

Poetry.

THE MARTYRS.

Oh! that it were as if we all to be,
When they were friends of fire all of thee,
Fought against terrors with smiles! gave glorious chase
To persecutions, and against the face
Of death and fiercest dangers durst, with brave
And sober pace, march on to meet a grave.

RICHARD CRASHAW.

SIR PHILIP SYDNEY.
(From the Church of England Magazine.)

Sir Philip Sydney, memorable as a man of literature,
of courage and humanity, and of sound religious principle,
is supposed to have been born at Penshurst, in Kent,
Nov. 29, A.D. 1554.

Philip Sydney, at an early age, went to Christ Church, Oxford,
and subsequently travelled on the continent, in 1572,
where he gained universal esteem, by the amiability of his manners
and the openness of his conduct.

Sir Philip, in 1586, while governor of Flushing,
and serving under his uncle, the Earl of Leicester,
was mortally wounded at the battle of Zutphen,
a strong town in Guelderland, then besieged by the Spaniards.

His ardour of attachment to the service of the Queen
was now most fully illustrated. Leicester mentions in a letter
to Sir T. Heneage, written the day after his nephew's wound.

His ardour of attachment to the service of the Queen
was now most fully illustrated. Leicester mentions in a letter
to Sir T. Heneage, written the day after his nephew's wound.

The earthly remains of Sir Philip were conveyed in solemn state to England,
and magnificently buried in St. Paul's Cathedral, on the 16th of February, 1587.

Church matters, says, "Nothing can be more obviously expedient than such a reference as this, to the ancient Fathers."
As a difference exists touching the real bearing and purport of some of the apostolic writings,
the wisest course, by confession of all commentators,
is to seek for the judgment of those to whom those writings were originally addressed
and of their immediate successors.

And here it is necessary to state that in our appeal to the Fathers, we appeal to the reasoning faculties of men.
We do not seek to overwhelm them with authority separable from argument;
but we appeal to their reason to receive and value the authority.

Before concluding this chapter we are tempted to give an extract or two from the Right Honourable W. E. Gladstone's very able work on the State in its relations with the Church,
which bear much on the subject we have in hand.

Now with this we thoroughly agree; and to this our reason most freely assent if we will but in reason consider who the Fathers were,
and what opportunities they had superior to any we can possibly possess of understanding and knowing the minds of the Apostles,
and the real meaning of their sacred writings.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH IN ITS EPISCOPACY.

The ages contemporary with, and succeeding that of the Apostles—
An evidence slighted by none—Essays on the Church,
published by Bishop Bowstead—The appeal to the reasoning faculty—Hooker, St. Cyril, Irenaeus, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, Tertullian, Doctor Pusey, on paramount authority of the sacred Scriptures—Character of the Fathers: Luther's opinion—Rev. J. H. Newman on the Sixth Article—Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone's remarks—Note from Rev. William Wigan Harvey—Remarks on quotation from Mr. Gladstone.

It may be added that the Poles would have chosen Sir Philip Sydney to be their King;
but, at the wish of Elizabeth, he declined a sceptre when just within his reach.

And here it is necessary to state that in our appeal to the Fathers, we appeal to the reasoning faculties of men.
We do not seek to overwhelm them with authority separable from argument;
but we appeal to their reason to receive and value the authority.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

And to this point we might quote largely in the same spirit from St. Cyril, Hilary, Justin, Optatus, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexander, Theodoret, with Gerson and Lira,
eminent men of later date, and several others, for their written opinions are now actually before us as we pen this;
but the above quoted instances are sufficient to show that the Fathers held the authority of Scripture to be the paramount authority in every argument or controversy,
and without the Scriptures they would not wish to listen to others,
or that themselves should speak on sacred things.

celebrate the Holy Communion. The Hebrew converts indeed might refer to an incidental expression in the long disputed Epistle addressed to them by St. Paul.
But the first Epistle believers at all events could not ground their ordinary worship on any recorded command either of Christ or His Apostles,
while the mere impulse of a natural feeling would hardly have led them to disregard the prohibition of the magistrate.
Nor could they have founded their custom on the precepts of the Old Testament;
for such collective meetings as theirs, though introduced into the synagogue after the captivity,
were no part either of Mosaic or Patriarchal law.
Yet their assemblages for public worship were the main thing which excited the attention of heathen persecutors,
who would have been indifferent what opinions prevailed the depths of society,
if its surface had continued unbroken.

