

The Bazaar.

THEY RECEIVED THE WORD WITH ALL READINESS OF MIND, AND SEARCHED THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, WHETHER THOSE THINGS WERE SO.—Acts xvii. 11.

No. 24.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1844.

[Vol. I.]

Doctr.

THE PEOPLE'S BIRTHRIGHT.

FROM THE PROTESTANT MAGAZINE.

The Bible—and our Church that stands
Upon that deep-fixed rock;
We'll guard them from unhallowed hands
E'en in the combat's shock;
Our God his chosen few will save,
And keep the gifts his bounty gave.

The Bible!—no; we will not yield
That blessing, for whose sake,
Our fathers battled in the field,
Or perished at the stake;
Our end is truth—unblemished, pure,
God will the victory secure.

The Bible! oh! thou richest store
Of all that man can need,
Do we require thy treasures more
Than those that us succeed?
Let us bequeath them unimpaired,
The blessings we ourselves have shared!

THE LAW OF UNITY PERVERTED.

The work of this distinguished author* sets out with a proposition which cannot be controverted, namely, that the Church of Christ, being his body, salvation is only promised to those who belong to it. He proves satisfactorily, from their own standards, that this solemn truth has been professed not only by the primitive writers, but by all denominations of Christians since the Reformation; and therefore, whatever secret method may be reserved in the wisdom of God for those who have never heard the gospel, it is universally admitted, that "all men to whom the gospel is preached must be members of this Church, when sufficiently proposed to them, on pain of being excluded from the favour of God for ever."

The essential characteristics of this Church of Christ, are next laid down. Its visibility, its unity in communion, its unity in faith, the sins of heresy and schism, and the effects of excommunication, are all ably and learnedly treated. But I have no intention of reviewing each specific link in the chain of his argument. I pass on, therefore, to the conclusions which seem to me so hostile to correct principle.

The eighth chapter of the first part is devoted to the proposition, that the apostolical succession of episcopal ordinations to the ministry is essential to the Church. The twelfth chapter and fourth section advocates the necessary result, that the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Zuinglians "could not be considered as Churches of Christ, properly speaking; though they might have been called so in a general and popular way, as being internally united to the Church." And the thirteenth chapter, treating the position of the English Dissenters, affirms that "they are no part of the Church of Christ." Many subordinate arguments are urged for this conclusion, but the leading one is derived from the alleged principle, "that separation from a Christian Church is incapable of excuse, that no reason can possibly justify it, and that the society so formed by such an act of separation is entirely cut off from Christian unity and from the true Church of Christ." (p. 402.) The same arguments are applied with the same result (p. 576-7) to the Presbyterians of Scotland.

On the other hand, the Church of Rome is maintained to be a branch of the true Church of Christ, in common with every other Church which can trace its descent from the apostles, and retains the original Christian creeds, &c. But it is ingeniously insisted that in England, the Romanists themselves are in the position of dissenters and schismatics, because they separated from the Reformed Church of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. (p. 305.) And inasmuch as "schismatics do not cease to be so by a mere change of country, therefore the papists who went from England to establish colonies in the United States of North America, were schismatics when they arrived there; and always remaining separated from that branch of the Catholic apostolic Church which was established there, they only perpetuated their schism. In fine," continues our author, "when America received bishops from our Churches, the schismatics constituted a rival episcopacy, and so remain to this day, separated from the true Church."

It is very obvious that on these principles, the Church of England would seem to be entirely abandoned to the charge which the Romanists have always made their chief point of accusation, namely, that the Reformers committed a schism by separating from what is acknowledged to be a true and apostolic branch of the Church universal, and thereby cut themselves off from the Church of Christ. But from this consequence our author thinks his theory perfectly protected, by denying that the Church of England separated herself from the Church of Rome in the act of Reformation, and by charging the separation upon Rome; as well through the sentence of excommunication fulminated against Elizabeth and her adherents, as through her formally withdrawing the English Romanists from their union with the established Church, and setting up a rival priesthood, in the eleventh year of that sovereign's reign.

The practical working of these principles next demands our attention, as stated in our author's own words.

