

to any other, he (John Wesley) solemnly set apart, by the imposition of his hands and prayers. Thomas Coke, D.C.L., a presbyter of the Church of England, for the Episcopal office, and having delivered to him letters of Episcopal Orders, commissioned and directed him to set apart Francis Ashbury, then General Assistant of the Methodist Society in America, for the same Episcopal office, he (the said Francis Ashbury) being first ordained Deacon and Elder. In consequence of this the said Francis Ashbury was solemnly set apart for the said Episcopal office by prayer and the imposition of the hands of the said Thomas Coke, other regularly ordained ministers assisting in the sacred ceremony; at which time the General Conference, held at Baltimore, did unanimously receive the said Thomas Coke and Francis Ashbury as their Bishops, being fully satisfied of the validity of their Episcopal ordination." Dr. Coke himself does not seem to have been so well satisfied, as there is a letter of his in existence to the then Archbishop of Canterbury asking for ordination in order that he might go as a missionary Bishop to India.

I call your attention to one point in the paragraph quoted as showing the

WANT OF VALIDITY

of the Methodist Episcopacy. Mr. Ashbury was ordained Deacon and Elder before being made Bishop, thus acknowledging the superiority of the Episcopal office, and yet his consecrator, Bishop Coke, derived his authority from the inferior officer, John Wesley, a simple presbyter. This fact disposes of the claim that Wesley only intended to make "Superintendents." The officers thus created are called Bishops in the authoritative manual of the Methodist body, and I venture to say that to day you will find the Methodist Bishops as tenacious of their Episcopal rights as any member of the historic Episcopate of our own Church; indeed, the section of the "Discipline" on Bishops says it is their duty "to consecrate Bishops and ordain Deacons and Elders."

Perhaps it may not be out of place to add a word with respect to the doctrine of conscious conversion, associated in the popular mind with Methodism as its distinguishing feature. There is not one word about it in their discipline as a prerequisite for entering the Church. Article Fifty says: "We regard all children who have been baptized as placed in visible covenant relation to God, and under the special care and supervision of the Church;" and in Article Fifty-three it adds: "Whenever baptized children shall have attained an age sufficient to understand the obligations of religion, and shall give evidence of piety, they may be admitted into full membership in the Church on the recommendation of a leader with whom they have met at least six months in class, by publicly assenting before the Church to the Baptismal Covenant, and also to the usual question on Doctrine and Discipline." The system of revivals would seem to be a survival of the hysterical phenomena that attended John Wesley's preaching at Bristol, to which I have before alluded, and to which he himself attached no importance. So far as the Methodist body differs from us in worship—the extempore form, as they call it—is really discouraged by their Discipline, for Sec. 4 of the Rules on Public Worship says: "In administering the Sacraments and in the Burial of the Dead let our Ritual be invariably observed." John Wesley, indeed, compiled a Book of Prayer differing but little from that of the Church of England, but it was only used in a few places in this country, and soon withdrawn; and a majority of their adherents are ignorant of its ever having existed.

Thus briefly I have endeavored to show the origin and tenets of the three great Christian bodies of to day. Of necessity much has been omitted and much condensed, but I hope I have given the main facts. We must bear in mind always what I said at the beginning, that we

have been discussing their historic basis, not their religious work. When organizations make claims they must expect to have them weighed. The Church in the last few years has done a good deal of defence of her position, and I think for a change it is only fair play that we should criticize our critics.

The positions assumed by the Christian bodies and their reasons therefor may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The Presbyterians differ from us on the ground that the Episcopate is an unwarranted order, but the testimony of fifteen hundred years previous to their own rise is against them; their founder, John Calvin, never protested against it except as abused by the Roman power; on the contrary, there is evidence that he sought it for himself. The words of Beza, his great friend, in praise of the institution are on record; and Blondel, one of their writers, says: "By all we have said to assert the rights of Presbytery, we do not intend to invalidate the ancient and apostolical constitutions of Episcopal pre-eminence, but that wheresoever it has been put down or violated, it ought to be reverently restored." Who are right—the Presbyterians of to-day or the men who made Presbyterianism? So far as doctrine goes they have receded from their founder's five points and are daily getting farther distant.