Why then did the first Christians provoke what might seem so needless a jealousy?
Why did not they allow their opinions to spread like a literary taste or philosophical conviction?
What induced them to challenge opposition from the empires of the world,
by presenting themselves in the obnoxious light of a spiritual kingdom?
Yet we find everywhere that public worship was the fundamental law of their religious union;
as men could not be Christians save by participation in that sacred rite of the Lord's Supper,
whereby they were united to Christ,
so were public prayer and praise held to be the necessary conditions of individual welfare.
The reason was that private benefit was felt in that age to result from participation with Christ,
as engrained members of His mystic body.
And therefore the independent allegiance of unconnected worshippers was not enough;
the gospel was not to be locked up in each man's bosom,
his religion being a personal affair,
his faith the judgment of his own understanding,
but social worship was the necessary condition of church membership.
To prescribe it was as needless as to assert the inspiration of the Gospel,
when once admitted to be the words of the Son of God;
for allow public worship to be communion with Christ,
and what believers could be indifferent to the Lord's presence.

Now the increased importance of public worship in the present day is exactly proportionate to its diminished estimation.
We need it not only for its inherent advantages, but also as the stay or restorer of that very truth, from which in earlier days it was a spontaneous and unbidden produce.
For can we disguise from ourselves that a large proportion even of our more earnest attendants are wholly ignorant of any peculiar gift to be expected through the instrumentality of Christian ministers?
Is not their object instruction, if not excitement; do not they measure the effect by what they feel, and think the present result the sole test of edification?
Have they any serious belief that the Church of Christ is a spiritual kingdom, and that each minister in his appointed place is a steward of the mysteries of God?
On this subject we may quote the opinion of a well-informed and dispassionate historian, who illustrates the little sensation produced by the exclusion of the nonjuring bishops in the year 1668,
by remarking that the "established liturgy was and is at present in the eyes of the great majority, the distinguishing mark of the Anglican Church, far more indeed than episcopal government,
whereof so little is known by the mass of the people, that its abolition would make no perceptible difference in their religion."
Mr. Hallam's assertion is strikingly borne out by what befell the Church of Scotland at the very period to which his observations refer.
The mass of the Scotch, except a small portion of the West, were living contentedly under the episcopal government which had prevailed in that country from the year 1612 until the eve of the revolution.
To what can we refer their ready compliance with the interdicted attempts of William III. to introduce Presbyterian doctrine and discipline,
save to their lack of an established liturgy.
Except to those who were well taught in the principles of their faith,
the change from one source of authority to another seemed immaterial.
A portion only of the more educated classes continued from conviction to be members of the same primitive communion with ourselves,
and remain as a scanty remnant in the inheritance of their fathers.

A similar change, Mr. Hallam asserts might easily befall the English Church,
but for the national attachment to the Book of Common Prayer.
Indeed its possibility is increased by causes which at the revolution were yet slumbering in the womb of time.
For while the other ranks of the ministry have expanded themselves in a manner somewhat proportioned to our increased population,
the unhappy limitation in the number of our spiritual rulers has precluded any proportionate development of this part of our system.
Our altars are served by ten times as many priests as in the time of Elizabeth,
but confirmation and orders are not ministered by more hands than were found needful for a tythe of our population.
This evil, my reverend brethren, can hardly be remedied till the residue of the clergy follow your example,
and petition her Majesty to grant that opportunity of synodical deliberation,
which she is pledged to concede to their request;
but its existence sufficiently accounts for the popular ignorance.
Formularies and Canons will never teach the mass of mankind whose instructor must be experience,
and the key to whose faith is in the usages of the age.
Till the Episcopate therefore is so far increased that its functions can be adequately developed—a thing at present notoriously impossible—what marvel if our people believe the Bishop to be only a check upon the actions of the clergy,
and that his functions might be as easily discharged by any commissary of the crown.
Indeed it is to be feared that this notion is not confined merely to vulgar minds.
Now it is vain to tell such persons of those more sacred objects of this order which our service book declares;
the ancient maxim *Ecclesia est in Episcopo* is a mere unpractical statement ill exhibited in action.
Under these circumstances, what remains to constitute a Churchman's assent to our public ritual.
If the principles of our system are so little appreciated that the majority of our people neither know nor value those peculiar blessings, which result from union with an Apostolic Church,
to what can their attachment be linked save to that mode of public worship, which at all events is no unmeaning name, but which lives and acts among them.
A churchman is in reality a man who believes in the doctrines and lives in the communion of the church;
who abides in it.
In the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayer."
But the name is popularly applied in a loose, indefinite, uncertain manner,
and persons are supposed to be Churchmen who lead unholily lives and are habitually absent from the Lord's table.
With many the word has no other significance than that the parties are occasional listeners in the House of God.
Now the habit of public worship is the only mode of conveying conviction to such minds.
Its office is to lead men to that belief from which in past ages it resulted.
Let them once learn to regard it in its true light as the collective action of the Christian community,
as sustaining our title to be one with that family of Christ,
with which is the Lord's Spirit,
as essentially distinct from any private offering or voluntary assemblage,
and we shall have done much to teach them the forgotten truth, that Christ is truly present with His Church among the generations of mankind.

