

# 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.

COBOURG, UPPER CANADA, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1839.

[NUMBER XX.]

VOLUME III.]

## Poetry.

### AUTUMNAL HYMN.

The leaves, around me falling,  
Are preaching of decay,  
The hollow winds are calling—  
"Come, pilgrim, come away!"  
The day in night declining  
Says I must too decline,  
The year its bloom resigning—  
Its lot fore-shadows mine!

The light my path surrounding,  
The loves to which I cling,  
The hopes within me bounding,  
The joys that round me wing—  
All, all, like stars at even,  
Just gleam and shoot away,  
Pass on before to heaven,  
And chide at my delay.

The friends gone there before me  
Are calling me from high,  
And happy angels o'er me  
Temp't sweetly to the sky.  
"Why wail," they say, "and wither,  
Mid scenes of death and sin?  
O rise to glory hither,  
And find true life begin!"

I hear the invitation,  
And faint would rise and come,  
A sinner to salvation,  
An exile to his home;  
But while I here must linger,  
Thus, thus, let all I see  
Point on with faithful finger  
To heaven, O Lord, and Thee!

British Magazine.

### THE HOUR-GLASS.

BY JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Alas! how swift the moments fly!  
How flash the years along!  
Scarce here, yet gone already by  
—The harp of a song!  
See childhood, youth, and manhood pass,  
And age with furrowed brow:  
Time was—Time shall be; drain the glass—  
But where, in time, is Now?

Time is the measure but of change;  
No present hour is found:  
The past, the future, fill the range  
Of Time's incessant round.  
Where then is Now?—In realms above  
With God's anointed Lamb,  
In regions of eternal love  
Where sits enthroned I AM.

Then, pilgrim, let thy joys and tears  
On earth no longer lean:  
But henceforth all thy hopes and fears  
From earth's affections wean.  
To God let votive accents rise  
With truth, with virtue live;  
So all the bliss that Time denies  
Eternally shall give.

### INFANT BAPTISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.\*

We have been induced to notice a tract on the subject of Baptism,† because it is the only one which we have had an opportunity of seeing, for a short time, of those which some over-zealous females in the eastern vicinity of the Metropolis are assiduously introducing into the houses of the members of the Established Church, with a view of detaching the inmates from her communion. We have reason to fear that the same plan is in operation in some of the Sunday schools.

The tract is written with moderation, and is very specious. It condenses, in a small space, the principal objections which the Baptists have made against our practice. The exclusive source from which the arguments are affected to be drawn is the New Testament; and the writings of the fathers, ecclesiastical documents, and customs, are rejected, as unconnected with the enquiry. Here Mr. Craps has acted fairly, but unjustly; for he must be assured that their evidence is against him. It is obvious to every rational person, that the statements of those who lived near to the primitive times must be far more worthy of credit than the statements of the moderns. As we, however, regard the authority of the early fathers on this point, but at the same time will meet him, without their aid, on his own ground, we shall content ourselves with referring our readers to Wall's excellent work on Baptism, where the ecclesiastical testimony is preserved; in fact, the passages which we might additionally quote, would only be confirmatory of those which are there produced.

Not contented with allowing the New Testament to be the exclusive authority for the mode of administering the rite, it is clear that Mr. Craps expects us to understand it, as he understands it, from which we shall shew abundant reasons for dissenting. Because the New Testament does not, *videlicet* *verbis*, avouch our practice, it is inconsequently assumed that it is opposed to it: on the other hand, we affirm, that it distinctly implies infant baptism, and that even if it afforded no hint upon the subject, it would be most illogical to argue from its silence to the impropriety of the custom.

A critical theologian, remembering that children, by circumcision, were admitted, on the eighth day, by a positive Divine command, into the covenant struck with Abraham, ere he ventured to affirm that infant baptism was contrary to the Divine will, would require as positive a prohibition of it from the same exalted authority, more especially, as Circumcision and Baptism were typically connected. He would infer, from the absence of such a prohibition, that Christ intended children to be admitted into the new covenant, in the infant state; and ere he would admit the contrary to be proved, would expect a satisfactory reason, why neither Christ, nor his Apostles, in their writings, treating of Baptism, left not an injunction to determine the cessation of this as a legal age of incorporation into the Church.

