

in his Diocese. The approval required should therefore have been in the conjunctive instead of the alternative. There are besides, in the present circumstances of the Church in England, some peculiar reasons, not unknown to that part of the English public who look sharply at the conduct and bearing of the English Bishops, which render it far more desirable that with a view to an *uncompromising* support of the true doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, the choice of missionaries should be left to the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, or some other Bishop of our Church, rather than the Bishop of London. And if the Bishop of the Diocese has not a power of rejecting, or removing a Missionary, sent by a Society so constituted, it may be apprehended that under the operation of the 4th Regulation, much mischief may sometimes be done; for according to its spirit, it would only be in the case of a grave or palpable charge against a Missionary, and *with the consent of the Society*, that he could be removed by the Bishop. Here is a source of probable danger, or probable mischief, to an undefinable extent. What will a society, which may consist, in a large proportion, of half or whole dissenters from the Church of England, consider to be a grave and palpable charge against a missionary sent out by them? Is there any thing short of actual immorality that is likely to come under such a description in their view of the matter. And yet, how much damage may be done to the Church, and to sound religion, by the innumerable shades of "*anfractuosities*," (to use a phrase of old Johnson,)—of fanaticism, wrong headedness, presumption, and folly! Are these to be left unchecked, except with the consent of a Society whose local habitation is in London. True it is, "and pity 'tis, 'tis true," that the Colonial Church is in that strait, that it cannot afford to repudiate any aid that is rightly and reasonably offered to it. But let me ask the well intentioned, zealous founders, or *gatherers*, of the Upper Canada Clergy Society, this plain, simple, searching, stringent question; why did they not join the Society for Propagating the Gospel, on condition of their contributions being limited to the particular object they profess to have in view? Was it not because they wished to be free from certain restraints in the selection of their instruments;—and to send Missionaries of a peculiar school?

"These queries and hints will not be without their application, if a Provincial Missionary Society should be formed in Nova-Scotia and should seek to place itself in connection with the Upper Canada Society, (if the objects of that should be extended) or with any similar association that may be formed in the mother country. In such case, I should earnestly urge the maxim, *stare super vias antiquas*, as a good one to set out with, and to follow. There are two ancient Societies, one of which is wholly, and the other in a subsidiary manner, devoted to the propagation of the Gospel in these colonies; and I do conceive that whether we look to their constitution and objects, or to the experience of a century and a half, we may safely say that on none other foundation need any man, or any other Society in the British dominions, build any further scheme for advancing that Church, of which Christ is the 'chief corner stone.' To them, in their several spheres of action, it is no disparagement to any Society to be affiliated and subordinate; and in them will be found, while the Church of England stands, a steady regulating principle and power, which will restrain, modify, or render innocuous, the outbreaks of untempered religious zeal. These things, as you know, are far removed from my ordinary range of action; but they have long and frequently attracted my attention and thoughts, amidst very different employments;—and I am quite convinced, that in these American colonies especially,—abounding as they do in a rank growth of multifarious enthusiasm and dissent, any new missionary society, professing to be for the Church of England, whether formed in Nova Scotia, or in England for colonial missions, will be *unsafe* in its progress, if not placed in early and close connexion with the authorities and the other Established Societies of that Church. This may shock the large liberality of those who deem every new bustle in religious matters to be, as if *ex vi termini*, good in itself."

From the Gospel Messenger.

"THE OLD PATHS;"

OR, THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

By G. Boyd.

"Thus saith the Lord: 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."—Jer. vi. 16.

It only remains that I now point out how the "Protestant Episcopal Church is identically the same church as the Apostolic, and has been perpetuated in succession from the apostles' time. The resemblance of this branch of the christian church, to the apostolic, cannot fail to have struck the reader all along.

The "Church of England," was founded in apostolic times, and existed in Great Britain long before there was any connection between it and the Church of Rome, and entirely independent.

Clemens Romanus, the same whom we have already quoted, so called to distinguish him from Clemens Alexandrinus, the companion and fellow laborer of St. Paul says, "that St. Paul preached righteousness through the whole world, and in so doing, went to the utmost bounds of the West: an expression (remarks the editor of the Churchman, to whom I am indebted for many valuable selections upon this branch of the subject,) which is equivalent to Britain, and similar to that of Catullus, "Ultima Occidentis Insula." Arnobius also speaks of the Britains, "As the bounds of the gospel to the West."

Origen likewise says—"That the power of Christ was seen in Britain, as well as Mauritania."

And Tertullian, in the second century, speaks "of places which proved impregnable to the Romans, but were subject to Christ." And a little after, he says, "Britain lies surrounded by the ocean. The Mauri and the barbarous Getulians are blocked up by the Romans, for fear they should extend the limits of their countries. And what shall we say of the Romans themselves who secured their empire only by the power of their armies; neither are they able, with all their force, to extend their empire beyond those nations; whereas the kingdom of Christ and his name reaches much further. He is every where believed in, and worshipped by all the nations above mentioned."

