

The Church.

"HER FOUNDATIONS ARE UPON THE HOLY HILLS."

STAND YE IN THE WAYS, AND SEE, AND ASK FOR THE OLD PATHS, WHERE IS THE GOOD WAY, AND WALK THEREIN, AND YE SHALL FIND REST FOR YOUR SOULS.—JEREMIAH VI. 16.

VOLUME IV.]

TORONTO, CANADA, SATURDAY, MARCH 20, 1841.

[NUMBER 37.]

Poetry.

PSALM CXXXVII.
BY DR. DONNE.

I.
By Euphrates' flowery side
We did abide,
From dear Judah fair absent,
Tearing the air with our cries;
And our eyes
With their streams his stream augmented.

II.
When poor Zion's doleful state,
Desolate;
Sacked, burned, and enthralled,
And the temple spoiled, which we
N'er should see
To our mirthless minds we called:

III.
Our mute harps, untuned, unstrung,
Up we hung
On green willows near beside us,
Where we, sitting all forlorn,
Thus, in scorn,
Our proud spouters' gain deride us.

IV.
Come, sad captives, leave your moans,
And your groans,
Under Zion's ruins bury;
Tune your harps, and sing us lays
In the praise
Of your God, and let's be merry.

V.
Can, ah! can we leave our moans,
And our groans
Under Zion's ruins bury?
Can we in this land sing lays
In the praise
Of our God, and here be merry?

VI.
No, dear Zion, if I yet
Do forget
Thine afflictions miserable;
Let my nimbles joints become
Stiff and numb,
To touch warbling harp unable.

VII.
Let my tongue lose singing skill,
Let it still
To my parched ro' be glued,
If in either harp or voice
I rejoice,
Till thy joys shall be renewed.

VIII.
Lord, curse Edom's traitorous kind,
Bear in mind
In our ruins how they revelled;
Sack, kill, burn! they cried out still,
Sack, burn, kill!
Down with all, let all be levelled.

IX.
And thou, Babel, when the tide
Of thy pride,
Now a flowing, grows to turning;
Victor now, shalt then be thrall,
And shalt fall
To as low an ebb of mourning;

X.
Happy he who shall thee waste,
As thou hast
Us, without all mercy, wasted,
And shall make thee taste and see
What poor we
By thy means have seen and tasted.

XI.
Happy, who thy tender bairns
From the arms
Of their weeping mothers tearing,
'Gainst the walls shall dash their bones,
Ruthless stones
With their brains and blood besmeared.

MATTHEW PARKER, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

A high degree of interest attaches to the history of those men, who lived at, or near the period of our glorious reformation, and who were instrumental, either in purifying the doctrines of religion from Romish corruption, or settling that form of worship which the English church now enjoys, and which is contained in the liturgical services of her book of common prayer.

Matthew Parker, the second protestant archbishop of Canterbury, was born in the parish of St. Saviour's, Norwich, on the 6th of August, 1504. In 1521 he was admitted of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; of which house he was chosen scholar, and bible-clerk six months after. His contemporaries at college were Nicholas Bacon and Cecil, Bradford and Ridley. In 1526 he was made sub-deacon, and in the year following he was ordained priest, and elected to a fellowship. He was now about twenty-four years of age; and, being anxious to inform himself on the subjects which were then controverted, he read with diligence the volumes of the fathers of the church, and ecclesiastical writers, "becoming a hard student in the sacred science of theology; and that with so great a vehemency of mind, that, in a short space he arrived to a very considerable knowledge therein, and acquaintance with the truly ancient state and doctrines of the church." When he was about twenty-nine years of age, he thought fit to quit his retirement, and go out into the world, to preach the word of God to the people. He preached his first sermon, to the university, on Advent Sunday 1533, the year in which Cranmer was made archbishop. Profitable preaching was a thing very rare in those days; and, when many testified to the excellency of the discourses he had delivered at Granthester, near Cambridge, and at Madingly, and Barton, near Cambridge, and sometimes in towns, then in the town of Cambridge, and before auditories of great eminence, Cranmer granted him a licence to preach throughout his province, and King Henry VIII. granted him a patent; it being needful, at this time, to license and encourage with public countenance those who would undertake the task of drawing away from the eyes of the people the film of superstition that had been spread over them, and persuade them to resist the excessive encroachments of popes upon the imperial power of the kings of this land, exalting themselves over them in their own dominions, and commanding the purses of the people when they pleased.

