

Father and the Son, are one in *essence*; and the Son breathed on His Apostles, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." The Son is rightly recognized in the terms of the latter creed, "Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son," the Latin preposition "a" including both *out of* and *from* the Father, as well as *through* the Son.]

Well would it be for the Universal Church if the deep learning and conciliatory spirit of Dr. Dollinger pervaded all separate bodies of Christians, and that they would conscientiously try to understand each other's difficulties, looking to the points whereon they agree rather than insist on those in which they differ; for the power as well as influence of the Universal Church is vastly diminished by present standing apart. It may be readily said, "Physician, heal thyself." Well, then, my object is to find a basis (and the only basis, it appears to me) on which union is possible. It is not Individualism, it is not Individualism, but it is "Churchism"—the belief that Christ Himself, on the day of His resurrection, instituted and armed with divine authority, a visible Society or Church, to which "He added daily such as should be saved."

For, to the neglect or denial of this doctrine we owe, I believe, that Rationalistic criticism which would cast down from all authority the Holy Scripture, the foundation of our beliefs and hopes.

That there was great need of some such external witness to the Scriptures—some such guide to distinguish genuine from spurious Gospels, the faith once delivered to the saints from additions of heresy and later superstition—is sufficiently obvious.

And some such *standpoint* for our common faith becomes still more necessary in these days, when improved education stimulates enquiry, and demands reason for the faith propounded for its acceptance. At the same time, there is a yearning for a closer fellowship in the Gospel, and more united ministerial action on every side. The first symptom of such a desire was the proposal, many years ago, for "Evangelical Alliance;" but the principle of *alliance* implies normal separation in opposition to the primitive dogma of "one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." It tended, however, to call forth Christian sympathy. Since that Alliance began, it seems as if Independency had softened into Congregationalism, and Congregationalism, in despite of its name, was gravitating towards union. Again, the Baptist, minimising the grounds of his separation, fraternises with Pædobaptists. The Presbyterian repudiates his ancient claim of divine right, and, forgetting past antagonism, allies himself with the Independent. Everywhere disintegration seems to be setting in. Cohesion is overpowered by attraction from without.

Meanwhile freethought and Rationalistic criticism are eating into the heart of negative Protestantism, from which the zeal and fervor of old Puritanism has departed. Union, therefore, seems more than ever desirable for those who believe that "there is one God and one mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus."

The great hindrance to such union I imagine our Protestant brethren conscientiously believe to be the connection between the Church and State in England. Were the civil and social distinction hence arising removed, they think that the separation between themselves and the Anglican clergy would come to an end.

I shall not enter here into the historic continuity of life, through many changes and chances of the Church of England, from the days of its first martyr, St. Alban, to the present time; but it is my conviction, looking to the American Episcopal Church,

that disestablishment would in no wise have that effect.

I acknowledge the talent, energy, learning, piety, and respectability of many ministers not of our communion. I have always entertained a hope that, as time went on, some method would be found whereby they might, without wounding feeling or conscience, combine with us to evangelize a sinful world.

I need hardly remind you how this hope found expression in my letter to the Rev. T. Binney, in 1858. His reply, contained in his "Church of the Future," effectually dispelled the "dream" which I had entertained. Athanasius contending against the world for the Catholic Faith (not his own *private* judgment) was adduced to sanction the principle that "one may be a Church as well as three," and it was asserted that the Church was once "centralized" (which does not mean *individualized*) in him. The difference between the believers in a Catholic and Apostolic Church, and those who maintain that "every individual may be a Church in himself" then appeared essentially irreconcilable.

I am not pronouncing *ex cathedra* that the Anglican Churchman is right and the Individualist's view wrong. I am simply endeavoring to bring into view the direct antagonism of their *principles*, and to point out that before *co operation* or *union* can take place, it must be shown that the one or the other principle is untenable according to Scripture. I now, therefore, briefly set before you the facts which justify our belief in the divine origin and inspired authority of a Catholic and Apostolic Church, and make loyal adherence to it as an obligation of conscience, and not an uncharitable prejudice.

