

will not soon be forgotten. It seemed to lift us above the world, and to give us a foretaste of the communion which the redeemed enjoy in heaven.

On Saturday, January 5th, 1839, she was suddenly attacked by an illness, which in a few hours terminated her valuable life. She expressed herself happy in God, and calmly resigned to his will; but neither she herself, nor any of her friends, anticipated the nearness of her change from mortality to life. And when that change did come, it resembled translation rather than death, except that the earthly tabernacle remained behind; but the spirit, in its triumph and its flight, left upon the "sleeping clay" the smile and flush of victory! The occasion of her death was improved, in a very impressive discourse, by the Superintendent of the Circuit, the Rev. Robert Masaroon, from that portion of Scripture, "O death, where is thy sting! O grave, where is thy victory! The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Review.

A REVIEW OF DR. HOOK'S SERMON ON "HEAR THE CHURCH," PREACHED BEFORE THE QUEEN, AT THE CHAPEL ROYAL, IN ST. JAMES'S PALACE, JUNE 17, 1838: BY THE REV. THOMAS POWELL.

Dr. Hook is the Apostle and High Priest of the high church scheme of the present times. If assertions were proofs, his writings would contain convincing evidence of the authority of his Mission. I doubt his assertions; and I controvert his scheme. His doctrine of the succession has been sufficiently refuted in the preceding Essay; indeed the arguments in the Essay do, in their consequence, demolish his whole high church building.

But there is one topic upon which he evidently delights to dwell; for he speaks and preaches it everywhere; it is this—That the present Church of England was founded by the Apostles, and has come down to the present day, with no other difference, at any time, from that Apostolic Church, than the difference caused in the same man by having his face washed or unwashed; see page 13th of his sermon.—This is his favourite illustration. Speaking of the church of this country before the Reformation, when sworn to Popery, the Pope acknowledged as its head by all its authorities, when governed by Bishops who preached the doctrines, and were sworn to the government of Popery, when the church itself was filled with Idols and abominations; with perfect and full grown Popery.—and comparing that church with the church after the Reformation, he says, "THE CHURCH REMAINED THE SAME AFTER IT WAS REFORMED AS IT WAS BEFORE, just as a man remains the same man after he has washed his face as he was before," p. 12. The conclusions he draws from this argument, are,—that the Church of England "maintains those peculiar doctrines and that peculiar discipline which have ALWAYS MARKED, and do still continue to mark, the distinction between the Church of Christ, administered under the superintendence of Chief Pastors or Bishops who have regularly succeeded to the Apostles, from those sects of Christianity which exist under self-appointed teachers;—that this church is the ONLY church of Christ in this kingdom;—that it possesses its original endowments, which were never, as ignorant persons foolishly suppose, taken from one church and given to another," (p. 12);—that her Bishops have regularly succeeded to the Apostles; and that her ministers are the ONLY divinely commissioned Ministers in this kingdom: all other denominations are SECTARIANS, SCHISMATICS, and left to the UNCOVENANTED mercies of God. On this ground he has the intolerable arrogance thus to insult the Christian Churches in general in America: "When the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA were English Colonies, the ENGLISH Church was there established; at the revolution, the State was destroyed. Monarchy had there ceased to exist; but the Church, though depressed for a time, remained unjured: so that there—among the American republicans—under the superintendence of no fewer than sixteen bishops, you will find her sacraments and ordinances administered, and all her ritual and liturgical services celebrated, with no less of piety, zeal, and solemnity, than here in England;—there you may see

THE CHURCH, LIKE AN OASIS IN THE DESERT, blessed by the dews of heaven, and shedding heavenly blessings around her, in a land where, because no religion is established, IF IT WERE NOT FOR RELIGION, NOTHING BUT THE EXTREMES OF INFIDELITY OR FANATISM would prevail," p. 7, 8.

The reader sees at once that this Succession scheme a little modified. That scheme has been sufficiently refuted in the Essay. We intend, in this Review of the Sermon, to expose the sophistry of this modification. Here, "THE CHURCH" is the topic:—"BISHOPS" were the former topic.

If Dr. Hook be the man he is said to be, it is hard to suppose that he is not conscious of the sophistry of his own argument: in which case he would be a public deceiver; if his reasoning powers be weak, he may possibly be entangled in his own net. Be these things as they may, his argument is a TISSUE OF SOPHISTRY:—we shall endeavour to untwist it, and break its force of deceiving.

THE GREAT FALLACY or delusion of the whole argument lies in using the expression "The Church" in DIFFERENT SENSES, in different parts of the argument; that is, as Logicians would say, in CHANGING THE TERMS.

