to Victor, who was thirty-eight years old when Polycarp suffered martyrdom, and therefore a witness without exception; and the same title is given him by the Church of Smyrna in their epistle concerning his martyrdom; and in the Acts of the Apostles, xx. 17, and in 1 Timothy, i. 17; but here our blessed Lord does not address his letter to the body of the presbytery, but to a single individual, namely, the Angel of the Church of Ephesus. That the Angels are addressed singly, appears from the fact that they are constantly spoken to in the singular number: I know thy works; I have a few things against thee; Remember how thou hast received and heard; Thou hast kept the word of my patience. But when our Lord writes what equally concerns the people, He changes the style and speaks in the plural: The devil shall cast some of you into prison; Thou hast not denied my faith, even in those days when Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you; I will give unto every one of you according to your works; That which ye have already, hold fast till I come.

We may first mention that St. Ambrose says in his commentary on the first chapter of the Book of Revelations, "He names the bishops Angels, as is taught in the Apocalypse of John." And Augustine says, "By the Divine voice, the president (propositus) of the Church is dignified by the name of Angel." Thus does ancient history greatly assist and confirm the representations of Scripture; and no man is justified in speaking lightly of antiquity, whose very dust is golden sand, when from it so many important facts are derived. In other transactions our learned men are encouraged to dive into antiquity: the judges of the land, committees of the House of Commons, and writers of various branches in literature, are compelled to call evidence from its treasures in various ways. And if a Christian refuses to look deeply into the records of ancient and primitive Christianity, or to encourage and exhort others to do so, it is very clear that he is either unlearned and indolent in a righteous cause, or that he fears lest a scrutiny into the views, and customs, and facts, of the Christians of a primitive and purer age should contradict his modern notions and assumptions, and drive him to the extremity of surrendering opinions which serve his own notions and station, but which are not agreeable with the dictates of reason and historical evidence.

The Rev. Hugh McNeil, a writer from no high Church source, observes also in this matter, and we justly venture to give a sentence or two; he says, "In our Lord's address to the angel of the Church of Ephesus, we have the principle of episcopacy established. In his address to seven Angels of seven Churches in Asia, we have his sanction for the subdivision, the geographical subdivision of episcopal superintendency; and more than this, we have the foreseen usurpation of a primacy, or universal bishop over the whole Church, pointedly condemned." There is an Angel over all the pastors in Ephesus; this excludes independency. There is not an Angel over all the pastors in Asia; this excludes popery." And again, in commenting on Tit. i. 3, 4, also, ii. 6, and v. 22, 19, with 1 Tim. i. 5, iii. 10, he observes: "Now, according to our views of the episcopal constitution of the Christian Church, all this is easy, natural, consistent, harmonious. We wrest nothing, we conceal nothing, we explain away nothing of the sacred document.

But the opponents of this episcopal constitution do certainly seem to us to require some ingenuity in order to evade the pressure of such scriptural argumentation. Let me ask—suppose a gracious renewal of miraculous communications from the Lord to His people, and suppose some favoured servant to receive an inspired message, in terms similar to that we have been considering, addressed to the Angel of the Church of London, were we so Scripturally constituted, that we should have no hesitation in at once soliciting the individual to whom it should be forwarded. But who is the primus inter pares (the first among equals) to whom the dissenters would send it? In reference to this remark, it may be well just to relate an anecdote, furnished by Dr. Buchanan, and we will observe that all the early Christian Churches—concerning which we have received intelligence from modern travellers, are found to be episcopal—the Coptic, Abyssinian, Syrian Church at Malabar, &c.

The following conversation took place, as recorded in his published "Church Researches," between the Doctor (who was a Scotch Presbyterian) and one of the Syrian bishops. "I mentioned that there was a Kaseesha or Presbyter Church in our own kingdom, in which every presbyter was equal to another." "And are there no deacons in holy orders?" "None." "And what, is there nobody to overlook the presbyters?" "Not one." "And who is the Angel of their Churches?" "They have none." "There must be something imperfect there." This short conference is very graphic and very forcible, and should stimulate Christians to seek information from those Eastern Churches which have existed for every ancient time.

But over and above all modern speech, let us note the manner in which the judicious Hooker meets an opponent, if such there can fairly be, with this strong argument: "It will, perhaps, be answered," he says, "that the Angels of those Churches were only in every Church a minister of sacraments; but then we ask, is it probable, that in every one of these Churches, even

† Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. iv. cap. 15, p. 170.
‡ Irenæus, lib. iii. cap. 3, p. 176. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. 36, p. 130.