The visible Church of Christ grew directly out of the Mosaic. The olive-tree from which the Hebrew natural branches were broken off, and wild branches from the Gentile world grafted in, preserved unbroken its continuity of life. The Apostles were to "sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." They were to be the spiritual heads of the new Israel. The elder dispensation accordingly closed with that last passover, which in gloom and sadness at even on the day of preparation our Lord ate with His Apostles. He would eat no more of that typical passover, for it would be fulfilled and superseded by the sacrifice of Himself. He would drink no more of that fruit of the vine until he drank it new, as representing His own most precious blood, in the kingdom of God.

In less than forty-eight hours He fulfilled that prediction. He made Himself known after His resurrection, to His disciples at Emmaus in the "breaking of bread;" recalling the sacrament of His Body and Blood which He had instituted just before He suffered. Later on that evening and in the same upper chamber He gave to the eleven their Apostolic Mission. "As my Father hath sent me, so send I you." He also breathed on them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." The day itself also was consecrated by His resurrection, being the first day of the week, to be the Christian day of worship.

In these recorded circumstances we find the framework of the Apostolic Church which was to become Catholic—Apostolic commission—Apostolic authority—plenary Inspiration—the belief of His Church in the Father, Himself the Christ—and the Holy Ghost—the redeeming sacrifice of Himself as the true passover—His resurrection from the dead—the power of binding or loosing sinners—the ministration of the sacraments—the keeping holy the first day of the week as the Lord's Day—the unity of the Church

concentrated in the company of the Apostles in that upper chamber! But as His epiphany, after His birth at Bethlehem, to the Gentiles was deferred for a short interval, so the manifestation of His Church, as destined to embrace all nations and languages, was postponed until the Day of Pentecost, where, by the visible descent of the Holy Ghost, the gift of languages was poured out upon the twelve Apostles and whole body of believers, together with the gift of discerning spirits. They were thus fitted to be the Evangelists of the world. This gift of tongues was at once followed by the conversion and baptism of three thousand souls. The Apostolic ministry was then enlarged. The Apostles laid hands on the seven deacons. The Church had already grown to a great multitude of men and women; but after that ordination, the "number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly, and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." Acts vi. 7. Many of the *Seventy*, too, whom our Lord sent forth after His apostles, were still exercising the office to which He had sent them; and we find—A.D. 44—Saul and Barnabas bringing to the "elders" at Jerusalem the alms of the Antioch Gentile Christians. No mention is anywhere made of their appointment by the Apostles; but they were known and recognized in the Mother Church of Jerusalem, most probably because appointed by our Lord.

The history, then, of these early days of the Church shows how systematic and complete was its organization, and how it thoroughly acknowledged the apostolic regimen within it. The record of the Evangelists is so clear that it excites our wonder how any critic acquainted with the New Testament Scriptures and disposed to read them without prejudice, could attribute to James, "the traditional first Bishop of Jerusalem, the organization and form of government of the Church."

The Church of England, however, "receives and accounts Canonical" all the books of the New Testament as they are commonly received. In faith, then, of the authenticity and inspiration of the Scriptures, Churchmen entertain a strong conviction of the duty to uphold, and adhere to that Apostolic fellowship and Church to which our "Lord added daily such as should be saved."

But while we act ourselves on this principle as Churchmen, we do not feel called on to LIMIT the blessing or grace of God, and we forbid none to work spiritual miracles in Christ's name, "because they follow not us." I only wish to show our Protestant brethren the real ground of not giving them, as we would wish, the "right hand of fellowship." With our convictions we cannot be false to Christ's institution.

Moreover, there are issues now raised in regard to the Scriptures and Evangelical doctrine on which the *fact* and authority of the Church, as instituted immediately by Christ Himself, are of the utmost importance. The Anglican Church says in her 20th article "that the Church is a witness and keeper of Holy Writ." Instituted by Christ Himself on the day of His resurrection, it is, indeed, admirably fitted to record and to preserve our Lord's own teaching during the forty days in which he was seen of the apostles, and heard "speaking of the things pertaining unto the kingdom of God." The living Church, filled with the Spirit at Pentecost, taught "that form of sound words, and guarded it as a sacred deposit, and delivered it to the saints. It was committed to the 'Apostles' to 'faithful men,' that they might be able to teach others. Their divine gift of 'discerning of spirits,' enabled them to stamp with authority four only out of many Gospels as *authentic* and genuine, which have come down to us on;