Our whole conduct then, my reverend brethren, in the performance of our public office must be subservient to the great end of leading our people to regard public worship in its true light.
To say that we should ourselves be grave, reverential, and devout, is

PUBLIC WORSHIP AND FORMS OF PRAYER.
(From the Visitation Charge of the Ven. Archbishop R. J. Wilberforce.)

Practical religion consists mainly in two things—obedience and worship.
The first whereof is chiefly relative to our personal duties;
but the second has great reference to that public homage, which as part of the collective body of the Church we owe to God.
It is the very condition and object for the sake whereof the Church of Christ was formed,
and in which its life is situated;
the discriminating circumstance which separates the communion of all saints from that individual adherence which any single votary might render to God.
Now it cannot be doubted that it would increase our people's sense of the importance of public worship, did they see us consider nothing wasted which contributed to invest it with all the accessories of dignity and honour;
did we desire cordially to render God's house the best place in every parish.

And I beg you to consider how much this would tend in itself to set forth the Church in its proper character,
both among the various societies which of late years have risen up around us,
and among those many individuals who are still hovering on the verge of our communion.
We cannot be ignorant that the circumstances of our age and country have given a preponderating influence to one portion of the truth of God's word:
that religion in the present day has come to be looked upon as a mere personal concernment.
Now while we nowise deny, or rather while we strenuously affirm, that religion is an individual concern, we are bound to contend with equal earnestness that it is not an individual concern only.
The service of God is not based merely on our natural feelings,
on the development of any innate principles of human judgement,
on the proclivity of the will,
on the calmness of the understanding;
it is a divine graft and supernatural influence,
which has its root above,
and descends to individuals from the body,
and is partaken by each member of the divine household,
through his union with that parent source wherein it resides.
Now the gifts of grace are nowhere promised to men as individuals,
but as members together of Christ,
and as the family of God.
What is needed then is not to withdraw men's attention from other truths,
but to set this also before them.
Such is the glory of God's grace,
wherever any of its beams have visited the soul,
that the regenerate taste cannot choose but to recognize its lustre and beauty.
It were idle therefore to attempt to withdraw men from whatsoever their consciences have affirmed to be beneficial;
nay,
the very suspicion is likely enough to excite distrust and arouse opposition.
But to set before them a new truth which does not militate with the old,
but illustrate and explain it,
which opens enlarged views of God's kingdom,
which unfolds a fresh idea,
which calls forth their feelings for the future,
without doing violence to the past,
this is the true principle of a divine philosophy.
"Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship,
him declare I unto you."
Our office therefore must be to instil truth rather than to expose error.
The parties with whom we have to do,
have no rival system of belief,
no truth which can be set in opposition to our own;
but they know not the "manner" of Christ's kingdom,—the transcendent doctrines of his real incorporation with the body of his elect,
that He tabernacles among the sons of men,
that He tabernacles with the congregation of His people,—of all this they need to be informed.
Yet how shall we deal with men who are swayed rather by sense than faith,
feeling than testimony,
and to whom the history of the past has never been unfolded.
There is but one thing which can speak to such men's minds,—the subduing effects of a truly Christian worship.
If God be indeed present in the congregation of His Saints,
if His mysterious influence is vouchsafed them,
we must believe that where this portion of religion is adequately set forth,
and human efforts properly minister to the divine praise,
there will be manifested a present influence,
which will arrest the attention and carry along with it,
so that the feelings of mere worldly interest will be gradually elevated into the preceptions of Christian sympathy.
Thus was it with the Christian assemblies of old,
when that believed not and was ashamed found the secrets of his heart made manifest,
and so falling down he worshipped God,
and reported that God was of a truth with his people.
What is needed then is not to tell men their duty,
but to accustom them to feel it.
By the neglect of worship,
has the Church lost her children,—and she must regain them by its revival.
Till this portion of their office and heritage is felt and valued by our people,
till they take a part in the public service of God as their highest privilege and peculiar blessing,
as that which challenges for them a share in the divine promises,
and gives them place and entrance amidst the family of God,
we have taken no step towards the enlargement of their spiritual sense,
however they have not learnt the only language in which mankind are to be instructed.

