

in the vine, so neither can ye except ye abide in me" "for apart from Me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered." (Jno. 15: 4—6).

If a man were only spirit, then the spiritual—oneness argument, might possibly stand. But man that is being saved, is the whole man; spirit and soul and body, and *therefore* VISIBLE, the ORGANIZATION VISIBLE, as *a vine is visible*. Jesus Christ the Head, AFTER HIS RESURRECTION *was visible*, joined to Himself *the visible Apostles*, who joined to themselves and to Christ *through their fellowship* VISIBLE, others by baptism—and *a man*, a branch of this vine, must be *visibly attached* to THIS VISIBLE ORGANIZATION, which being planted in Heaven, in Christ Jesus the Head, branched out into the Apostolic Ministry, and growth unto the ends of the Earth, and age, in *its* VISIBLE FORM and SPIRITUAL STRENGTH—and *a man*, NOT *thus visibly attached, in Apostolic fellowship*, IS OF NECESSITY SEVERED.

What God may do with such. How He may reward a faith in Him, sincere doubtless as that of the woman of Samaria, (which through false teaching, false because imperfect) does not do what He commands, as He commands; but often the very opposite, like Saul of Tarsus, or even the Samaritans; What their position in this life, or the next? are questions we cannot solve, being neither "The Saviour" nor "their judge;" further than however strong *the Hope* may be there can be *no certainty*. Doubtless

"THE JUDGE OF ALL THE EARTH WILL DO RIGHT."

But the question that does concern us to solve, is the maintainance in all their integrity, and strictest severity of the statutes, ordinances, and commandments, and Ministry of the Lord blameless. And the Lord will not condemn us, but commend us in so doing. For thereby is He glorified, and honoured. And "them that honour Me, I will honour, saith the Lord, and they that despise Me, shall be lightly esteemed."

For otherwise should the Church Herself *universally* become lax, and if the thing can be conceived, could separate from Herself, that is, all Her members become separatists, schismatics, she would become extinct. Something else would exist in Her stead—which something, would be, any one or all of the various sects now around her, having absorbed by perversion her members into themselves—unity would be disunion—The Body of Christ destroyed; the vine branches torn with the violence of the devastating winds of dissension, from the trunk, Christ.

Now, such is the state of divided professing Christendom of the present age—such is the state of *Religious License*—that any body of men have made, and now may make, or set up, their own ministry; mark! even though the ministry of Christ's own establishing shall be there present in their midst! Or indeed, any *one* man may, if he has certain abilities, constitute himself a ministerial source—such exhibitions are not wanting in our own day—and if they think fit to baptise at all, they do so; and some do so in another name than that of The Father, Son and Holy Ghost; it may perchance be "in the name of the Saviour of men" or some such form.

Considering then the license of religionists, and the so called liberality of the various sects, in accepting as valid the actions of others without gainsay;

THE QUESTION

vital to its very core is, considering this looseness and uncertainty at the present time of the form and validity of the baptism of any convert to the Church from sectism, or that of his baptism, or of the one preceeding him; considering this uncertainty, and further the possibility that once admitted into the Church, he may rise to her highest post; should not the Church of to-day, in receiving any such convert from the sects, admit him not as it is now usually done, by imposition of hands (confirmation) according to Arles 314, A. D., but by hypothetical baptism, according to Carthage 12, 255, A. D.

This it seems to me she should *officially require* to be done, in order to transmit *intact*, the trust committed to Her charge—that no soul within her arms should be subjected *to the risk* of any spiritual loss, through the carelessness of her guardians.

The subject seems of sufficient import, in this careless and *spiritually licentious* age, to DEMAND the consideration of her chief pastors, when by Divine permission they may again assemble at Lambeth, as even did the rebaptism of heretics, that of Church authorities in the ages past.

The question as to whether any lack of grace in baptism will not be sufficiently complemented in Confirmation and in Holy Orders, by a gracious and loving God, so as to render *all official acts effective*, is what must be left in His Knowledge who only knows how He acts; but has commanded man certain things *to do*, and a certain *ministry* to serve therein, so as to attain certain desirable ends, and any laxity on man's part in these respects, will redound not to God's honour and glory, but certainly to man's loss, unless God should *especially* interfere; and I know not that in any scripture of His Revelation, He has intimated that he will do so—or that He estimates one soul above another, in disobedience, except that he that knew his Lord's will (or might have known if he had chosen to have made use of his opportunities), and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes. His neglected privileges, of obtaining knowledge and grace, shall be his condemnation. And not to quote other scriptures, even from the Beloved Disciples, with this, seems to agree the Blessed *Ignatius*, the disciple of the Beloved Apostle, whose words to the Church of Philadelphia, I will conclude with.

"Chap. II. Wherefore, as becomes the children both of the light and of truth, flee divisions and false doctrines: but when your shepherd is, there do ye, as sheep follow after; for there are many wolves who seem worthy of belief, that with a false pleasure lead captive those that run in the course of God; but in your concord they shall find no place.

III. Abstain, therefore from those evil herbs which Jesus Christ does not dress; because such are not the plantation of the Father. Not that I have found any division among you, but rather all manner of purity. For as many as are of God, and of Jesus Christ, are also with their Bishop. And as many as shall with repentance return into the unity of the Church,

even these shall also be the servants of God, that they may live according to Jesus Christ. Be not deceived, Brethren; if any one follows him that makes a schism in the Church, he shall not inherit the Kingdom of God: if any one walks after any other opinion, he agrees not with the passion of Christ.

IV. Wherefore let it be your endeavour to partake all of the same holy Eucharist; for there is but one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the unity of His blood; one Altar; as also there is one Bishop, together with his Presbytery and the Deacons, my fellow-servants; that so whatsoever ye do, ye may do it according to the will of God."

And also from his Epistle to Polycarp his fellow disciple of St. John and Bishop of Smyrna.

"Chap. VI. Harken unto the Bishop, that God also may harken with you. My soul be security for them that submit to their Bishop, with their Presbyters and Deacons. And may my portion be together with theirs in God."

These are the words of a man, on his wearying way to Rome to receive the martyr's crown, as the seal of his

FAITH IN "CHRIST AND THE CHURCH."

THE CREED IN THE SECOND CENTURY.

WE are continually informed in certain quarters that the Apostles' Creed is a "development;" that the Christians of the early Church had no fixed "form of sound words," or "profession of faith" to be held "without wavering." There are two motives for this insistence. The first is that it may be made to appear that the only element of the Gospel which claims absolute allegiance is its ethical teaching, of which the Sermon on the Mount is the greatest example. The second is that certain assertions of the Creed, which are held to be of a mythical character, may be dismissed from the sphere of necessary belief; for instance, "He was born of the Virgin Mary."

Looking at the matter from the point of view of antecedent probability, it is hard to see how new converts to the Church could abide steadfastly "in the doctrine of the Apostles," unless they had already some convenient summary of it. Further than this, there are tolerably plain references to something of this kind in the New Testament itself. It may not be necessary to assume that the form employed was at first always expressed in precisely the same words, but if it existed at all, it must have been always the same substance. All confessed the same faith.

A recent discovery throws a new light upon the use of a creed in the first part of the second century. We have already referred to this discovery in a former article, and we may be pardoned for dwelling upon it at somewhat greater length, both on account of the interest attaching to the circumstances and the inherent importance of the document so strangely recovered after many centuries. Eusebius, the historian, mentions that an Athenian philosopher named Aristides, who was a Christian, presented an apology to the Emperor Hadrian. But until the present day this is all that was known of the matter. It is true that a few years ago the Arminians of the Lazarist monastery at Venice published, from a manuscript in their possession, what purported to be