

The Church.

"HER FOUNDATIONS ARE UPON THE HOLY HILLS."

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.—JEREMIAH VI. 16.

COBOURG, UPPER CANADA, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1840.

[NUMBER XXXIV.]

VOLUME III.]

Poetry.

THE SOLITARY WOOD-PIGEON. BY MRS. SAWELL.

Written on seeing a wood pigeon, very late in the autumn, take refuge in the belfry of a decayed church.

Art thou a lone and plaintive dweller here,
Beneath this sacred gloom,
Where each sound echoes from the dark and still
And lowly vaulted tomb?
Long have the autumn wanderers gone from hence
To where the green leaves wave,
And thou art left deserted and forlorn,
Companion of the grave.
Poor widowed bird, thou art indeed among
The desolate of earth—
A lonely mourner in this hallowed wreck
Of past deceasing worth.
The low-toned bell's sweet music oft hath stirred
The trembling poplar trees,
Nought save the fluttering of thine own light wings
Now answers to the breeze.
The deepened voice of hallowed prayer hath waved
The elder's snowy bloom;
But now no breath of sacred worship wakes
The silence of the tomb.
Here hath that parting blessing been bestowed,
Which lasting rest must sway—
That heaven entrusted peace the world gives not,
And cannot take away.
But here none kneel in meek devotion now,
Beneath this mouldering shrine,
Around the altar's place the clinging wreaths
Of wild climatic twine.
The dark-veined leaves a saddened murmur breathe—
A deeply mournful tone—
A low and plaintive melancholy sound—
A spirit grieving home.
Thy rest, lone bird, hath never been among
Such relics of decay,
Where o'er the dead the crumbling tombstones fall,
Beneath the night-wind's sway.
Thou wilt thy long and dreary vigils keep,
Until the spring's warm breath
Shall stir thy muffled plumes, and bear thee from
This monument of death.
But unto thee there speaks no hallowed voice
Within thy chill abode,
Though the tall sepulchral nurtured trees
Rise from ancestral sod;
For thou couldst rest in peace, thy bosom, where
Their sacred dust is spread.
No haunting memory should thy pinions trail
The ashes of the dead.
Fold thy light wings. This sanctuary, in
Its perishing decay,
Mournfully tells how fondly cherished things
From earth must pass away.
Dust with its dust to moulder in the wreck
Affection's tears behold,
Where drooping flowers and long funeral grass
Sweep o'er the sainted mould;
And mystic murmurings from the unsought grave
Sigh through the shadowy gloom,
But not their spirit's voices, for their rest
Is not within the tomb.

ANGLO-PROTESTANT CHURCH ARCHITECTURE.*

Christianity, under the various aspects it has worn in successive ages and distant countries, has everywhere left a characteristic impress upon the buildings employed in divine worship. The small square chambers in the Roman catacombs, and the consecrated ruins of Philæ, are not less striking records of the depressed, than St. Peter's and St. Sophia's of the prevailing, faith. Every ancient Basilica, every Lombard and Gothic abbey, re-echoes its own history, and truth often seems like romance as their sculptured legends are deciphered.

A painful thought indeed accompanies the contemplation of those buildings which exhibit Christian architecture in its most sublime and imaginative form. Their grandeur is coeval with the corruption of that religion which they profess to honour. There is a continual allusion to errors and superstitions in the maze of a Gothic cathedral; and the age is not far distant when every eye could detect them where they did not exist, while they overlooked their finest moral lesson. For those stones have sermons in them less often read than the tale of priestcraft, idolatry, and intellectual prostration.—They tell the professors of a purer creed that their fathers did not offer to God that which cost them nothing.