The way in which he manages this is, by giving only a GENERAL and imperfect definition of the terms in the BEGINNING of his sermon; and then, introducing particulars into it in the progress, as is the most convenient for deception. So, at pages 5 and 8, he says, "Now at the very OUTSET, I must state that I refer to the Church, NOT as a mere National Establishment of Religion, but as the Church, a religious community, intrinsically independent of the state; that is to say, I am about to treat the Church, not in its political, but simply and solely in its religious character.—And so you may perceive what is meant, when we say, that we wish to speak of the Church, not as an establishment, but as the Church, A RELIGIOUS SOCIETY, A PARTICULAR SOCIETY OF CHRISTIANS." Then, this "particular society of Christians" becomes "OUR Church"—"THE Church of ENGLAND"—"THE Church;" and, at the last, on the LAST page, this "particular society of Christians," becomes DISTINGUISHED from all other "religious societies" BY THESE SPECIFIC PROPERTIES, as "maintaining those PECULIAR DOCTRINES, and that PECULIAR DISCIPLINE, which have ALWAYS MARKED, and do still continue to mark, the DISTINCTION between the Church of Christ, administered under the superintendence of chief Pastors or Bishops who REGULARLY SUCCEEDED to the Apostles, from those SECTS of Christianity under self-appointed teachers." Well, thanks be to the Doctor for giving us, at last, a complete definition of the Church of England. This definition, as perfected by himself, is, "That the Church of England is a particular society of Christians, distinguished from all other particular religious societies, by its peculiar doctrines, and its peculiar discipline." By discipline, he tells us, he means its Church Government, as administered by its Bishops; their Succession is another question, and has been fully treated in the Essay.

Now let us try his main position: "the present Church of England is the old Catholic Church of England, reformed in the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, of certain superstitious errors; it is the same Church which came down from our British and Saxon ancestors. The Church remained the same after it was reformed as it was before, just as a man remains the same man after he has washed his face as he was before," p. 11, 12.

Here, then, let us examine the matter. The Church before the Reformation was "a particular religious society;" and the Church, after the Reformation, was "a particular religious society." There is, then, this general agreement, that each was "a religious society." So a harlot is a woman, and a virgin is a woman. There is this general agreement between them,

\* Some respectable persons have made a little objection to this illustration. The writer has duly weighed their observations, and thinks them groundless, for the following reasons: 1st. The authority of the word of God and of all the great Reformers, justifies and authorizes the application of the term Harlot to the most appropriate designation of a corrupt Church; so it is here applied to the Church of Rome; 2ndly. The contrast of the purity of the Church of England by the term Virgin, pays a respect to that Church, so contrasted by the Reformers, and as the most important branch of the Protestant Church, which, under this view, the writer has a pleasure in paying.

that each is a woman. Now if we wish to know the difference that distinguishes the harlot from the virgin, we should be told that it would be the peculiar principles, manners, and conduct of each. If, then, we wish to know the difference that distinguishes the Church before the Reformation, from the Church after the Reformation, the answer would be, "The peculiar doctrines and the peculiar discipline of each Church." Each is a Church, i. e. "a religious society;" as each of the above persons is a woman; but were those Churches THE SAME? This will be answered by another question—Are a harlot and a virgin THE SAME? Yes, according to Dr. Hook, if the harlot washes her face!

Let us look at the face of the Church before the Reformation, and at the face of the Church after the Reformation:—at their peculiar doctrines, and their peculiar discipline.

1. PECULIAR DOCTRINES.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.—The Church, before the Reformation, maintained the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and committed hundreds to the flames for disputing it, but

The Church, after the Reformation, declares it "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, that it overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." Art. 28th of the Church of England.

MASS.—The Church, before the Reformation, maintained that the Priests did offer CHRIST for the quick and dead to have remission of pain and guilt.—

The Church, after the Reformation, declares these positions to be "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." Article 31st of the Church of England.

IMAGES.—The Church, before the Reformation, maintained the worship of Images, and the churches were full of Images.—

The Church, after the Reformation, declares this to be IDOLATRY; see Homily on Idolatry. Thus also the 22nd Article: "The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, veneration and adoration, as well of Images, as of reliques, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God."

JUSTIFICATION.—The Church, before the Reformation, maintained that a man was justified through the grace of God by works, and NOT BY FAITH ONLY.—

The Church, after the Reformation, maintained that the doctrine "that we are justified by faith ONLY, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as is more largely expressed in the homily of Justification;" Article 11.

These points of doctrine may suffice—many more might be added.

2. PECULIAR DISCIPLINE:

The Church, before the Reformation, acknowledged the POPE as SUPREME HEAD OF THE CHURCH, as CHRIST'S VICAR, and that all were heretics who rejected him. A few passages from the Canon Law, as collected by Archbishop Cranmer, and given in the Collection of Records by Bishop Burnet, in his History of the Reformation, Book 3, No. 27, will illustrate this point:

"He that acknowledgeth not himself to be under the Bishop of Rome, and that the Bishop of Rome is ordained by God to have primacy over all the World, is an Heretic, and cannot be saved, nor is not of the flock of Christ.