"When Roman Churches," saith he, (p. 304), "were founded in South America, Canada, the Philippines, &c., by the Europeans who first colonized or subdued those

countries, such Churches are altogether free from schism, and are invested with the original rights of Catholic Churches, so that no one has a right to establish rival communities among them, with a view to oppose their authority or draw proselytes from them. If in Canada, the English community united to our Catholic Churches, have bishops and priests, it is only as a matter of necessity, because the Church there refuses them communion, and they are properly for the English only. The arrangement must be considered only provisional in a certain measure, and not designed to interfere with the prior claims of the Roman Churches there, within their proper districts. The same may be observed of our clergy on the continent of Europe."

Again, in answer to the objection that upon his principles, "it must be unlawful for any one to separate himself from the Church of Rome, and become a Protestant in France, Germany, &c.," our author replies: "It is always right to embrace the truth, and if, in consequence of maintaining the truth, any one should be excommunicated by those who are misled by the authority of their Church, erroneously supposed infallible, he is not in schism, and may lawfully consort with those who are not themselves in schism, and by whom the truth is maintained. But he ought not to forsake his Church voluntarily, but rather remain in its communion, and endeavour with prudence and humility to edify his brethren." (p. 316.)

In answer to the further objection, that upon his principles "it is unlawful to send missionaries among the Roman Churches, to establish any rival worship, seek for converts among them," &c., our author replies, (p. 317), "The rule of fraternal charity encourages different parts of the Church, to aid, if possible, in the dissemination of perfect Christianity among all their brethren. Therefore whatever can be done by writings and conferences, managed without acerbity, and without intrusion on the appointed sphere of others, may be lawfully resorted to. But it is inconsistent with the true principles of Catholic unity, for any branch of the Church to send missionaries to raise a rival worship, and seek for converts in the bosom of another."

One citation more seems necessary to a full view of Mr. Palmer's rule of Christian duty with respect to Rome. He states very fairly the objection, that, according to his principles, since "it is not necessary to institute an examination into particular doctrines, but we are to be guided in a great measure by the Church; it follows, that if an Englishman were resident in France or Spain, he ought to join in communion with the Roman Churches there; and in order to do so, ought to subscribe the creed of Pius IV." &c. To this our author answers, that "the LAW OF UNITY requires that he should be willing to communicate with those Churches; but he cannot lawfully subscribe or profess the creed of Pius IV., for the following reasons. First, this creed is proposed to him as a heretic. It is designed to exact from him a condemnation of his own Church, and this he could not pronounce with truth. Secondly, the Roman Church in exacting the profession of this creed, evidently expects an explicit profession, after examination, for otherwise she would only have required a general adherence to all her doctrines. But this cannot be made consistently with truth, for several of the doctrines of this creed are disputed and erroneous." &c. Now Mr. Palmer assigns no other reasons than these two, why an Englishman proposing to commune with the Church of Rome, should refuse to subscribe the creed of Pius IV. If, therefore, he were told, that as his own Church was not mentioned in that formula, he was under no obligation to apply the anathema to her, the first argument would lose its force; and if he were assured that he was not required to make any examination, but that a general adherence to the doctrines of that creed would perfectly satisfy the Roman priesthood, the second argument would be set aside with equal facility. But suppose, what undoubtedly would be the fact, in a majority of instances, that the priest should receive the English Protestant to communion in the most accommodating spirit, and, for the sake of securing a future proselyte, or, at least, of weakening the English Church, by the appearance of disaffection, should consent to waive the subscription of the creed of Pope Pius IV. altogether. In such a case, Mr. Palmer's LAW OF UNITY requires that the ENGLISH PROTESTANT should be willing to commune with the ROMAN CHURCHES, in Italy, Spain, or any other country where they are free from schism. Our author, therefore, would condemn the communion with Rome in England. He would also condemn the communion with her in the United States, as they were constituted before the purchase of Louisiana. But his LAW OF UNITY requires our willingness to commune with Rome, (if she will excuse our subscribing to the creed of Pope Pius IV.) in every part of the world where that Church has had a previous and regular possession. And therefore we are bound to exhibit this willingness, in all those States of the Union which have been formed out of the old Province of Louisiana, as purchased from the French under the administration of Jefferson; in the Floridas, in the Canadas, in the Philippine Islands, in South America, in many parts of the East Indies, throughout the continent of Europe, in general, in a word, wherever Rome has had a prior peaceable possession: for the question of communion with Rome, according to this system, is made to depend, not, as hitherto, upon her reforming her dangerous and unchristian doctrines, but on the ground of a legal right, to be determined by GEOGRAPHICAL LINES AND DATES OF SETTLEMENT! And this is the

principle which, in the opinion of some of our beloved and respected brethren, deserves to be received amongst us with the most absolute confidence and even fervent admiration!