As the habits engendered by the Reformation became familiar to men's minds, they discovered how inappropriate the old churches were for those purposes to which they applied them. Instead of processions to be watched along the aisles, dense congregations were to be seated and to listen. Instead of distributing the service into many chapels one group alone could combine in public worship. The preacher had gathered to himself that interest which used to be centered in the priest, and the pulpit competed successfully with the altar. The largest area of the sacred building was thenceforth alone required. Transcripts became useless, and gave the superstitious image of the cross; chancels, worse, as they brought back exploded Judaism and a holy of holies.—Bucer, by Calvin's direction, therefore declared that reading service in the chancel was an insufferable abuse and high treason against God;—a denunciation which procured a rubric in the second prayer-book of Edward, bringing the minister into the nave, and lest he should return, Hooper urged the king to "shut up the partition, called the chancel, which separates the congregation of Christ one from the other, as though the veil and partition of the temple in the old law yet should remain in the church, when indeed all types and figures ended in Christ."[†]

The relapse thus dreaded actually occurred. Soon after Elizabeth's accession, her prelates began to suspect that their predecessors had not observed the golden (or, as Jewell called it, the leaden) mean, in endeavouring to keep pace with the popular notions of reform.—The minister was sent back to his position near the altar, and as he needed no accommodation beyond a low desk or fold-stool not more cumbersome than a chair, such alterations might instantly be made. But as every ordinary had a dispensing power over this regulation, and it was in many cases inconvenient in itself as well as opposed to vulgar prejudice, the practice was far from uniform. A paper of Lord Burleigh's enumerates, among other clerical irregularities, "Some say the service in a seat made in the church; some in the pulpit with their faces towards the people; some keep precisely the order of the book."[‡]

It remained for James, who, with all his vices, cannot be charged with want of reverence for the altar, to break

the last connecting link between it and the daily prayers. A convocation in the beginning of his reign directed that "a convenient seat" should be made for the minister, and the sentence naturally concluded "to read service in." Thus the desk became a fixture; prayers were read to the people, not prayed with them; and the altar, although treated with an affectation of respect at communion time, ceased to be the place "where prayer was wont to be made." Hence the attempt to maintain its sacredness by decoration only experienced the fate of every attempt at expressing a sentiment no longer felt; and the bitter epigram of Andrew Melville spoke the thoughts of thousands:—

"Cur stant clausi Angli libri duo regia in ara
Lumina coeca duo, polubra sicca duo?
Num sensum cultumque Dei tenet Anglia clausum
Lumina coeca suo, sorde sepulta sua?
Romano et ritu dum regalem instruit aram
Purpuream purget religiosa Lupam."

It only remained for an amiable divine in the same century to make the desk and pulpit of equal height, thus formally acknowledging the competition which had long been implied, and setting an example which has been extensively followed; how thoughtlessly let him decide who deprecates the state of feeling and neglect of the sacraments it has contributed to produce.

Thus it would appear that no mode of worship had hitherto become sufficiently established to affect the architecture. Indeed churches were so much more numerous both in England and Scotland than revenues for incumbents, that to build more would have been an absurd waste of money. It was much if a small portion of the old buildings could be kept in tolerable repair, the lead and bells having been generally plundered. The puritan taste, therefore, was never able to develop itself in England; but crossing the Atlantic, formed an original and characteristic school.