Chrysostom too, a native of Antioch, who became Bishop of Constantinople, and lived in the fourth century, one of the most illustrious fathers of the Church, speaking of the Christian religion in Great Britain says: "The British isles situated beyond the sea, and lying in the very ocean, have felt the power of the word, for churches and altars are erected even there."—Again, "How often in Britain have men eaten the flesh of their own kind? but now they refresh their souls with fasting."

Eusebius, the same as before referred to in his third book of evangelical demonstration, having named the "Romans, Persians, Armenians, Parthians, Indians and Scythians, (adds) that some passed over the ocean to those which are called British islands;" and St. Jerome gives a similar account.

From these authorities it appears,

1. That the gospel was preached in Britain in the times of the apostles.
2. That it was preached there by some of the apostles themselves.
3. That St. Paul was one of the apostles who preached it there.

Bishop Gibbon says, "From these authorities, (especially that of Clemens Romanus) it follows not only that the gospel was preached in Britain in the times of the apostles, but that St. Paul himself was the first preacher of it. This is further confirmed by observing, that from the time of his being set at liberty, in the fifth year of Nero, to his return to Rome, were eight years which the ancient writers of the Church generally agree were spent in western parts; that having taken leave of the eastern parts, and assured them "they should see his face no more," it cannot be supposed that he returned thither, but that he employed his time in planting the gospel elsewhere; and that Gildas saith, (an ancient British historian, and not a Saxon,) "The gospel was here received before the fatal defeat of the Britons of Antoninus Paulinus, which was the seventh or eighth year of

\* *Concluded.*

Nero, that is the third or fourth of those eight years which ancient writers say St. Paul spent in the western parts."

So early as the year A. D. 175, Lucius, a king of Britain, and several other kings were numbered among its converts. This was only ten years after the martyrdom of Polycarp. Of Lucius, Archbishop Parker says, "Through the instrumentality of British Christians, he became imbued in Christian doctrine, and resolved to organize his kingdom on the Christian model."

In the year A. D. 314, at least three of the British bishops were present at the Council of Arles; the decrees of that council having been signed by Eborac, Bishop of York—Restitutus, Bishop of London—and Adelfreus, Bishop of Colchester. Upon this fact, Bishop Stillingfleet remarks that it was customary "to send but one or two (bishops) out of a province where they were most numerous," to attend a council. And that these churches were acknowledged to be apostolical, is plain from the fact that the British Bishops were admitted to a seat; for according to Tertullian, the apostolic character of a church depended upon its being able to trace the "succession of its bishops from the apostles."

"This council of Arles affords conclusive proof (remarks the editor of the Churchman) not only that the British Church was at this time independent of the jurisdiction of Rome, but that the figment of papal supremacy was equally unknown to the continental churches. At the present day, it is accounted a distinguishing prerogative of the pope to confirm the decrees of a council, and without such sanction, the decrees are considered invalid. But the council of Arles, at which the Bishop of Rome was not present, did not defer in any way to his authority, and appear to have been entirely unconscious of the prerogative which, in later times he has ventured to arrogate." The bishops assembled at Arles, after passing the decrees among themselves, by common consent, and independently of the Bishop of Rome, inform him as a brother bishop, of what they have done, and ask him, not to confirm them, but only to publish them. "Quoddecimus communi concilio, charitatis tuæ significarem, ut omnes, sciant quid in futurum observare debeant."

After this, the British Churches were represented at the council of Sardica, in the year A. D. 347, and at the council of Ariminum, A. D. 359.

In the year A. D. 308, St. Hillary, being banished into Phrygia by the emperor, published his book, "De Sinodis." In the beginning of this book, "he salutes the Bishops of Britain among the rest of the prelates of Christendom, and complains a little that the distance of place and the disadvantages of banishment, had barred him the satisfaction of receiving frequent letters from them. After this complaint, he congratulates their orthodoxy, and that they had preserved themselves all along from heretical infection." (Collier Ecc. Hist. vol. 36)

It was not until A. D. 595, that Augustine was sent into Britain by Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome; and even then the idea of any supremacy over other Churches, was expressly condemned by Gregory himself. Before this time, John, Bishop of Constantinople, had assumed the title of Universal Bishop. Gregory, in his letter to the Empress Constantia, inveighs against it as great pride and presumption in his brother and fellow bishop, John. In another letter to the Emperor Mauritius, he says, "I am bold to say, that whosoever uses or affects the style of Universal Bishop, has the pride and character of Antichrist, and is in some manner his harbinger, in this haughty quality of mounting himself above the rest of his order. And indeed both the one and the other seem to split upon the same rock. For as pride makes Antichrist strain his pretensions up to Godhead, so whoever is ambitious to be called the only or universal prelate, prefers himself to a distinguishing superiority, and rises, as it were, upon the ruins of the rest." Again, "I beg of you" (he says to Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, who had saluted him with the title of Universal Bishop,) "not to salute me in such language for the future, for by giving another more than belongs to him, you lessen yourself. As for me, I am but a brother of the order. Neither do I desire to flourish in respect but in behavior: nor do I reckon that an honor to myself, which is paid me at the expense and prejudice of my brethren. My re-