This astounding law of unity, however, is far from including the whole practical results of Mr. Palmer's ecclesiastical polity; since he maintains that no one has a right to establish rival communities, where the Church of Rome has acquired a quiet prior possession. RIVAL COMMUNITIES, not CHURCHES, because the author's principles oblige him to consider these communities as schismatics, and therefore "separated from the true Church." Hence he finds himself obliged to devise an excuse for the Church of England in Canada, &c. by informing us that "the arrangement is only provisional in a certain measure, and not designed to interfere with the prior claims of the Roman Churches there, within their proper districts." It is perfectly obvious that our own branch of the Church stands in precisely the same attitude throughout the whole valley of the Mississippi. And therefore the information here given to us is a matter of very serious importance, and quite unexpected, I may safely say, either by the Church of England, or by ourselves.

The British Parliament will learn from this new school of theology, that in legislating for the establishment and maintenance of bishops and Churches throughout the Canadas, &c., they have only been making a provisional arrangement, and the proviso is, that there shall be no interference with the prior claims of the Roman Churches, within their proper districts. But it unfortunately happens that the whole of these countries are the proper districts covered by the prior claims of the Church of Rome. And I am quite at a loss to conceive how the Parliament of England could "interfere" with these prior claims more effectually, than by sending their bishops, and erecting Cathedrals, and sustaining missionaries in every city, and throughout the whole land, for the express purpose of proclaiming the Gospel of Christ in its Protestant aspect as opposed to the Church of Rome. It is indeed said, in order to reconcile this monstrous incongruity, that the arrangement was properly intended for the English only, and even of necessity, because the Roman Churches refused them communion. But this statement, to my mind, is totally incomprehensible. For surely it must be manifest to any ordinary understanding, that those Roman Churches would have rejoiced to extend their communion to every Englishman in Canada, on the easiest possible terms, sooner than have an English establishment planted among them. The difficulty was "altogether of another character." The British nation had not then been asked to believe, that the LAW OF UNITY required an English Protestant, resident in a popish country, to desire communion with the Church of Rome. For want of proper knowledge, therefore, according to Mr. Palmer's argument, the Parliament of England committed a "manifest absurdity." They passed laws for a "provisional" arrangement, but quite forgot the Proviso! They did the very thing which most directly interfered with the "prior rights" of the Roman Churches, without intending to interfere with them at all! They established bishops, missionaries, and Churches, in the proper districts of the Roman Churches, merely on the principle of necessity, because the Romish priests refused to give the communion to the resident English; without the slightest evidence either of the refusal or of the necessity! For certain it is, that the Parliament itself has totally omitted the reasons which Mr. Palmer has ventured to assign, as their sole justification, as if they were profoundly ignorant of the LAW OF UNITY, which would have saved them all the expense and trouble of their provincial establishments. But can any one seriously doubt, that in those days they would probably have thought that man unworthy of the name of an English Protestant, who should have talked of a LAW OF UNITY, requiring him to desire communion at the hands of Rome?

If the Parliament of England, however, according to Mr. Palmer's argument, was thus far astray, it is perfectly obvious that the Church of England was equally blame-worthy. Her "Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," have been violating the law of unity, without the least idea of their transgression, making vast efforts, and expending immense sums, in what they conceived to be a work of the highest Christian duty, but what—according to this new System of Theology—proves to be nothing better than the establishment of schism. Her bishops in the provinces where the Church of Rome had prior peaceable possession, have been committing sin, in the very labours and sacrifices which they ignorantly supposed to be acceptable. They were only thinking of reverencing the holy claims of divine truth, when they should have been paying due regard to the prior rights of Romanism. They were only striving to gather men into a pure communion, when they should have sent them first, in obedience to the LAW OF UNITY, to ask admission to the Communion of Rome. They were acting upon the old doctrine, that theological truth in England must be theological truth everywhere, when they should have known the legal consequence of prior possession, by which the same Roman Communion which it was a duty to denounce at home, it was equally a duty to seek abroad, since the grace of the sacrament depended on the district in which it was administered, and therefore the wrong; in England, became the right, in Canada!—From "The Novelties which disturb our peace," by the Right Rev. J. H. Hopkins, D. D., Bishop of the Prot. Episcopal Church in Vermont.

WHAT WAIT WE FOR?