Parker imbibed the love of the gospel in his early years; the persons from whom he first tasted of the truth being thought to be Mr. Soude and Mr. Fooke, who were of the same college, of which Parker was a scholar. Bilney, also the martyr, was his contemporary, for whom Parker had such a veneration, that he travelled to Norwich on purpose to see his martyrdom; whose character he vindicated from the imputation cast upon it by Sir Thomas More, who gave out that he recanted before his

death, and read a scroll of paper to that effect. Parker, who had seen and heard everything relating to him from his condemnation to his death, strenuously denied this allegation. Fox, in his martyrology, has preserved the account of Parker's vindication of Bilney.

It was the lot of Parker, or rather the providence of God appointed the period of his life, to fall in with that moment when learning and religion began to dawn in the university of Cambridge; when several godly men used to resort thither for the sake of conference. They held their meetings to discourse together for edification in Christian knowledge, at a house called the "White Horse," which was afterwards nick-named "Germany" by their enemies. This house was chosen because the King's, Queen's, and St. John's men might come in with the more privacy, at the back door. Among this little assembly of the early professors of the gospel, we find the names of Coverdale and Ridley, besides that of Bilney.

Parker often preached at court, and never without exciting admiration. Queen Anne Boleyn, upon the death of her chaplain Betts, sent for Parker to succeed him. He declined the honour at first, but accepted it upon being pressed by the queen's almoner, who bade him "bring with him a long gown, and that should be enough." With this queen he soon became a great favourite; insomuch that not long before her death, she gave him a particular charge to take care of her daughter Elizabeth (afterwards queen of England) that she might not want his pious and wise counsel; and at the same time laid a strict charge upon the young princess to make him a grateful return, if it should ever be in her power.

In July 1535, Parker proceeded to the degree of B.D., and in the same year was preferred by the queen to the deanery of the college of Stoke by Clare, in Suffolk, which in former times was a priory of Benedictines, but afterwards changed to a collegiate church. He laboured to reform the superstitions he found here; and, with a view thereto, founded a grammar school for children, to be instructed in the "studies of humanity" (the classics) and in the principles of the Christian religion. The scholars here "were taught also to sing," Strype tells us, "and to play upon organs, and other instrumental music;" a circumstance which should not be overlooked, and from which a useful hint might be taken by those, who, in the present day, engage in the establishment of schools of a public nature. There is a class of school now being set up, in connexion with the church, called "commercial schools;" intended for that rank of children who would come between grammar and national schools. If the children who attend these institutions were taught to sing, in addition to the other more solid subjects of education, it would have a humanizing tendency. Nothing is more calculated to soften and to raise the feelings, than singing; and it might advantageously be adopted in the higher schools of learning in the realm. Some might object to its being introduced, generally, into our places of public education, from associating with it some ideas of degradation: but this would, indeed, be a false pride. Let this exercise consist of religious tunes and words as much as possible; and let the utmost caution be used that it be always moral and sober, and the result will be the elevation of the tone of moral feeling—at any rate this is its constant tendency.