The author of the tract states, that infants could not have been the subjects of baptism, because St. John baptized "such as confessed their sins," Matt. iii. 1, 6, Mark i. 5. This restricted version of the Greek text will not bear; and whilst we admit that infants could not have confessed their sins, we deny the words to be capable of constituting premises for the inference which has been drawn from them. If we even supposed the majority of those who flocked to the Jordan to have attained the years of adolescence, it will not follow that *all* in the congregated throng were adults: the words, therefore, can become no authority against the existing practice. It is, however, preposterous to imagine, that there were not children among the multitude; and it requires a

great exertion of fancy to suppose this discourse differently composed from all others. The words in the original are, certainly, inclusive of every gradation of age; and the argument which is hazarded on "confessing their sins," demands the article to be added to the Greek, ere it can be valid. That the passage in St. Matthew applied indiscriminately to the whole assembly, we have the authority of St. Mark, who adds, that *all* were baptized.

Inquiries of this nature, it is necessary deeply to study the idiom of the writers; and we fearlessly maintain that the New Testament cannot be criticised without a knowledge of the old Hebrew, and of the dialect which was spoken in Palestine in our Saviour's time. On the principle of criticism which Mr. Craps has adopted, taking the preceding verse in St. Matthew, and the whole verse in St. Mark, as our guides, we might equally assert, that although we read of impenitent Pharisees and Sadducees, and unbelieving Jews, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, of all Judaea, and of all the region round about the Jordan, confessed their sins and were baptized. Were we thus to interpret the narrative, as we might on Mr. Craps' principle, would he be sufficiently hardy to affirm, that these places were without infants and children? If he should admit their existence, how can he avoid the inference, that these infants and children were baptized? But, although we will not resort to such a disingenuous argument, we affirm, that it is absolutely incredible, that the multitude should have been devoid of children. As the evangelists, however, by this full statement, merely implied that the multitude was composed of people from these places, so, by the same style of idiom, where the multitude are recorded\* to have confessed their sins, it will not follow, as an inference, that the infants, who could not confess their sins, were not baptized, any more than it will follow, that we must literally understand that the *collective* inhabitants of Jerusalem and these places were received on this occasion among the disciples of the Baptist, which the subsequent history of the Jews, in the Life of Christ, most fully disproves. The evangelists wrote according to the customary style of the Hebrews, and their meaning must not be distorted by modern interpretations.

Another very curious argument urged against infant baptism is, that Christ was not baptized in his infancy, but when he began to be about thirty years of age. Yet, as he was circumcised on the eighth day, according to the requisition of the existing and then stringent economy, the principle of infant admission into the covenant was observed with respect to him; and it would have been exceedingly strange, if he had entered into the covenant by a rite which did not then exist: for the baptism required at the admission of the proselyte had certain characteristic distinctions from that which was administered by St. John. Accordingly, when he was baptized in the Jordan, he was about (or *was*) thirty years of age, shortly after the period of John's manifestation; but, independently of this, there were other reasons which rendered this the eligible period for his baptism. First, this was the statutable age of the ministry, before which the Jews would not have acknowledged him, as a reformer and teacher sent from God; secondly, having attained that age, as he intended baptism to become a sacrament in his Church, he confirmed *then* the institution by his own example, and was duly inaugurated by his precursor into his office. If then, the sort of baptism which Christ sanctioned and ordained in his Church (for the earlier Jewish baptisms are distinct considerations) existed not till John, emerging from his crematical seclusion, baptized the multitude in the Jordan, how possibly can an argument be founded against infant baptism, because Christ was not baptized in his infancy?