The question naturally arises in every heart, "What wait we for?" There stands the harvest, white, ripe, and abundant, waving gently in the wind, and inviting the sickle of the reaper. There are the implements ready at hand wherewith to gather this harvest in. There are the men, may I not say, standing idle in the market-places, prepared to endure the hardest labour, the hottest sun, the greatest perils. All things are ready: what wait we for?—It does indeed seem that outward circumstances could hardly be more favourable for the evangelization of the world than they are. If the work is ever to be accomplished by human agencies, why not now? Why, in such a state of things, is Messiah's kingdom, in its power and completeness, so long in coming?—why tarry the wheels of his chariot?

The answer is, that we lack life, light, warmth, love. There are the altar, the wood, the sacrifice; there is the wood set in order on the altar; there is the sacrifice laid upon the wood; all things are ready; we only lack the fire from heaven! Oh, yes, we lack fire from heaven;—not the wild fire of enthusiasm, nor the secular fire of a political Christianity, nor the profane fire of denominational ambition; but the fire which the Holy Ghost kindles, and which burns in earnest longings to see men truly converted to God, and the Saviour truly glorified in their hearts and lives. This is what we need, in far larger measure than we have attained. We need it for the Church in all her members: for parents, that in the spirit of Missions they may dedicate their children to the work, and encourage them when they show an inclination to it; for the rich, that they may give of their abundance, and the poor, that they may give of their penury; for the old, that they may use their influence, and for the young, that they may employ their energies; for the laity, that they may live, and for the clergy, that they may live and preach for this cause; for all, that they may "do this one thing—forget the things which are behind, and reach forth to the things which are before."—I pretend not to say what we may need in addition, in things external and palpable. These matters may call for amendment, or they may not: I presume not here to judge; but I do venture to judge, I do feel assured, when I test our condition by the Word of God, that infallible touchstone, that our great want is more of the mind of Christ,—more pure love to God and man; and that if we only had a large increase of this, our resources would be developed, our sleeping energies would be awakened, and our whole Church be found moving forward in the propagation of the Gospel, at a rate compared with which our present progress is but a laggard pace.

But how can this want be supplied, consisting, as it does, in lack of will, and arising, as it does, from deficiency of light and instruction? Does not its very nature shut the matter up in utter helplessness and hopelessness? Who can enter the citadel of the human will? Were not the Jews left in their impenitence by our blessed Lord, with the simple declaration, "Ye will not come unto me?"—Alas! for man alone the case is hopeless: he cannot, unaided, control himself aright: much less can he control others. He may lay truth before them: that is all; but he cannot open men's hearts; he cannot "order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men." But there is a remedy: what is impossible with men, is possible with God, and to God accordingly the text refers us: "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth labourers into his harvest."

In all the emergencies of mankind, our last resort is the throne of grace,—our final dependence the spirit of the living God; but in the present instance, it is so in a more peculiar manner. Till we have reached the one, and besought and depended on the other, we have fallen short of the mark, and our labour will prove, for the most part, in vain. The text, by implication, tells us, that till we have done so, we have no warrant for expecting any thing great or good. It is, indeed, a most notable circumstance, that our Lord, in view of the extent of the field and the paucity of the labourers, should refer those anxious to see the harvest gathered in, not to any maxims of human policy, not to any measures which man might immediately apply, not even, primarily and chiefly, to external means of his own appointment; but directly to God. And the principle involved in this is applicable where the labourers are many as well as few, and the means abundant as well as scanty. It teaches that as God can save by few, so many cannot save without Him: and that though this work is to be done on earth, it must be done from heaven. Our Lord would impress upon us, that this is unlike every other undertaking in one important respect. In every other, due preparation of means, mature counsel and energetic and persevering exertion, are ordinarily enough: here, he would teach us, all these things, being alone, are useless, nay, profane; and that with them there should be a direct and constant and devout dependence on the Spirit to give them efficiency. Yes, this work of extending the kingdom of Christ is altogether peculiar. Man must do the work; but God must have the glory: attempted on any other principle, it is sure to fail; and this principle is especially embodied and manifested in a spirit of prayer.—prayer in secret, prayer in the social circle, prayer in the great congregation, prayer for ministers, prayer for the people, prayer for Christians at home, prayer for the poor heathen abroad;—that prayer which is the "soul's sincere desire," and which, in our ignorance must to pray for as we ought, the Holy Ghost teacheth.