That a particular individual is meant by the title of "Angel," is confirmed even by those commentators whose prejudices would have induced them to favour another interpretation. It is thus interpreted, among others, by Didakt, Theodore Beza, Bullinger, Marlorate, Gualther, Piscator, Pareus, and Peter Martyr. And Scultetus says: "All the most learned interpreters, by Angels expound the bishop of the Churches: non enim id est obsequium interpretatum sine viobus to text." Grotius argues for this assertion; for Christ himself commends that a letter be sent unto the seven Angels of the Churches; they who by Angels understand the Churches themselves, manifestly contradicted the Holy Scriptures: for the candlesticks are the Churches, Christ says, and the stars are the Angels of the Seven Churches." "It is surprising," observes Good, "how far men are carried away by the love of contradicting, when they dare to confound things so clearly distinguished by the Holy Spirit."—Rev. Francis Good, late Lecturer at Clapham, and fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

McNeil's Lectures on the Church of England, Lecture 7.
† In the course of writing this work, the author's attention was directed by a friend to the question put by some members of an ancient Eastern Church to the Rev. Joseph Wolff, D.D., the indefatigable missionary; namely, "What Bishop sent you out?" And hence, having written to the Doctor, in order that he might be assured of this matter, he received a very interesting letter in reply, from which the following is an extract: "This question was addressed to me by the great Bogos, late Patriarch of the Armenian nation at Constantinople, the great Heres, Archbishop of the Armenian nation at Tiflis, and by the whole body of Bishops at Erzen-Miazin, the celebrated convent at the foot of Mount Ararat, by the Syrian Patriarch in Mesopotamia, by the Coptic Bishop, by the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, and by the Roman Catholic Bishop at Basgand." "When I replied to them, 'My internal voice sent me forth, the answer I received was, 'Moses heard the voice of God upon Horeb; but God himself deemed it to be necessary to endow him with the gift of miracles (Exodus vii) in order that Pharaoh may be forced to acknowledge him as the extraordinary Ambassador. And the ordinary ministers of God, the Levites, had to receive their commission from Moses; and

in Ephesus itself, where many such ministers were long before, (Acts xx. 17—18), there was but one such, when John directed his speech to the Angel of that Church. If there were many, surely St. John, in naming but only one of them an Angel, did behold in that one somewhat above the rest. Nor was this order peculiar to some few Churches, but the whole world universally became subject thereto: insomuch, as they did not account it to be a Church which was not subject unto a bishop. It was the general received persuasion of the ancient Christian world, that Ecclesia est in Episcopo, the outward being of a Church consisted in the having a Bishop." (book vii. p. 124.) How replete with incontrovertible argument is even this brief passage of the admirable Hooker.

TRUTH—THE CREED—THE PRAYER BOOK—AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

(From a work entitled "Truth without prejudice.")

We need only look at the countless sects and parties which divide the Christian world, in order to feel how very uncertain even the purest heart and the strongest head must be in the search after truth, unless there be at hand some sure guide than the best of human understanding, guarded though that may be by the most pious intention. The question of Pilate, "What is truth?" spoken in a thousand different tones, with as many different feelings, is still unceasingly asked; and when we see one after another taking up that mysterious book, finding therein the same mysterious glimpses at eternal verities, and each, after such sincerity of purpose, coming to various conclusions on important questions, and then erecting for themselves a new creed, and propagating these opinions amongst others, we cannot but anxiously look round for some more infallible test of divine truth than that which our individual minds are capable of. Anxious as I have been to avoid even allusion to the endless religious controversies of this day, I can hardly touch upon this subject, without appearing to glance at some of them. Had the Almighty Being provided us with no other guide in the study of Scripture than the force of our own reason assisted by prayer, we might have confidently followed that. It would then have been presumption to desire any other, or to suppose any could be necessary; but since He has given another, it is yet greater presumption to imagine we can do without it. He exacts nothing from us which He does not give us the means of obeying; and since He has required our belief of truth, He has doubtless somewhere or somehow made it plain what is truth, and given us some criterion by which, unless we are wilfully blind, we can know which of the hundred interpretations of the principal religious tenets must be the right one.

Years elapsed from the death of our Saviour before any of the writings of the New Testament were composed, and, of course, years more before they were generally diffused. During that period the direct personal instructions of the Apostles themselves in some instances, and the oral and traditional repetitions of these instructions in others, formed the "gospel" of the early church. Previously, however, to any of the writings of the four Evangelists, that summary of doctrine, termed (and accurately termed) "the Apostles' Creed," was incontestably used in the Church, as the universal baptismal formula or confession of faith required from candidates for baptism. It is therefore more ancient than any of the written doctrines of the New Testament, and it is unquestionably of pure apostolic origin.* It must, then, throw some light upon the subsequent writings of these same Apostles. It comes from the same pure source, and in date is nearer to the fountain head. Now the words of belief required in the first times of the apostles, from those who sought admission into the Church, must doubtless be a correct sketch as it were, of what the writings of those same apostles would afterwards teach in the Church. We should expect in this teaching to find no contradiction to these elementary principles, which were to form the ground-work of their faith; and where we might be in doubt as to the true intention of any subsequent documents coming from the same hands, we should employ this as the test, as that whereby we might define the limits of their meaning.