2. The Baptists claim we are wrong in baptizing infants, and this is generally accepted as the main cause of this division from us. Their view making adults the only proper recipients of the sacrament is contradicted by the testimony of all the great writers of the early church, from Justin Martyr down to Augustine, and it is hardly to be supposed that if there had been any Scriptural or historical foundation for the assumption that it would have been neglected during the lifetime of the Apostles. Origen, one of the great Fathers of the Church, was born only 85 years after the Apostles' time, and he tells us distinctly that the "Church received a custom handed down from the Apostles to give Baptism even to infants."

3. The Methodists are separated from us. Why? The answer seems difficult. It is not our form of church government, for they thought enough of it for themselves. It is not our liturgical worship, for their discipline commands them to use the same in the most solemn services. There are no serious causes of difference; may we not hope, then, for their return to the Church to which they rightfully belong?

It is only when we come to examine the claims of those who walk not with us that we can appreciate our own advantages. If doctrinal truth, unmixed with mere opinion, and an historic lineage and descent constitute any attraction to the thoughtful mind, then this Church of ours is bound to increase more and more. We have no doctrine to hide, to apologize for or to minimize; taking our stand on the revealed parts of Christianity as summarized in the Creed and asking adhesion to these as matters of faith and nothing else, we do not have to revise our standard; with a scheme of church government that came to us from Apostolic times, hallowed by the Christian custom of ages, we have no need of modern theocracies, no matter how carefully devised; with an open Bible and a liturgy that breathes the spirit, nay, the very words of Scripture, we need no new schemes for the presentation of Divine truth or the offering up of our bounden duty of worship. Other Christian bodies have done a mighty work for the spread of the Gospel—all honor to them for it—but a still greater work lies before us and them—the unification of Protestant Christendom. Our Church, acting through her Bishops, has taken her farthest step; it is for our divided brethren now to take the step that will meet that. There are abundant signs of promise that they are doing it; may God hasten the time of its accomplishment.

GOOD ADVICE.

BY BISHOP TUTTLE.

A clergyman in a community stands by his office always, and in his person and character, almost always, the guardian and promoter of the highest and best forces and interests of that community. As a guide to the children, a helper of the poor, a carer for the sick, a sentry guard over the sanctities due the dead, and as the upholder of ideals and standards that belong to purest and best things, he is a benefactor of the community. In equity and up to the bonds of its reasonable ability that community ought to stand by and support the clergyman. It is no more than fair. It should feel it to be a matter of honor. He is ready to take by the hand the children and incline them to virtue, and to visit and help the sick and poor, and to bury the dead, and to serve in a hundred ways, when called on, the good of the people. Is it not to be recognized then that dues from the whole community belong to him? By the very nature of his avocation in life he is devoting himself to the common benefit. In fair return all of the community owe him dues. And I venture to maintain that every business man and working man, in the underlying protection to his business and property, and every woman in the sanctities of her womanhood, wifehood and motherhood, are receiving common benefit from the clergyman's work, and that in fairness and honor, one and all owe to him dues of support. My conclusion is that, in an American community, whoever is not helping to support some minister of religion is not honorably discharging the obligations that rest upon him in communion with others.

So much for men and women in general and what it seems they ought to do.

For Christians and Churchmen and Churchwomen, 'The Lord hath ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.'

No such man or woman should ever for a moment be content not to give something, and as regularly and steadily as possible for the support of the pastor and his services. The lilies should be as conscientiously given and as carefully gathered as the greets. I know of some vestries who make the mistake of going only to those of large means, or at most to the well-to-do. They leave the mechanic, the clerk, the day laborer, the seamstress, the young man and the young woman out. It is not right. It is not fair. It is not best. If it is more blessed to give than to receive, (the Master says this), then it is not right to deprive those of slender means of the pleasure and privilege of giving. It is not fair—for it is unjust to the few generous ones, throwing upon them all the duty of support—and it is discourteous to the poorer ones, and often touches their pride, and fires their resentment, as if they are of no account and not even to be asked or consulted about the needs of the Church. It is not best, for a parish where each and every one according to ability is asked to do, and does, will be a parish full of life and interest and growth; while the parish where a few only are asked and depended on will be at the best but half alive, with no heartflow of interest leading throughout it, warm and deep.

Let not therefore, would be my earnest exhortation, any Church man or woman in our parishes suffer themselves to be the receivers of spiritual benefits from the Church while not being also steady returners of help to the needed support of her services and her minister.

And may I beg vestries and committees and solicitors and collectors to see that none be overlooked, but that all be firmly and persistently, though kindly and lovingly, urged to be steady subscribers to parish funds.—*Convention Address.*