This deanery of Stoke was an agreeable retirement to Parker for the pursuit of his studies: his friend Dr. Walter Haddon used to call it "Parker's Tusculanum." But he did not confine himself to contemplation; he was an assiduous preacher, often preaching at Stoke, and at Cambridge, and places adjacent; and sometimes in London, and at St. Paul's cross. It appears that in these sermons he attacked certain Romish superstitions with such boldness, that he raised up against himself an active opposition. In particular, having to preach on Easter-day, in 1537, (about the time of the rebellion that took place this year) at Clare, which was a populous town, and filled, at that time, with soldiers of the king, he took occasion to denounce the superstitious usages on that festival; and, among other abuses, he protested against the worship of reliques. Some of his enemies in the town picked out what invidious matter they could from this discourse, and raked together certain passages from past most inoffensive sermons, and drew up all into articles against him, which they delivered to the lord chancellor Audley. His foes were disappointed: the chancellor encouraged him to go on without fear; and on the death of Queen Anne, the king took him under his more immediate protection, appointed him one of his chaplains, and, upon new modelling the church of Ely, nominated him to one of the prebends. The articles above alluded to, being, with Parker's answers, curious, are here subjoined:

"I. The manner as they regard the resurrection, with the ceremonies appertaining, was but a pageant, or an interlude." Then follows the answer made by Parker: "Upon Easter Monday I had this text of St. Paul to my theme, 'If ye then be risen with Christ, &c.' At what time I moved them to consider, spiritually, what was meant by their procession on Easter Monday, when they followed the quare (choir) about the church, with 'Christus Resurgens.' I said that it was an open protestation of their faith, to believe that Christ died for their sins, and rose again for their justification. And that the ceremony of such, following in their procession, was to declare and testify openly to the world that they would henceforth follow Christ in their conversation; that as Christ once died, and died no more, so would they cease and die to sin, no more to live therein; and, as he rose from death to life, that so they would rise to a new life, and without this meditation and purpose, their processions, with the solemnities thereof, was to them but a vain pageant, whereof they had no profit."

"II. That cross that Christ died on, was no holier than the crosses which the thieves died on."

"Upon Relick Sunday I declared unto them, what were the true reliques which we should worship, and moved them not to put their trust and affiance in the holiness and virtue of men's bones and coats whereof we have no certainty, whether they be the reliques of saints or no. And I said, that be it in case they were so, as we have been made believe, as if we had, indeed, some pieces of Christ's cross; yet to forget the mystery of Christ's cross, and fall to the worshipping of the tree of his cross, was a superstitious worship, and reproved of Ambrose."

The knowledge of God was happily beginning to be sown in these parts, through the instrumentality of Parker—a result which, as might be anticipated, nettled the popish party. Nix, bishop of Norwich, accordingly sent Dr. Stokes, prior of the Augustines, in Norwich;

who, with certain others, had been despatched to Bilney, a little before his martyrdom, to counteract those good beginnings. Truly might Parker have taken up the words of the apostle at this moment, and said, "A great door, and effectual, is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries." But though he was opposed, the resistance did not daunt, nor even check him; nor was it permitted to impede the progress of his efforts.

This Stokes was sent now to Clare, (the town mentioned above, near Stoke) under the pretence of settling there, and to preach out of good will. So he told Parker: but Parker "smelt it out," says Strype, that "it was to supplant his doctrine, and to reduce the people to the old superstitions, and to keep them in their blindness and popery." Upon which Parker, soon after, wrote him a letter, telling him boldly and plainly, that "if he came to decoy the truth, which he had preached, or to make invectives to the decay of the king's authority and lawful ordinances" (one of the articles formerly alleged against him to lord Audley, being that he had urged the people on Easter day to pay their taxes); "and to sow schism and confusion among the people, he must and would, according to his duty, give information above against him; but that, if it were his sincere intention to declare the truth, and edify the king's subjects, he would promise to join hands with him, and therein their friendship should consist." Stokes would not take this warning, and was afterwards imprisoned for popish preaching.

In 1538 Parker made a visit to the university, and took the degree of D.D., and soon after was summoned to preach before King Henry's court: but, though he was fully occupied in the discharge of his various duties, sometimes resident in his college at Stoke, sometimes attending at court, and sometimes in the pulpit, he had no cure of souls until the year 1542, when he was presented to the rectory of Ashen, in Essex, conveniently situated both for Cambridge and Stoke; but this preferment he resigned two years after, being presented to the rectory of Birmingham All Saints, in Norfolk. His most important promotion, however, that year, was to the mastership of Bend or Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where he had been educated. In the commendatory letter which the king wrote on this occasion to the college, he styled him his "beloved chaplain," and declared to the fellows of that house, that it was "for the zeal and love that he bore to the advancement of good letters, that he desired to see them furnished with such a governor as in all points might seem worthy of that room." Upon the receipt of these "letters commendatory," the fellows immediately elected him, and gave him a glad welcome. "And to this college," says the historian before alluded to, "he was ever after an extraordinary friend and benefactor; and, even when he was archbishop, took as much care of it, as though the members thereof were his own children."