If public worship were not thus intimately connected with the existence of Christian Society,
if it were not a recognition of its character,
and proof of its being,
we might well marvel at the importance attached to it by the early Christians.
The only express command which bound them to assemble for religious duties was our Lord's order to

Before concluding this chapter we are tempted to give an extract or two from the Right Honourable W. E. Gladstone's very able work on the State in its relations with the Church,
which bear much on the subject we have in hand.
First, though we have far more than probable evidence on our side,
yet we give this remark:
"Probable evidence, be it remembered, is binding upon us as well as demonstrative;
nay, it constitutes the greatest portion of the subject matter of duty,
and so a dim view of religious truth entails an obligation to follow it as real and valid as that which results from a clear and full comprehension;
as real and valid, although it be true that different degrees of guilt are incurred by the disregard of the one or the other.
So, if I find a purse,
which I conjecture belongs to my neighbour,
I am as truly bound—it is as legitimate a part of my moral duty—to take it to him,
and ascertain the fact,
as it would be at once to restore it if I absolutely knew him to be the owner.
If our apprehension of the Divine Will be indistinct and uncertain,
we are nevertheless bound to follow it so long as a reasonable balance of probability remains in favour of the reality of our impressions,"
(page 35.)

The Christian man (page 164), although he receives the truth on trust as to its details,
and is most blessed in the continuance of a simple and child-like spirit,
and the voluntary abasement of his own self-will in a degree proportioned to the general capacity and development of his understanding,
not merely in order to determine whether there is sufficient evidence of a revelation from God;
but also in order to be the more fully assured that are the matters contained in the doctrine on which the Church of England acts,
like the early Fathers,
that of the sufficiency of Scripture for salvation;
so that he is not liable to have matter of faith imposed upon him,
from any other source.
Tradition is not a co-ordinate authority.
But it is a witness to the facts of the case,
and he, acting in the character of a judge upon his own religious belief,
is bound to hear that witness,
and to judge,
according to the balance of probabilities,
whether it is not more likely to convey in a disputed point the mind of God,
than his own single impressions,
which (by hypothesis) are either altogether new,
or where formerly promulgated,
have been authoritatively or practically disavowed.
That upon every point,
small and great,
he must surrender,
it is not necessary for the general purpose to contend,
but where he finds antiquity and universality combined with fundamentality,
the conclusion is inevitable,
and, in proportion as he finds the evidence of each of those three conditions,
it is plainly legitimate."

How admirable is this:
but what would this writer think of those who blindly seek to pass judgment without the hearing of witnesses in a case;
or of those who rest more upon small criticisms than upon the apparent validities in a long chain of evidence;
in short,
of those who,
in the weakness of little ingenious sophisms and improbabilities,
reject the great facts founded on sufficient testimony as to their truth!
"But perhaps,"
our author proceeds,
"those who love unity may ridicule the whole notion of encouraging a general spirit of inquiry into the ground of the doctrines of religion,
and at the same time teaching the doctrines of unity,
if arriving at one conclusion,
and that one the ancient Catholic Creed,
with any anticipation that that duty will be observed.
And they may point to the state of this country,
and ask how much unity exists among us.
It is a sore question,
and very little.
The abusive and irreverent exercise of private judgment,
the forgetfulness of the supremacy,
and oneness of truth among us is grievous.
We have almost ceased not only to contemplate unity as an object,
but to remember it as a duty.
THE MIND OF GOD,
there is unfulfilled in respect of this great duty.
May our case soon be otherwise!"

We may justly observe that the soreness in the question of unity is not with Churchmen.
There must be painful feelings arising from seeing others run heed-

\* Does not the poet Dryden, in his forcible manner, write to the above effect:
"Suppose we on things traditive divide,
And both appeal to Scripture to decide;
By various texts we both uphold our claim;
Nay, often ground our titles on the same;
After long labour lost, and time's expense,
Both grant the disputes, and quarrel for the sense,
Thus all disputes for ever must depend:
For no dumb rule can controversies end.
Thus, when you said, Tradition must be tried,
By Sacred Writ, whose sense yourselves decide,
You said no more, but that yourselves must be,
The judges of the Scripture sense, not we.
Against our Church tradition you declare,
And yet your clerks would sit in Moses' chair;
At least his proved against your argument,
The rule is far from plain, where all dissent!"
DRYDEN.

† Commentary in Genesis 2, p. 27.