Without all this, I am aware, to the eye of sense the cause may seem to prosper; but, in fact and truth, it will be, for the most part, an utter failure. The visible structure may be raised, but there will be little glory in the midst. Converts may be made, but it can hardly be said that it is God's kingdom which is extended. But even in reference to the external kingdom, little, comparatively, will be done on any other principle than that upon which the internal rests for its prosperity. And the remark applies with special force to a Protestant community, as long as it remains Protestant in its spirit. Here none of those human expedients, those crafty inventions, those soul-destroying doctrines by which funds are so readily accumulated in Popish countries for carrying forward the interests of their Church, will be tolerated. Neither can there grow up amongst us that secular partizanship, that mere spirit of proselytism, which, at the cost of much personal comfort and pecuniary means, would be willing long to sustain the cause. The people, even those who know nothing of religion by experience, know too much of the Bible to believe that it authorizes such "direct taxation;" and for the same reason, a Christianity which is upheld rather as a secular or ecclesiastical than a spiritual thing, they will not zealously and steadily support. Thank God that it is so. It is our glory, that if our Missionary operations are permanently and largely successful, it must be in the spirit of the Bible. The fact, I think, might be shown by examples; but enough. It would appear that, as Protestants, we are hedged up by our circumstances, whether our desire is to do good to men, or merely to advance our cause, as a Church, against rival causes, to much prayer and unceasing dependence upon God.

In conclusion, it only remains that we acknowledge the genius of Protestantism, bow to the spirit of true Christianity, and obey the plain precepts of Holy Writ: giving ourselves hereafter to more earnest and constant prayer, dictated by a more profound and abiding feeling that the work of missions is God's work, and if done at all, must be done by Him. We know indeed that it will be done: omniscience and omnipotence are pledged to it; but we know also that in reference to the very things thus promised, Jehovah has said "Yet for this will I be inquired of by the house of Israel to do it for them." The same great lesson is enforced by the Apostles. The agencies these men wielded were miraculous; wonders were wrought by their hands; foreign languages came to their lips without learning; and their minds were so furnished and assisted, that they needed not to take thought beforehand what they should say; though about to appear before kings and rulers;—yet we find that their constant entreaty to the Churches was, "Brethren, pray for us."—Would to God we had more of this spirit! This was no counterfeit humility. It was no mere intellectual obedience to the precept of prayer. It was not a cant-phrase of religious intercourse destitute of soul. It was a genuine feeling of insufficiency; a heartfelt dependence upon God's grace; an inward conviction that "neither is he that planteth anything, nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase."

Could this mind be more generally inspired into Episcopalians, causing them to lean less on human agencies and more on the arm of the Lord,—to feel less that Missions are our cause and more the cause of Christ;—if such a mind were given us, then, it may be, without the slightest change in our Missionary organization and ecclesiastical arrangements, employing the old agencies in the old way, our Missions would flourish with new vigour, yea, our whole Church throughout all her borders would flourish, as the vegetation of the earth after a long drought in spring, when the soft, warm showers come down. This remedy going to the root, the cure would be radical. All would be life and spontaneity. Aid would not come reluctantly. Impunity would not be necessary. Episcopal authority would not have to be invoked. Touching brotherly love, there would be little occasion to write unto the people; being taught of God, it would be only necessary to let them know how the demand increased, that their liberality might abound more and more. Our treasury being kept full, our Missionaries would not be apprehensive about their supplies; and when Providence opened a new door of usefulness, our Committees would not feel their hands tied up from the enterprise. Nor would money only abound, but men also. Out of the world there would be an abundant supply of all things for the Church; out of the Church for the Ministry; out of the Ministry for Missions. "Here am I, send me," would be the prevailing sentiment of ministers and people.—From the Rev. Dr. Sparrow's Sermon.

THE GREAT CHANGE.

When then the change which they have experienced? How have they passed from death unto life? How was their curse removed, how did they become lovers of God, holy, heavenly-minded, obedient to his will? The answer is short. It is the work of grace. God by his spirit convicts men of their lost condition as sinners, by shewing them the extensive and spiritual nature of his law, and that he cannot as a just God clear the guilty. They now see that the law must be perfectly obeyed, or its curse suffered. The former they feel to be impossible, for they know that they have broken the law times without number, and that every day does but swell the catalogue of their offences. The latter only remains for them, and filled with fear they ask, "Who can dwell with everlasting burnings?" What must they do? In them-

* A Treatise on the Church, by the Rev. Wm. Palmer, of Worcester College, Oxford.