"All the Decrees of the Bishop of Rome ought to be kept perpetually of every man, without any repugnancy, as the Word spoken by the mouth of Peter: and whosoever doth not receive them, neither availeth them the Catholic Faith, nor the Four Evangelists, but they blaspheme the Holy Ghost, and shall have no forgiveness.

"The See of Rome hath neither spot nor wrinkle in it, nor cannot err.

"The Bishop of Rome may excommunicate Emperors and Princes, and DEPOSE THEM from their States, and Assail their subjects from their Oath and Obedience to them, and so constrain them to rebellion."

ALL the Bishops in England, before the Reformation, SWORE OBEDIENCE TO THE POPE OF ROME: see Sect. 12 of the Essay: but

The Church, after the Reformation, declared the Pope to be Antichrist, the Son of Perdition; and the Church of Rome to be an Idolatrous Church: See Essay, Section 11. And every Bishop of the Church of England is bound to REJECT THE AUTHORITY

of the Pope and the court of Rome, under the PENALTY OF EXCOMMUNICATION.

Thus we see that the "peculiar doctrines and the peculiar discipline" of the Church before the Reformation, and those of the Church after the Reformation, EXPRESSLY CONTRADICT EACH OTHER: the Church after the Reformation, charging IDOLATRY and BLASPHEMY upon the Church before the Reformation. Yet, says Dr. Hook, "They are THE SAME." And Dr. Hook can prove it—yes more—he can prove, by his principles, that black is white, and that two and two are five. Thus, two and two are both numbers; and fire is a number, ergo, two and two are the same as five, i. e. they are both numbers.—black is a colour; and white is a colour, ergo, black and white are the same, i. e. they are both colours. Yes, replies the reader, but it was supposed you meant that two and two were the same in amount as five; and that black was the same colour as white. True, but this is leaving the GENERAL nature of the things, and coming to the specific differences, and I only spoke in general. Dr. Hook only shews you the general nature of the thing at first: the Church, before the Reformation is a religious society, and the Church, after the Reformation, is a religious society, ergo, they are the same, i. e. they are both religious societies; as black and white are both colours. True, says the reader, but we supposed he meant that they had the same distinguishing properties or qualities. Whether Dr. Hook meant it himself or not, I cannot say; but he doubtless meant his readers to think that they had the same distinguishing properties, i. e. the same peculiar doctrines, and the same peculiar discipline. see p. 23 of his sermon as quoted above. However, it was neither convenient for him to say so "at the outset" of his sermon, nor was it agreeable to him to exhibit this identity afterwards. black would have been seen to be black, and white would have been white still—the virgin would have appeared a virgin, and the harlot would have appeared a harlot, after the Doctor's perspiration in washing her face.

The Doctor's position, then, is a mere fallacy, involving the real absurdity, that two religious societies, distinguished as societies, by their "peculiar doctrines, and their peculiar discipline," and whose peculiar doctrines and peculiar discipline flatly contradict each other, are yet one and the same society, i. e. that CONTRADICTORY propositions are identical propositions:—They are,—just as much so as black and white are the same, and as two and two are five.

The absurdity of the Doctor's position being thus manifest, all his conclusions fall to the ground; and the following opposite conclusions become established:

CONCLUSION 1st.—The Church before the Reformation, and the Church after the Reformation, are two different Churches, distinguished by directly opposite peculiar doctrines, and peculiar discipline or Church Government.

CONCLUSION 2nd.—The Church after the Reformation, as distinguished by its peculiar doctrine and peculiar discipline, was founded at the Reformation, as much so as the Scotch Church, the Lutheran Church, or any other of those Sects towards which the Doctor manifests such scorn.

As to the succession of the Bishops of the Church of England, through the Church of Rome, or through the Church before the Reformation, we have shown in the Essay, that they have no more claim, on that ground, than bastards have to the substance of legitimate children.

CONCLUSION 3rd.—The Church of England, and the Bishops of the Church of England, have no more just affinity to the British or Saxon Churches, than any other Church that equally resembles them in peculiar doctrine or discipline. The Doctor's assertion, at page 9, that "the Church, as at the period of the Reformation, had existed, as all parties admit, from the first planting of Christianity in England," is one of his accustomed, hardy, fallacious, and baseless statements. Had that Church, as distinguished at the period of the Reformation, by such "peculiar doctrines and peculiar discipline" as we have seen above, existed as always marked (p. 23.) by those "peculiar doctrines and that peculiar discipline" from the first planting of Christianity in England! Yes! the Doctor says, "All parties admit" this! Then all parties admit that FULL GROWN POPERY existed in England from the first planting of Christ-