An allegation, still more extraordinary, follows this pseudo-argument, respecting the twelve disciples. We are informed by this writer, on the authority of John iii. 22, that they were baptized by Christ: we have inspected the passage, and think very differently. To render this an historical fact, *aliquid* must be supplied after *ἵδαντες*, and we are of opinion, that on so important a point, such an ellipsis would not have occurred. The meaning is, decidedly general, and has no allusion to Christ baptizing his disciples. It is clear from the two first verses of the next chapter, that he did not administer baptism; and that the expression must be explained by his disciples having baptized in his name. Strange, therefore, is this observation: "we do not read of his baptizing any but disciples, and these could not be infants; for he says, whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple!" We perfectly agree with Mr. Craps, that the full-grown disciples could not have been infants; but his odd remark seems to require that they should have been restored to infancy on the occasion, if infant baptism be true. It is very easy of solution, why infant baptism is not particularly recorded in the New Testament; for the evangelists, where they individualized, were occupied in detailing the most striking instances, and where they wrote of whole households and multitudes, included those of every age belonging to those households and multitudes in their narratives. From the case of little children having been brought to Christ, Mr. Craps allows no argument in favour of infant baptism to be drawn: but here he is mistaken. It is not, indeed, stated, that those children had been received by baptism into Christ's flock: nevertheless, two things are certain; the one, that they were infants or scarcely more than infants, since Christ took them in his arms; the other, that these infants, as St. Luke calls them, were brought for the purpose of a religious act. For although their age disproves the idea that they were brought to receive a rite answering to the Bar Mitzveh, or Son of the Precept, still, every one versed in Hebrew and early Christian customs must, in the imposition of hands, discern a religious office. Consequently, Christ, having rebuked those who would have kept them back—having taken them in his arms, laid his hands upon them and blessed them—having, moreover, declared that of such is the kingdom of heaven,—it is in the highest degree improbable, both from his act and that of those who brought them, that they should not have received the ordinance of baptism. The opposite idea is certainly encumbered with considerable difficulties. For, if baptism be the ordained mean of coming to Christ, and if Christ desired that infants (*βρέφη*, Luke xviii. 15) should be suffered to come to him, on what plea can infant baptism be refused?

The various other texts quoted are as faultily applied. Thus the attempt to disprove the baptism of infants, when whole households were admitted to the rite, because they are said to have believed, which could not have been predicated of infants, amounts to a denial of the

inclusion of particulars in generals. It would have been remarkable, if the families of Stephanus, Caius, and others, had been entirely composed of adults; and it would be incredible, that such should have been the case in every family which the apostles baptized. But, if Mr. Craps be right, we must to this unparalleled conclusion. Nothing, however, is more common, than for the sacred writers thus to express themselves; for such was the language of their day. If, then, the heads and adults of these families believed and engaged to follow the Christian profession, the custom of the times would induce them to pledge themselves to the education of the whole family, inclusive of infants, in the same faith; and a Jewish or Hellenistic writer would record such a pledge by stating, that such, with all their households, believed. David, alluding to this custom, says, "As for me and all my house, we will serve the Lord," which was an engagement to that effect on his part; and to this custom there were many parallels among the Gentiles. Consequently, all the members of these households, collectively, were baptized—whether or not they contained infants, we refer to common sense.

We have now arrived at the much worn argument, that baptism means immersion, and that *βάπτισμα* and *βαπτίζω* signify to dip or immerse. No one, indeed, can critically dispute, that such is the meaning of the words in pure Greek; but whether they may have had a wider sense in the Hellenistic dialect—the dialect in which the New Testament is written—is another affair. *Tabal* is the most common term for these verbs in Hebrew, which certainly means to dip; but, as it is allied to the Arabic *Tafala*, (as we may see in the native Arabic Lexica, under the word *Tabalon*), which implies to sprinkle or disperse, we may as critically suppose that this sense was also in the Hebrew *Tabal*, when the Hebrew was a spoken language. And in judging of the force of Greek words in the New Testament, we must consider what was the Hebrew term present to the minds of the writers. This idea is strengthened by the circumstance of *βάπτισμα* standing in the Septuagint, in Dan. iv. 30, 23, for the Chaldee term *tesbaa*, the cognate to which, in Arabic, is continually applied to Christian baptism. In our version the verses are Dan. iv. 33, v. 21. Now, as it is scarcely possible for anyone to say that Nebuchadnezzar was baptized with the dew of heaven, in the sense of immersion, since the dew fell on him; and as he could not have immersed himself in the dew, it is very certain that *βάπτισμα*, in this dialect, had a wider signification. Thus, as we proceed, we shall be able to justify affusion or sprinkling.