Being elected vice-chancellor of the university in 1545, he had a new and larger field opened to him for his exertions. It happened that about this time a play was acted at the college, against the mind (as some said) of the master and fellows, in which the popish manner of Lent-fasting and other ceremonies, were placed in a ridiculous light. This came to the ears of the chancellor of the university, Gardiner, bishop of Winchester; who was much offended, and, in consequence, took such notice of it as "made a great dust for some time in that university." He said he would have come down himself to examine into the matter, if business had permitted him; but required Parker his vice-chancellor, to investigate the case, and report to him. All this stir was made by the bishop because he was jealous of the old superstitions. Parker, in his reply, ingeniously told the chancellor that he found that "it was not against the mind of the master and fellows, as was given out, but that it cost the college twenty nobles, allowed by the master and company; that there were indeed in the play some slanderous cavillations and suspicious senses; but that the master and seniors took care that all such speeches should be wholly omitted in the acting of the play, whereby offence might justly have arisen." Parker made no more of the affair than this; and gave, therein, an instance of his discretion: but the business did not end here. The bigoted Gardiner would not be satisfied until he had commanded Parker to find out precisely what were the words spoken, and had brought him to bind all the parties who were present at the acting of the offensive drama, with sureties, until they should know the chancellor's pleasure. Gardiner wrote them a letter, saying, that if he should even be brought to forgive the offence, he could not forget the occurrence for a great while. He brought the matter before the privy council, who did not choose to espouse the chancellor's mighty quarrel any farther than by an instruction to the vice-chancellor, that he should call the parties before him and admonish them to employ their time better in future. Had Parker been allowed to put an end to this business, as his first treatment of the complaint of Gardiner showed he was disposed to, this disturbance would not have been occasioned. "I have but one thing more to add," says Strype, "concerning our doctor, in his office of vice-chancellor, and that I gather from what was writ with his own hand, on the back of the chancellor's letter aforesaid, which, I suppose, were minutes of matters that he intended to reform, and give his orders about, viz:—

"Raiment, gowns, beards, crowns, (which two last were to be kept shaven, and not allowed to grow.) Habits, lawyers and masters of art.
"Sitting at divinity, disputations, and at sermons, &c.
"Coming to congregations, and common dirges, king's dirges.
"Pronunciation of the Greek tongue (about which there was great controversy about this time; and which was one of the grounds of complaint which, in his displeasure, Gardiner alledged in the letter above referred to.)
"Revelation of Seercesies."

Under Edward VI. Parker was made a prebendary of Lincoln, and the same month, dean of that cathedral. In the following year Mary deprived him of all his preferments, in common with the other married clergy, who would not put away their wives; but he bore his reverse of fortune with firm resignation. Strype quotes a MS. in the college library, which says of Parker, at this period, that he "lurked secretly in those years (the reign of Mary) within the house of one of his friends, leading a poor life, without any man's aid or succour; and yet so well contented with his lot, that, in that pleasant rest and leisure for his studies, he would never in respect of himself, have desired any other kind of life, the extreme fear of danger only excepted." Either

from the remissness of his enemies, or the kindness of his friends, he succeeded in secreting himself in these peculiar times, being, says Middleton, "reserved for better days." Among other treatises which employed his pen, during this interval, was one in defence of priest's marriages, against a book by Dr. Martin—it was printed without his name, in 1562. He also translated the book of psalms into metre, which was afterwards printed, probably in 1566. This book, which Strype says he could never get a sight of, is divided into three quinquagenies, or portions of fifty, with the argument of each psalm in metre, placed before it, and a suitable collect at the end of each. Some copies of verses, and transcripts from the fathers and others, on the use of the psalms, are prefixed to it, with a table dividing them into "prophetic, instructive, consolatory," &c. And, at the end, are added several tunes, with alphabetical tables to the whole.