In America the early meeting-houses were scarcely distinguished from large barns with gable ends, except by their innumerable windows, and by porches carried up to the eaves, containing staircases, and giving access to the galleries. Occasionally a sort of canopy, raised on six or eight legs, and containing a bell, was placed above one of the gables. Within the ecclesiastical division of nave and aisles was set aside, each passage taking its own course between the seats. Galleries lined both the shorter and one of the longer walls, supported by columns of an unknown order; the communion table stood near the pulpit; "the ceiling is plastered, but huge rafters, which project from the walls about six feet below the eaves, and help to support the roof, are not concealed.—On the fourth side, and directly opposite the middle of the long gallery, stands the pulpit, upon which the whole magnificence of architecture that the age could boast of was lavished. The fluted pilasters with their wondrous capitals, the heavy balustrade of the staircase, the graceful elevation of the desk, the superb bow window, in whose presence the other lesser lights seem to withdraw and hide their diminished forms, and more than all, the majestic sounding board, heavy with mouldings, and rising in the centre into a boss most marvellously sculptured;—all these formed an assemblage of magnificent objects which seemed to mock at the puritanical simplicity of the remaining parts of the edifice. If the ambition of the builders was lofty enough for a steeple, one of the gable porches was made to rise considerably above the ridge pole; upon this was erected the belfry, a structure which strongly resembles the top of an urn; from the belfry a slender spire shoots up, terminated by a gilt vane. There was, however, another form of steepled meeting-house, which, we believe, is of earlier date than the one described. This sort of edifice, of which very few now remain, is square. The four sides of the roof meet in a point over the centre of the building, and from this point springs the steeple, consisting of a belfry and spire. We must not forget one remarkable contrivance in our early churches, the arrangement of the pew seats. These were made with hinges, so that in prayer time they might be raised up and allow the occupants to lean against the back of the pew. At the close of the prayer they were slammed down with a noise like the broadside of a frigate."[§]

It is curious to find monkish miseries in American conventicles; but such plagiarisms occur in works of all sorts. It is pleasant to add, that the Americans are improving in their notions on these subjects. There is a steeple at Boston upwards of two hundred feet high, and the pulpit has generally receded to the end of the church. Still, however, it retains much of its ancient splendour; and having thus accommodated the preacher, the hearer next thinks of himself. Many of the pews are lined with velvet. Interiors and pulpits closely resembling the early American are not uncommon in Scotland. Instances may occur in England too; but the writer apprehends that deserted chapels were at the time so numerous, that in neither portion of our island will be found any complete meeting-house exhibiting in its purity the architecture of the rebellion.

The temper of England at the restoration was more favourable to the production of a school of architecture suited to the necessities of the church and justly expressive of its purpose. To encourage this hope, a contemporary of Charles II. would have observed no deficiency of ecclesiastical learning in the divines, and genius of the highest order in an architect; the usages of the church quite unsettled, and above all a cathedral, and most of the metropolitan churches, reduced by the fire of London to a heap of ruins. Ages may pass away without presenting such another opportunity for producing a model combining all that antiquity sanctions and protestantism requires.

Sir Christopher Wren was elected to restore the fallen altars; he deeply felt the responsibility of his position, and saw that a protestant church could not consistently be the repetition of a popish abbey. To make provision for remembering and restoring what was wrong at the very outset, is no laudable way of commemorating the past. Long transcripts, deep recesses in the aisles, unnecessary screens where the whole building was to be filled with one congregation, he regarded as objectionable, and referring to St. James's, Piccadilly, he says:—

"Churches must be large, but still in our reformed religion it should seem vain to make a parish church larger than that all who are present can both hear and see. The Romanists indeed may build larger churches; it is enough if they hear the murmurs of the mass, and see the elevation of the host; but ours are to be fitted for auditors. I can hardly think it practicable to make a single room so capacious, with pews and galleries, as to hold above two thousand persons, and all to hear the service and see the preacher. I endeavoured to effect this in St. James's, Westminster, which I presume is the most capacious with these qualifications that hath yet been built. . . . In this church I mention, though very broad, and the nave arched up, yet, as there are no walls of a second order, nor lanterns, nor buttresses, but the whole roof rests upon

the pillars, as do also the galleries, I think it may be found beautiful and convenient, and as such, the cheapest form of any I could invent."[¶]

He did not, however, confine himself to any one form; the Greek cross and Roman atrium are exemplified in his works, with many beautiful adaptations, as well as the Basilica.