We grant that immersion was administered in the Jordan; for immersion is still practised in hot countries, and was enjoined by legislators who had no connexion with the Hebrews. But what would be salubrious in hot regions, would be often injurious in cold; and we may remark, that many of the Divine institutions had respect to the health. Thus, swine's flesh was forbidden, because it occasioned leprosy: thus circumcision was selected as the outward mark of the covenant, because, as Michaelis has shewn, an incontrovertible authority, it was in those climates conducive to health, in a manner which we are not required to explain; and, for the same reason, immersion was practised in the East.

But, if immersion was practised on account of climate, it is not imperative that baptism should be administered in this way alone, and as the apostle Paul shewed its object to be purification of mind, whether it be received by immersion, affusion, or sprinkling, that object will be equally realized. Mr. Craps has insisted on immersion, from the typical import of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, where he has the misfortune, in vindicating one part of his creed, to destroy the other: since, as the Israelites were accompanied in this passage by their little ones, they were as much immersed as the adults. On the same principle, as some of the legal affusions and sprinklings were typical of baptism, the analogy between type and anti-type will sanction affusion and sprinkling in baptism. Indeed, if in the one sacrament a part be accounted sufficient and equal in efficacy to the whole, we see not why the case should not be the same in the other.

It is further argued, that our Lord called his sufferings a baptism, because "he was about to sink into the deep waters of Divine justice for man's redemption." But such a reason no where appears; and, if different parts of Scripture can be brought together in this way, many things repugnant to the Scriptures may be proved from such an unconnected *juxta*-position of their passages. We shall not here stay to illustrate the cup and the baptism, of which our Saviour spoke, (Matt. xx. 22, 23, Luke xii. 50.) from the parasology of the times, but, will simply state, that, whilst the crucifixion can by no ingenuity be compared to an immersion, the apostle Paul, alluding to it, speaks of the *sprinkling* of the blood of Christ.

It is also urged, that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was an emblematical immersion, not a sprinkling; for, *all* the house was filled with the sound, as of a mighty rushing wind. For the reason which we have given respecting Nebuchadnezzar and the dew of heaven, it is impossible that this can be correctly denominated an immersion: it could not have been such in any way. A more happy term might have been selected, in *affusion*; but that was contrary to the writer's scope. The impropriety of pressing this event into the argument, is manifest; for those who subsequently received the Holy Ghost, by imposition of hands, could not, in any sense, be said to have been immersed, which would be necessary to the validity of the opinion. To this instance, therefore, as to the crucifixion, we perceive, that baptism is applied where immersion could not have occurred, which corroborates our former remark, as to the extended uses of the word.

We trust, that these observations will also suffice to rebut the insinuation, that we have changed a Divine ordinance: the Fathers, whom Mr. Craps has disingenuously rejected, would easily refute it. We also hope, that from the New Testament we have shewn the errors of his criticisms. The charge, indeed, of changing the Divine ordinance, will, in our opinion, rather tell against those who have abandoned the ancient forms of the Church. What would Mr. Craps say, if, as he so strongly insists on immersion as the only mode of baptism, we should object to the members of his persuasion, that they do not partake of the Sacrament, as Christ partook of the last supper, in connexion with the ceremonies of the Paschal Lamb? If, then, he insists that we are guilty of change, he, also, is not guiltless of it. But

\* In cases of clinical baptism, [the baptism of persons lying down] which must have occurred in the first ages, and converted made at the point of death, immersion could not have been practised; and what must have been practised on such occasions will prove, that we have not changed a Divine ordinance.

it is time to abandon controversial subjects, with the remark, that as the Dissenters often quote respecting us, that the letter killeth, but that the spirit giveth life; in this pertinacious discussion, the Baptists appear to discard the spirit, and adhere to what they conceive to be the letter.