(To be continued.)

SCHISM.

From Gresley's "Portrait of an English Churchman."

"A thousand daily sects rise up and die,
A thousand more the perish'd race supply."

DRYDEN.

"I have thought much," said Ridley to his friend, "on the explanation, which you were so good as to give me yesterday, of the doctrine of the 'Apostolic Church' and I have referred again to the passages of Scripture which you quoted. There appears to me no doubt that our Lord and his Apostles contemplated the formation of a uniform, undivided, and organized body; branching throughout the whole world, and maintaining every where the same essentials of doctrine and discipline—a body which should have 'authority in controversies of faith,' and power to expel disorderly members from its community—itself being preserved from error by the ever-burning lamp of scriptural truths. And I can well imagine how great an advantage and blessing it must have been, in the earlier ages, that such a visible body should exist, to which all Christians might safely join themselves for edification and communion; and, consequently how pernicious and sinful it must have been to break in upon this providential arrangement. The union with such a Church seems to present that happy medium between a blind submission to human guidance, and a presumptuous leaning to our private judgment, which is exactly suited to our condition as fallible and responsible beings; and no other state of things could well be conceived more calculated to preserve that friendly communion amongst Christians, which is so strongly enjoined in the word of God; or to re-establish that fellowship, if unhappily it should have been broken; and no other system appears more adapted to spread itself over the world, and embrace all nations and languages, and retain them in the true faith.

"One difficulty, however, occurs to me—namely, that if the Church be one, and that only be the true Church which maintains the Apostles' doctrine and discipline, we unchurch many existing bodies of Christians which have varied from these conditions."

"I see," said Herbert, smiling, "that you have forgotten my advice—to keep your mind fixed on the evidence given in Scripture to the doctrine of the Church. It is a doctrine of which I think Scripture furnishes abundant proof. If Scripture admit of different interpretations, then the best help to guide us to the right meaning is the testimony and practice of the first Christians; and in the case before us the practice of the ancient Church fully corroborates the view which I have taken. But I see that you have been perplexing yourself with the present aspect of the Church; and though you acknowledge that Scripture speaks very plainly; and do not deny the ancient uniform constitution of the Church; and even admit that you discern great advantage in such an arrangement, and suitability to our condition—yet, because within the last century or two, certain sects have sprung up, without being excommunicated, in this corner of the world of ours, you must alter the whole system, proved by Scriptures and ancient usage, and recommended by its manifest adaptation to the wants of human nature, for fear, as you say, of unchurching these modern separatists."

"Ridley.—I confess that you have described with tolerable exactness what has been the drift of my thoughts.

HERBERT.—It is a most common fallacy. The great misfortune is, that right-minded persons, like yourself, should so frequently fall into it. But tell me now, what do you mean by that word "unchurching" which you have used?

RIDLEY.—I meant that, in defining the Church as you have done, you deny its blessings and privileges to those bodies of Christians who do not belong to it.

HERBERT.—Just so, you seem to think that we act uncharitably to those bodies of Christians, and deprive them of certain valuable privileges. But I would fain ask, what possible effect our opinion, whether true or false, can have on those communities? How can it affect their claims either one way or the other? Our opinion cannot unchurch those who really belong to the Church of Christ; neither can it make those persons members of the Church, who are not so. We cannot arrest God's grace, or shorten his arm to save; but neither, on the other hand, can we extend the privileges of his Church to those who refuse to accept them,—except by persuading them of their danger.

RIDLEY.—All that is true. But then, do you not lay yourself out to the charge of illiberality and want of charity, by refusing to acknowledge them as Churchmen?