Had Wren been left to the unbiased exercise of his taste and judgment, there would have been no pews in his churches to take up the room of parishioners. He remonstrated against these unhappy contrivances, but selfishness and pride prevailed against him, and he succumbed to that interference which has injured the fame of most of his successors.† At no time did he feel submission more painful than when he was engaged upon St. Paul's. The model of that work as he designed it is still in existence, although grievously dilapidated from neglect and wantonness, and a splendid conception it is. A series of rotundas, three smaller, and one large, combine in a vast nave. On entering at either transept door, the extremity of the choir is visible; and that system of successive developments so repugnant to Roman, so congenial with Gothic architecture, is set aside for one burst of greatness. But this work of unrivalled learning and imagination was elaborated in vain. The portico of a single order was supplanted by the present frontispiece, because, being confined to the Portland oolite quarries, he could procure no blocks of sufficient size for colossal columns. Theaisles are said to have been added for a still more painful reason at the Duke of York's suggestion; Sir Christopher's design offered no opportunities for those lateral chapels which he hoped to introduce on the restoration of popery, and therefore it was abandoned.—This alteration mortified the great artist that his passions found relief in a flood of tears.

Entertaining sentiments as to just on the subject of protestant religious edifices, and versed as he evidently was in architectural acoustics, it is perhaps to be wondered at that Wren did not make a rotunda more prominently the type of his numerous churches. It would appear that the human voice is only exerted to its greatest advantage at a certain ascertained distance from the centre of a circle. It seems also very probable that no contrivances for reflecting sound are of any great value, and although in some buildings the echo is so quick as to enter the ear together with the original utterance, yet the voice is more distinctly heard where there is none at all. That these effects are best produced in a rotunda with slightly domical roofs the opinion of Sanders, confirmed by Wyatt, or constructed so as for the floor and roof to form a parabola in the section, according to Dr. Reed. The pulpit, desk and altar might occupy places equi-distant from the centre; ventilation without draughts might be effected through the lantern;‡ and, if the sanction of antiquity be anything, the first building erected at Rome for Christian purposes was a rotunda—the noblest monument of pagan Rome, consecrated as a church, is a rotunda—the holy sepulchre is a rotunda—St. Stefano's on the Cælian hill is of the same description, and in some respect an excellent model, especially as to the position of the altar.

Sir Christopher left aschool behind him which, although it never attained the master's excellence, followed honourably in his footsteps. His scholars had not his varied learning, nor his quick sense of propriety; but they shewed themselves neither destitute of resources nor invention. As one evidence of this among many, it may be observed that the steeples of Wren always stand upon a base of their own, and by their skillful combinations, make the observer forget that their beauty is extorted from forms reluctant to pyramidize. Of all his pupils, Hawksmore alone ventured to place a tower in the same position, and he hid little reason to applaud himself on its design.§ Gibbs, on the contrary, whose admirable spire at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, almost equalled the happiest inventions of his master, stuck it on the top of a Roman portico, as if bent on destroying the effect of both.

[To be concluded next week.]

AN APOLOGY FOR THE DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION:

CHAPTER VI. EPISCOPACY.

This system unassailable even if the evidence of Divine institution should fail.—Antecedent objections to it considered.—Uncharitableness—Exclusiveness—Popishness—Judaism—Matt. xxiii.; Mark x.; Luke xxii.—Protestant Reformers—Historical Evidence—Corruption of the Channel—Non-importance.

Since then, not only do all the proofs, whether Scriptural or ecclesiastical, adduced in behalf of the original Apostolical constitution of the Church for which the Presbyterians contend, fail to support it; but that very constitution, if admitted, proves indisputably the untenableness of the Presbyterians' position, and the invalidity of their orders; I think we may safely, without fear of being charged with a desire to avoid full discussion, proceed to consider whether more satisfactory and consistent testimony, both from Scripture and from antiquity, can be adduced in behalf of the claim of some other scheme to a Divine origin. Let us examine, then, the grounds on which Episcopacy lays claim to a Divine origin.