### PROGRESS OF CHURCH PRINCIPLES.

Each day gives to the Church of Christ, by God's grace established in this country, some fresh proof that her true sons are on the alert. A return to the good old paths in which our fathers walked is everywhere observable; and men are ceasing to be ashamed of their distinctive character as Churchmen. Alas! that there ever should have been a time when children could regard with indifference the claims put forth by their Mother in Christ; and yet so it has been. There have been many who nevertheless called themselves Churchmen, although in almost every action of their lives they belied their profession. Among these, an attentive observer will remark two classes—those who cling to certain doctrines of the Church, regardless of others, and careless of her primitive discipline; and those who held in the main with all her doctrines, and conformed for the most part to their ceremonial directions, but who sought their authority immediately from the state, instead of looking upon the state as lending her sanction and her co-operation to the exercise of powers whose origin is divine. Meanwhile there have always been a goodly band who have loved and honoured the Church of England, simply because she carried on her front the true notes and genuine marks of catholicity; because, in other words, by her unbroken succession of ministerial office from the apostles' times to their own, by her adherence to the three creeds of universal Christendom, her pure preaching of the Word of God, her due administration of the sacraments of Christ, she had shown that she was a pure and apostolic branch of the true vine—a living tree in the garden of the Lord—a sound and healthy member of the body mystical of God's dear Son, which is the company of true faithful people. This goodly band have of late years been on the increase, and the spirit of English reformers is again the characteristic of English divines. The press teems with primitive lore, and it is once again sufficient praise to say of a doctrine, that it is *old*. From these remarks, it will be seen that we altogether dissent from the opinions which would identify what are fashionably termed high-church principles, with the learned and pious contributions to the Tracts for the Times. We have no desire to withhold from these last mentioned gentlemen, all honour, and all praise for their diligent exertions in behalf of the genuine views of catholic truth, to which, by their consistent lives, no less than their lofty attainments, they have recalled public attention; but we are sure that they would not thank us for ascribing to them an honour which is not theirs, neither will they suspect us of unkindness towards their christian endeavours, when we say that we have ever looked upon their publications as the signs, or offspring, rather than the parents of the Times, which now brighten the Churchman's onward prospect. And this being so, we have felt the grievous injustice of looking up to them as authoritative fathers, rather than lauding them as fellow-travellers on the holy path which has truth as its termination, and as friendly fellow-strivers in the race which has truth for its goal. On these grounds, we repeat, we altogether dissent from the position which seeks to date the origin of high-church principles as co-eval with the appearance of the so-called Oxford Tracts. The fact is that the principles of the English Reformation were high-church principles; the brightest ornaments of the Church in every age would be set down by the slang of the day as high-churchmen; and the terms high and low, as applied to church principles, owe their existence to an age of religious madness, which ended in an era of irreligion apathy. We were to name the man who first had the courage to put himself forward in the breach, and who, amid sneers and vile imputation of unworthy motives of bigotry and priestcraft, dared to re-assert the almost forgotten truths, which modern liberalism set aside as non-essential; but in behalf of which martyrs have been content to suffer and to die, we should point to the late Rev. Hugh James Rose, B.D. of Trinity College, Cambridge. Yes, if it be permitted to us to say who first succeeded in extracting flame from the smothered ashes, at which (as the subsequent almost consentaneous blaze proved,) so many were seeking to re-light the candle of English theology, we do not think that we can well be gainsayed when we affirm that this honour belongs rather to Cambridge than to Oxford. We are free to confess that once kindled in Oxford, fuel was more readily furnished to feed the flame than in the sister University; but to give honour where honour is due, we think it must be allowed that Cambridge has the hallowed praise of reviving truths, which had been suffered to grow into disuse in an age which Socialized the hierarchy, and sensualized the clergy.—*Christian Remembrancer*.

### WESLEYAN MATTERS.\*

Extracts from the Minutes of Conference—Section I.

