

Christian state which owns and maintains the Church of Christ, refuse obedience to the government in the Church as to Gods ministers over them for the good of their souls and the glory and honor of his name, they have moved their feet in the direction of treason and rebellion; and though they may intend no such thing, yet, since

"We first endure, then pity, then embrace,"

as it once did happen in England, the very thing farthest from their intentions may come to pass*. Those who do dissent, should well understand the supposed necessity for it, the principles involved in it, and the consequences which may follow.

It may be expected that we have something here to offer by way of apology on the subject of religious toleration. We refer the reader to the extract in the note from the British Critic, and furthermore reply:—That we have nothing materially different from the practice of the British Government;—only that it appears at best, a theoretical anomaly to admit in the Legislative Department

attacked with such deadly and determined hostility, it were cowardice,—it were TREASON to withhold the truth in fear of giving offence to open and declared enemies.

* See the following paragraphs "from a Review of Hallam's Constitutional History in the British Critic for October," as given in the Episcopal Watchman of December 13, 1828:—

"We cannot enter fully upon the interminable question between the English Church and the Puritans in the days of Queen Elizabeth. And, in truth, the attempt would be wholly needless. It is admitted by Mr. Hallam, that Cartwright's disciples became not only dissatisfied subjects, but downright rebels; that they disgusted the moderate prelates, Sandys and Grindal, and drove them into measures of severity. He allows that there is no middle course with sectaries, between the persecution which exterminates, and the toleration which satisfies; and he shows, too, quite irresistibly, that no toleration would have satisfied the Presbyterians; that nothing, in short, would have satisfied them, but the overthrow of the Establishment; and thus he conducts us to the inevitable conclusion, that nothing was to be done but to resist their demands, or to establish the Holy Discipline on the ruins of the Episcopal Church! And yet he tells us of the aggrieved Puritan. He talks of pride and persecution on one side, but only of Sectarian insolence on the other. He maintains that some apology might be pleaded for the libels of the oppressed Sectarians,—and this in the very same paragraph in which he asks—"if these insults shock us now, in the present licence of the press, what must they have seemed in the reign of Elizabeth, when the press had no acknowledged liberty?" He observes that the Puritans were likely to be confirmed in their own conceit, when they found that nothing but force was relied on, forgetting that argument and reason had utterly failed to convince them, and that rebels and traitors will always say that governments rely on force! In short, notwithstanding his multiplied concessions, and his profession of impartiality, his statements and his reasonings are calculated, on the whole, to leave an incautious reader under the unjust impression, that the Church was insufferably and cruelly bigoted, and that the Puritans, after all, were only rather impudent and intractable!

With regard to the remark of Mr. Hallam, that a Christian is bound to honour God outwardly by that form of devotion which inwardly he believes to be right,—it may be observed, first, that the Christian may pursue that lawful and factiously and rebelliously; secondly, that by virtue of a similar obligation, the civil magistrates may repress him. It cannot be denied, that, if coercion be allowed at all, conscience which compels the Puritan to resist, may compel the Churchman to restrain. This is the inevitable state of the case, where the principles of toleration are not clearly understood and fully acknowledged by both parties; and on this view the Presbyterians acted most rigorously and mercifully, when they had the power to do so. The constitutional historian, therefore, should have stated this matter thus: the Puritan contended for the subversion of the hierarchy; toleration he professedly rejected and despised. The contest, therefore, was on his part, at best, a strife (a conscientious strife perhaps) for mastery; and on the part of the Churchman, it was, at the worst, a conscientious struggle for the defence and preservation of the establishment. Whether or not, that struggle were maintained with greater keenness of spirit and violence of action, than the perils of the time demanded, is a vast and complicated question, which, perhaps, no human sagacity will ever wholly set at rest. Thus much, however, an impartial historian of the constitution, could not fail to perceive, that to the Protestant Episcopal Church of England, this kingdom was then indebted for a blessing, second only to its deliverance from Popery, namely, its preservation from the illiberal, and fanatic tyranny of the Presbyterian discipline; from a system which, in the plenitude of its success, must have been alike destructive of the rights of the throne, and of the civil and religious liberties of the subject."

materials which, should they gain the ascendancy, would as certainly subvert the fabric of the Constitution. Men cannot be expected to support principles which they abhor: and they have no rightful claim to dictate in a government founded on, combined with and supporting and protecting the Gospel, when those principles which they do hold must continually tempt them to circumvent and betray. We are always safest in the hands of our friends; and our enemies, though of our own household, themselves being judges, have no lawful claim to be our keepers. We require certain well defined and inviolable principles as the ground of a common interest; and a halloved attachment to the same, sanctified by the fear of God and the pure love of his truth as the instrument of a congenial union, and the security of faithful and permanent adherence. The seeds and principles of a union which shall embrace and fix upon itself all the lawful desires of the human heart, and all the lawful homage of the soul;—which shall concentrate in one ground and absorbing focus all the lawful occupations of time, and all the best hopes of eternity as but integral and necessary parts of one mighty scheme;—which shall firmly bind all our affection to "every ordinance of man FOR THE LORD'S SAKE: whether it be to the KING AS SUPREME or unto Governors as unto them that are sent by him;"—these are the only proper materials and principles with which to lay the foundation of a CHRISTIAN commonwealth, which shall smile in derision at the turbulence of faction, and behold his angriest billows breaking harmless at its feet.

"Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand." One of the most dangerous divisions is to be found where a structure is built up with the untempered mortar of principles hostile to each other in their very nature: whose very peace is a hollow and hypocritical truce in order to gain time and gather strength, and strike at each other the decisive and fatal blow. And of a government uncemented and unsupported by religion, or admitting into its structure rival and irreconcilable religious factions, it may well be asserted that it is founded upon the sand: and if a timely remedy be not applied, posterity may look back upon its ruins and say: "The rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell; and great was the fall of it."

But for the present, we have done. What we have advanced must speak for itself:—but it should be met with dispassionate candour and a constant reference to the Bible, and to human nature, and to the structure of human Government on the divine plan, or as moral and religious, and not by the dogmas and sophisms of democracy and anarchy. We believe that we have done our duty; and we leave the event with Him who restraineth "the madness of the people," and knows how to bring good out of evil. We know that we love our native country: and we FEEL for that class of our countrymen who are the easiest to be led astray on the side of a sinful and rebellious nature by the artful and designing—and we feel for them the more affectionately, because we have had personal experience of the condition, temporal, moral, and intellectual, of the most unknown and obscure among them, and know the conflict of mind through which a man must pass in laying down prejudices deeply seated in every source of thought and feeling. And could such a measure subserve their best interests, present and to come, gladly would we lay down the pen—retire from the arduous post of a CHRISTIAN SENTINEL—resume the axe and the plough—and find in peaceful obscurity that happy quiet which is denied to public employment—and the recollections of which not unfrequently still steal upon the mind like the pensive shade of departed innocence in another and better existence.

RECAPITULATION OF THE MARTYRDOM AND EPISTLES OF ST. IGNATIUS.

1. THE CHURCH testifies that "Ignatius the disciple of St. John the Apostle," was "a man in all things like unto the Apostles." He was made Bishop of Antioch by St. John in the year seventy, twenty five years before that Apostle wrote his Revelation and Gospel, and suffered thirteen years after; as may be seen in Hammer's Translation of Eusebius, and his chronology.