And now suppose that, in the after writings of these Apostles, difficulties arise which surpass the limits of this creed, and that questions start up which require a full explanation and comment, and which, if misunderstood, lie open, as all great truths do, to much abuse and danger. What would be the natural course to follow with respect to this, and how might we best hope to come to a plain sense of their meaning?—Would it not appear that, if near to the time in which these obscure doctrines were first propounded in the Church, there had lived, as members of the same Church, great and holy men, who held an important place as teachers and guides; and that, if these men had written directly upon such doctrines, and handed down to us, not simply their own private views on the subject, but those interpretations which were then universally held by the members of the Church, and which they knew, either directly or indirectly, to have been universally held as the true interpretation since the very first teaching of these same doctrines by the Apostles themselves in person—would it not appear, I say, that in the writings of these great men we shall get very near to the pure truth? Take another instance. Suppose that there appears to us great doubt upon any important doctrine, say that of justification, election, of the value of good works, or any other such, and that by searching the writings of these primitive teachers, we discover that each one in their different works, different country, and different age, all agree in giving the same interpretation, would not the obvious conclusion be, that they had received it unbroken from the apostolic times, and that it is believed by universal consent throughout the pure Church? And when we find that in the same manner in which they uphold one doctrine, they condemn another as false, and speak of heresies and heretics who have been separated from the pure body of the

Christ made the same provision in the Church. He imparted the gift of miracles to the Apostles in sending them forth; but they instituted Bishops by the imposition of hands, and charged them to follow up that manner of constituting ministers (Titus i. 5). If you, Joseph Wolff, are an extraordinary minister, prove it by miracles; if an ordinary one, who lays hands on you? Your internal voice is evidence to you, not to us." "He writes further, after stating that he himself once held wild and irregular views in Church matters, 'The very fact that ALL THE EASTERN CHURCHES, WITHOUT ONE SINGLE EXCEPTION, HAVE BISHOPS, PRIESTS, AND DEACONS; and the very fact that a Presbyterian Church is not known, is to me a sufficient proof that Episcopacy is of Divine origin, and that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is a Scriptural doctrine.' "The above is certainly most remarkable and satisfactory evidence of the continued existence of Episcopacy as the sole form of government in the Christian Church; and it is difficult to conceive how any attending fact, so easily to be proved in the present day by any traveller in the East, can be evaded. It is surely as the city set on the hill that cannot be hid; and how deeply interesting to the Anglo-Catholic Church would be the ancient records of the Christian Churches of the East. "The author would take this opportunity of thanking the Rev. Joseph Wolff, D.D. for the prompt and courteous manner in which he replied to his questions; and he only wishes that Dr. Wolf would do good service to religion by publishing his experience on this most important subject."

"The fundamental formula on which the 'Apostles' Creed' was doubtless constructed might have been so; and in fact the Apostles themselves contain allusions to some such symbol of faith: (see Rom. 6. 17; Gal. 6. 16; and 2 Tim. i. 13); but internal evidence seems to prove that the greater part of the 'Apostles' Creed' was introduced in opposition to heresies which sprang up some time after the last of the Apostles had ceased to exist.—Ed. C.

Church, should we not believe that this doctrine was not taught by the Apostles in the Church, and that therefore these men knew it to be recent and false, and that so it must be equally false in the present day?

Now suppose that the branch of the Church to which you as an Englishman belong had gone on for centuries in close connexion with, and dependence upon, another branch of the Church which is at Rome; and at last, discovering that this latter had contracted in her practice many things which were not held in the early Church in the time of the Apostles and their immediate successors, but, on the contrary, were quite recent as compared with these, and that thereupon the portion of the Church in England determined to cut off from herself these false additions, and to return as nearly as she could to what was originally universally held. Suppose that, in order to accomplish this, her best men endeavoured, with great labour and care, to compile a book, the materials of which they sought for in the early documents or liturgies of the Church, as preserved in the writings of the fathers, and as many of them were still retained in the portion of the Church from which these men were anxious to separate themselves, and that in this book, though they may have failed to preserve all that they might have done, yet it can be proved that they added nothing of their own, nothing which they have not either directly taken from early usage, or entirely founded thereon. Surely, then, in this book we should find a safe compendium of authentic Christian doctrine, a compilation of what the early Christians held to be, from the Apostles themselves, the right interpretation of those doctrines taught by those Apostles in Scripture. This book is the Common Prayer-Book. Can you, therefore, wonder, when I tell you that here you may find a safe guide in the study of Scripture; that in these beautiful liturgies and ordinances you may search for the true doctrines of the Church and be safe there? And it would be impossible for any person of ordinary understanding to attend the services of the Church regularly bearing in mind the value of the Prayer-Book as a key to the meaning of religious doctrines, without obtaining a clear practical view of all that is of most importance, unless, indeed, the mists of sin exclude all light from his mind.