HERBERT.—That is to say,—though we believe our neighbours to be walking in an unsafe course, or to say the least, at great disadvantage, we ought never to invite them to join themselves to us, and share our privileges, but let them go on as they please, without one word of caution or admonition. This may be liberal; it may be called liberal to explain away the word of God, and say that one form of religion is as good as another, when God expressly teaches us the contrary. It may be thought very liberal to say that separation from the Church is no sin, when Scripture declares it to be so; but I deny that it is charitable. I deny that it is charitable to remove the ancient landmarks which God has fixed; or to see our brother in imminent peril, and persuade him that he is in safety. Surely, if any persons can properly be said to unchurch their brethren, it is those, who, from false liberality, or worldly policy, or indolent good-nature, or ignorance of Scripture, speak lightly of the sin of schism, and so prevent separatists from seeing their error, and joining themselves to the Apostolic Church.

But, in truth, the question is not as to what is liberal or illiberal, but what is true or false. The Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ established and organized a church; and expressly declared that schism or separation from that church was a grievous sin. If we believe that there is a church at all, we cannot help being illiberal, as it is termed, to some; because, whosoever we believe the line to be drawn, we must by the very force of the terms, suppose that those who do not come within the line are beyond it—that those who do not belong to the Church are without it. Do not (the so-called) orthodox Dissenters themselves call the Church of Rome Antichristian, and Socinianism a God-denying heresy? It is our plain duty to ascertain what the Church of Christ really is, and not only to adhere to it, but to avow our adherence to it. We should cast to the winds all idle notions about liberality or illiberality in religion, and pray God to deliver us from so mean a principle as the fear of being thought illiberal.

RIDLEY.—Your opinions are somewhat strong for the nineteenth century, though I confess I cannot deny their correctness.

HERBERT.—No lapse of centuries can alter the eternal word of truth. What the Church was in the first century, such must it remain in the nineteenth and for ever.

Perhaps the subject before us may be placed in a clearer view, if we consider the circumstances of the early Church. St. Paul, we know, in the course of his journeyings, went to the island of Crete, (the "hundred cities" in Homer's time, and a flourishing and populous island in the time of St. Paul.) Here his labours were blessed by the conversion of many heathens; and when he departed from the island, he left Titus behind him in the episcopal office, with the commission to "set in order the things that were wanting, and ordain elders in every city." Now let us suppose, that, soon after the Apostle was gone, there arose up "certain unruly and vain talkers and deceivers," respecting whom he had given Titus warning. Suppose that these men took upon themselves to dissent from the arrangements made by Titus. Some were not satisfied with their ordained elders, and appointed others, who ministered without ordination; others obtained their ordination, not from the Bishop, whom St. Paul left for that purpose, but from the elders who had no such commission; others mixed up Pagan rites with the pure ordinances of Christianity—the worship of idols, and other such abominations. In short, some became Romanists, others Presbyterians, and others Independent Congregationalists. The rest kept in all things to the Apostolic doctrines and ordinances. Can there be the slightest difference of opinion as to which was the true Church, and which were the schismatics? And can there be any doubt that those who separated from the Bishops, and induced others to separate, were guilty of a very great sin—namely, the sin of schism—and debarr'd themselves from the blessed privilege of that Church from which they had departed.

RIDLEY.—You have put the case in a point of view, which, I confess, had not before struck me. Still there seems to be a question, whether the separatists of the present day stand on the same footing as your primo-primitive dissenters?