WESLEYAN METHODISM ACCORDING TO THE IDEA OF MR. WESLEY, as it is unfolded in the "Minutes of several Conferences between the Rev. John Wesley, M. A., and others;" being a digest, undertaken and completed by himself, of "all the Minutes of Conference from the year 1744 to the year 1789." (A)

"*Ques. 3.* What may we reasonably believe to be God's design in raising up the preachers called methodists?"

"*Ans.* Not to form any new sect (B) but to reform the nation, particularly the church; and to spread scriptural holiness over the land."

"*Ques. 23.* What is the office of a Christian minister?"

"*Ans.* To watch over souls as he that must give account."

"*Ques. 24.* In what view may we and our helpers be considered?"

"*Ans.* Perhaps as extraordinary messengers (i. e. out of the ordinary way,) designed, 1. To provoke the regular ministers to jealousy. 2. To supply their lack of service toward those who are perishing for lack of knowledge. But how hard is it to abide here! Who does not wish to be a little higher? Suppose, to be ordained!"

"*Ques. 44.* Are there any other advices which you would give the assistants?"

"*Ans.* Several. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. Exhort all that were brought up in the church to continue therein. Set the example yourself (C). And immediately change every plan that would hinder their being at church at least two Sundays in four. Carefully avoid whatever has a tendency to separate men from the church. And let all the servants in our preaching houses go to church once on Sunday, at least.

"Is there not a cause? Are we not unawares, by little and little, sliding into a separation from the church? O, use every means to prevent this! 1. Exhort all our people to keep close to the church and sacrament. 2. Warn them all against niceness in hearing, a prevailing evil! 3. Warn them also against despising the prayers of the church. 4. Against calling our society, the church. (D). 5. Against calling our preachers ministers; our houses, meeting-houses; call them plain preaching-houses, or chapels. 6. Do not license them as dissenters."

\* From the British Magazine.  
† "This class of officers is now commonly designated superintendants," i. e. of circuits.—*Warren*.

"*Ques. 45.* But are we not dissenters?"

"*Ans.* No. Although we call sinners to repentance in all places of God's dominion; and although we frequently use extemporary prayer, and unite together into a religious society; yet we are not dissenters in the only sense which our law acknowledges; namely, those who renounce the service of the church. We do not: we dare not separate from it. We are not seceders, nor do we wear any resemblance to them."

"And never let us make light of going to church, either by word or deed."

"But some may say, 'Our own service is public worship.' Yes; but not such as supersedes the church service. It pre-supposes public prayer, like the sermons at the university. If it were designed to be instead of the church service, it would be essentially defective; for it seldom has the four grand parts of public prayer—deprecation, petition, intercession, and thanksgiving."

"If the people put ours in the room of the church service, we hurt them that stay with us, and ruin them that leave us. For then they will go nowhere, but lounge the Sabbath away, without any public worship at all."

"*Ques. 46.* Nay, but is it not our duty to separate from the church, considering the wickedness both of the clergy and the people?"

"*Ans.* We conceive not. 1. Because both the priests and the people were full as wicked in the Jewish church. And yet it was not the duty of the holy Israelites to separate from them. 2. Neither did our Lord command his disciples to separate from them: he rather commanded the contrary. 3. Hence it is clear, that could not be the meaning of St. Paul's words, 'Come out from among them, and be ye separate.'"

"*Ques. 47.* But what reasons are there, why we should not separate from the church?"

"*Ans.* Among others, those which were printed above twenty years ago, entitled 'Reasons against separating from the Church of England.'"

"We allow two exceptions. 1. If the parish minister be a notoriously wicked man. 2. If he preach Socinianism, Arianism, or any other essentially false doctrines."

### Notes to Extracts—Section I.

(A) "It is according to this public instrument that every candidate for admission upon trial as a travelling preacher is examined. And after they have passed their four years of probation [they] receive a copy of it, with the following inscription, signed by the President and Secretary of the Conference.—To A. B.—You think it your duty to call sinners to repentance. Make full proof thereof, and we shall rejoice to receive you as a fellow-labourer."