Thus the authority of the Church, as the only lawful expounder of Scripture with which the Almighty wisdom has sought to shelter his own Divine word, is disregarded and laid aside, and with head and heart full of arguments to prove the right of private judgment upon religious matters, (that is the right of every man to find out a private way of his own in which to believe and serve his Creator,) each one sits down with what he finds at hand, to pick out his road in the awful mysteries and hidden things of Divine truth! What wonder, then, that even in the professed members of the Church herself, we see such serious diversity of opinion? What wonder that thousands more leave her fold, and erect a sandy fabric of their own!

He who has been tossed about with every wind of doctrine, who has bent with anxious heart and aching head over the puzzled pages of modern theology, and in vain sought for a full satisfaction to the yearning thirst for an entire truth which burnt within him,—he who has felt that he must find it or perish, and who has agonized with the thought of what seemed the almost impossible command to search and follow truth,—who has listened in midnight silence to the dark riddle of the mysterious sphinx,—and heard her threatening voice in tones that deadened the loudest call of busy life,—alone knows what it is at last to take up his rest within the hallowed walls of the Church, laying aside all his long-sought and hard-earned religious schemes and systems, to listen like a child to her simple teachings, and having bent his faith to her creed, to feel that it is now only left him with a quiet mind and a believing heart to mould his life to her instructions. With what a soothing calm do the deep shadows of those time-hallowed arches which echo to her constant voice, fall on the brow that has been heated with religious controversies.

You will at once perceive the difference between thus yielding your faith to the testimony of universal and catholic agreement in the united body of the Church, in and near the apostolic ages, and the error of which the Romanists are accused, of committing their conscience to the government of their priests, and thus receiving his individual testimony as an infallible guide. Strange to say, many persons confound these two most opposite principles; and when we talk of submitting to the authority of the Church in all points of doctrine and practice, imagine that they are to be reduced to a priest-ridden people!

THE JEWS OF SPAIN.

(From 'Coningsby' by B. D'Irasi Esq.)

Whence came those Hebrew Arabs whose passage across the strait from Africa to Europe long preceded the invasion of the Mohammedan Arabs, it is now impossible to ascertain. Their traditions tell us that from time immemorial they had sojourned in Africa; and it is not improbable that they may have been the descendants of some of the earlier dispersals; like those Hebrew colonies that we find in China, and who probably emigrated from Persia in the days of the great monarchies. Whatever may have been their origin in Africa, their fortunes in southern Europe are not difficult to trace, though the annals of no race in no age can detail a history of such strange vicissitudes, or one rife with more touching and romantic incident. Their unexampled prosperity in the Spanish Peninsula, and especially in the south, where they had become the principal cultivators of the soil, excited the jealousy of the Goths, and the Councils of Toledo during the 6th and 7th centuries attempted, by a series of decrees worthy of the barbarians who promulgated them, to root the Jewish Arabs out of the land. There is no doubt the Council of Toledo led as directly as the lust of Roderick to the invasion of Spain by the Moslem Arabs. The Jewish population suffering under the most sanguinary and atrocious persecution looked to their sympathizing brethren of the Crescent, whose camps already gleamed on the opposite shore. The overthrow of the Gothic kingdoms was as much achieved by the superior information which the Saracens received from their suffering kinsmen, as by the resistless valour of the Desert. The Saracen kingdoms were established. The fair and unrivalled civilization arose, which preserved for Europe arts and letters when Christendom was plunged in darkness. The children of Ishmael rewarded the children of Israel with equal rights and privileges with themselves. During these halcyon centuries, it is difficult to distinguish the follower of Moses from the votary of Mahomet. Both alike built palaces, gardens, and fountains; filled equally the highest offices of the state, competed in an extensive and enlightened commerce, and rivalled each other in renowned universities.

Even after the fall of the principal Moorish kingdoms, the Jews of Spain were still treated by the conquering Goths with tenderness and consideration. Their numbers, their wealth, the fact that, in Arragon especially, they were the proprietors of the soil, and surrounded by warlike and devoted followers, secured for them an usage which for a considerable period made them little sensible of the change of dynasties and religions. But the temper gradually gathered. As the Goths grew stronger, persecution became more bold. Where the Jewish population was scanty, they were deprived of their privileges or obliged to conform under the title of 'Nuevos Christianos.' At length the union of the two crowns under Ferdinand and