HERBERT.—I think a very strong parallel might be drawn between the supposed condition of the Church in Crete, when St. Paul left it, and that of the Church in England, at the time of Elizabeth. In both the doctrine was pure and scriptural, and the discipline was Apostolic. We had put from us the modern corruptions of Rome, and stood on the basis of ancient Catholicity. Whosoever sinfulness therefore attached itself to the supposed Cretan dissenters, would be equally attributable to those Englishmen, who first separated themselves from the reformed branch of the Church in England. With persons born and educated in dissent, and living in an age when schism is not acknowledged as a crime, we may hope and believe that to live in separation from the Church is not a sinful but an involuntary error, the fault of their education and early prepossessions. All this we may acknowledge, and yet warn men against dissent, as ruinous to the Church, and most pernicious to those who follow it. With those who are dissenters from ignorance and not from wilfulness, it may be not so much their fault, as their misfortune; but a very great misfortune, I believe it to be. For if their parents or forefathers who first wilfully separated from the Church, deprived themselves of great privileges, it does not seem possible that their privileges should be restored to their children, except upon their joining the Church. Whosoever blessing God gives through his regularly ordained ministry, whatsoever benefit is attached to their administration of the sacraments of Baptism and the holy Eucharist, whatsoever advantage belongs to hearing the word preached by lawful spiritual authority,—all these the dissenter manifestly loses, whether it be through his sin or his misfortune. Thus, in a remarkable manner, the sin of the parents cleaves to the children until the third or fourth generation; for—as I have remarked, and, as far as my own observation extends, believe it true—dissenters, except of the more violent political sort, do, after a few generations, find their way back to the Church.

So then we believe that the Church of Christ is one and indivisible, and that God's providence will continually preserve it. Time, in its course, may for a while obscure the excellencies of its beauty. It may be weighed down by heresy and error, as it was before the Reformation; but, by the help of God, and through the light of his holy word, it will again emerge in its former purity. It may be vexed by schism, as it is at the present time; but, with God's aid, it will shake off from it all its enemies and false friends, as it has done many times before. It will flow on, like a mighty river, fertilizing the plains through which it passes, and, though its current may run turbid for a while, or a thousand bubbles float upon its surface, yet will it go calmly and majestically onward till it fall into the ocean of eternity.

(Herbert paused, but his friend making no reply, he resumed.) The observations which I have made with regard to separation from the Church, have been in answer to the latitudinarian opinions, which are at present so lamentably prevalent. I am, however, very far from denying that there is also such a thing as intolerance, and undue positiveness, as well as latitudinarianism. Each man of course endeavours to attain the true medium. In my opinion, the best way to avoid the two extremes is to make up one's mind as to what is the true Church of Christ, and with thankfulness to God, to study to live in holy communion with it; but not to care to pronounce decidedly, who do not belong to it, or what disadvantage accrues to them. Church matters are so confused and involved, that it seems impossible to draw the precise line of demarcation between the Church and separatists. With regard to the several bodies more immediately in contact with ourselves, which receive commonly the appellation of Churches, it does not seem necessary, or even possible, that we should affirm how far they have a right to that title—or rather how far the individual members of those bodies may claim the title of Churchmen. We cannot admit their claim, because in our judgment, they do not adhere to the Apostolic doctrine and discipline. On the other hand, to say precisely what degree of aberration excludes them from the rank of Churches, would be doing more than we are warranted. Thus, the Church of Rome, miscalled the Catholic Church, while it maintains the Apostolic succession and threefold order of ministry, has, as we believe, especially at the Council of Trent, authorized gross errors, and departed in many things from the Apostolic doctrine, as set forth in holy Scripture. How far this may vitiate her ministrations, we presume not to judge. Hooker says, "We must acknowledge even heretics themselves to be, though a maimed part, yet a part of the visible Church."

*** We dare not communicate with Rome concerning her sundry gross and grievous abominations; yet, touching those main parts of christian truth, wherein they constantly still persist, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Jesus Christ."

So again with regard to Presbyterians,—the doctrines which they hold are, in most respects, similar to our own, and they profess to maintain the Apostolic succession of the ministry, but in rejecting the ordination of bishops, to whom alone, as we believe, power was given in the Church to ordain, they have introduced a perplexing novelty, and have departed from the Apostolic discipline, which had existed for fifteen hundred years. The power of ordination, which was conferred by the Apostles on the first bishops, has been handed down from bishop to bishop throughout the whole Church from the beginning; and we have no intimation, either in scripture or in history, of Elders or Presbyters having received the power to ordain, or to administer the sacraments without episcopal ordination. At the same time I

* From the Church of England Magazine.