The terms of this instrument of admission into full connexion are accurately chosen, and well embody the prominent feature in Mr. Wesley's idea. The office of his preachers was "to call sinners to repentance." And to the full and efficient discharge of this office he confined them.

(B) "It was with a single eye to the conversion of souls that Mr. Wesley carried out his plan, and that the living members of that branch of the church of Christ in England might be multiplied, not that a separate branch might be raised up. As John the Baptist was to Christ, so (according to his idea) were his preachers to those whom Christ sent in his own stead. It was their part to lead those whom their preaching awakened to a diligent attendance upon the ministry of the church, both in the administration of the sacraments, and the ordinary services of prayer and praise. And he, accordingly, to the end of his life, "peremptorily refused to his preachers permission to administer the Lord's Supper to the societies;" and put forth "all his influence and authority to keep the whole of his chapels closed during the time of public worship in churches."

N. B.—In London and in Scotland he allowed the sacraments to be administered to the societies for obvious reasons. "The reason for excepting London was, that a clergyman, episcopally ordained, had been regularly appointed for several years to administer the Lord's Supper to the societies there." And he seems to have felt that in Scotland his preachers and those of the presbyterian form there established, might be regarded as being upon the same footing of spiritual authority, and might therefore, without scandal, discharge the same functions.

Also, in the matter of attendance at church and preaching during church hours, he allowed two exceptions from his general rule; for which see the answer to question 47, above recited. And in these cases he required the prayers of the church to be read, or at least an abridgment of them, provided by himself.

(C) Some remarkable instances of his own attendance to these rules are found in his private journals. "1770, Sunday, 17. We had a poor sermon at church. However, I went again in the afternoon, remembering the words of Mr. Philip Henry—'If the preacher does not know his duty, I bless God that I know mine.'" And again, "1759, Thursday, 25.—I had appointed to preach at Bradford; but when I came I found Mr. Hart was to preach at 6, so I delayed till the church service was ended, that there might not appear (at least, on my part) even the shadow of opposition between us." Again, "1759, Sunday, 3.—I received much comfort at the old church in the morning, and at St. Thomas's in the afternoon. It was as if both sermons had been made for me. I pity those who can find no good at church! But how should they, if prejudice come between? an effectual bar to the grace of God."

On the deadening effect of a schismatical spirit he has this striking remark in another place. "1757, Sunday, 10.—In the evening, talking with the society, I saw more than ever the care of God over them that fear him. What was it that stopped their growing in grace? Why, they had a well-meaning preacher among them who was inflaming them more and more against the clergy; nor could he advise them to attend the public ordinances, for he never went either to church or sacrament himself. This I knew not, but God did; and by his wise providence prevented the consequences which would have naturally ensued. William Mansuet was pressed for a soldier, so the people go to church and sacrament as before." Again, "1760, Tuesday, 3.—I met the classes, and was agreeably surprised to find that bitterness against the church, with which many were infected when I was here before, was now entirely over, yet the deadness had occasioned remained, and I doubt it will not soon be removed."

(D) So earnestly did he dread the danger of his society degenerating into a schismatical church; so acutely did he shrink from the idea of his body of preachers ever exercising the peculiar functions of the ministry—that he forbade the use of any term which might tend to produce a false impression on these subjects, and uniformly in his own writings observed the same accuracy of expression.

In a letter to one of his preachers, dated February 21, 1787, he says "Modern laziness has jumbled together the two distinct offices of preaching and administering the sacraments. But be that as it may, I will rather lose twenty societies than separate from the church."

"In the year 1777 or 1778," writes the author of a pamphlet published soon after his death, "I asked him the question—'Sir, in case the Methodists should, after your death, leave the church

\* Warren's Digest, p. 14.  
† See a pamphlet, entitled "The Church and the Methodists," by Thomas Jackson, 1834: p. 82.  
‡ Ibid., p. 83.  
§ For the extracts contained in this and the following note the compiler is indebted to Dr. Dealtry's late Charge, Note C.

\* From the Churchman, Magazine.  
† A concise view of Baptism. By John Craps.