But, as I concluded the examination of Presbyterianism by showing that, even if their scheme of Apostolical constitution for the government of the Church were freely admitted, it would utterly fail of vindicating their course, and would prove the first ordainers of their ministers to have been incompetent to discharge such an office; so I will commence the Episcopalian section by showing, that its utter failure to make good its claim to a Divine origin will not avail to clear the Presbyterians of guilt. For whenever and whencesoever the order and authority of Bishops, as single superintenders over other orders of ministers, and over the whole Church within their respective districts, took its rise, yet this is admitted by the Presbyterians themselves, that wherever such an order exists, ought to be respected and obeyed, unless it exceeds its power. Mr. Powell, the latest writer on

* Parentalia.

† Pews appear to have existed in England anterior to the Reformation. Sir T. More was accustomed to sit in the aisles as a protest against them. The old churches, however, seem to have been very partially tainted with these practical corruptions; but after the Restoration, persons of quality frequented the churches so entirely as resorts of fashion that they became indispensable. In the drama of that odious age it is no uncommon thing to find the most infamous characters moot the merits of a sermon in the midst of an intrigue. It is rather curious that both Romanists and every other class of English dissenters, who can discern so many evils in the establishment, have all adopted this crying sin.

‡ See report of Evidence on Warming, Ventilating, &c. the House of Commons. Sanders considered that the distance between speaker and hearer should never exceed 70 feet. Sir C. Wren allots to the theatre in the Ducal Palace at Parma, 130 feet by 102. Sanders and Wyatt conceive that their experiments prove a speaker to be heard best when standing 17 feet from the centre of the circle he addresses.
§ St. George's, Bloomsbury.

their side, speaking of a passage of St. Ignatius, says that it "signifies that where a superintendent had been appointed for the sake of order, that order ought to be kept;" and then adds, "Very right; so say all Churches where a superintendency has been established, though making no pretensions to Divine right for it." (Powell on Apostolical Succession, p. 51.) Again; he says, "It is a plain Scriptural principle that ministers are to govern the people: that they are to govern according to the letter and spirit of their commission; and that whilst they so govern, the people are bound by the authority of the word of God to submit to their government, and to honor them as those who watch for their souls; but when ministers violate the law of their commission, their authority so far ceases, and the people are, in that proportion, free from obligation to obey them." Ibid. p. 89.

Calvin, one of the first leaders of this scheme, had said long before, that those persons were worthy of anathema, who would not submit to truly Christian Bishops, if such could be had. (Tract. de Reform. Eccles.) And, ages before him, the second General Council, that of Constantinople, [which is one of the four to which the English statutes, (1 Eliz. c. 1, § 36,) since the Reformation appeal, as the English Canons did before, (Canons of Ælfric,) as the test, together with the Scriptures, for determining heresy,] declared those persons to be heretics who, however sound their profession of faith may be, made separations and gathered congregations contrary to our Canonical Bishops. (Canon vi.) Whether, therefore, the origin of Episcopacy be Divine or human, yet this is clear from the above; namely, that seeing the British Churches were and are actually governed by Bishops, the Presbyterians can no otherwise avoid the condemnation of heresy denounced by the Council of Constantinople, and acknowledged and ratified by the English Parliament, nor the sentence of anathema awarded by Calvin, nor the testimony of Mr. Powell of open violation of the written Law of God, against those who break that established order, than by proving that the British Bishops, either are not truly Christian Bishops, or have violated the law of their commission; a totally different question from that under consideration. But though it thus appears of what comparatively little importance it is as regards the justification of the Presbyterians, whether the claim of Episcopacy to a divine origin can be established or not, still I believe the proof of it to be as such to carry conviction to every mind open to embrace the truth, as strong and full, I verily believe, as can be advanced in behalf of any other religious truth which Christians receive; sufficient for all, in short, who are content to "walk by faith and not by sight."

But before proceeding to the proofs, I will endeavor to remove certain popular objections, irrespective of Scriptural or ecclesiastical testimony, which not only avail to prejudice the question, and to prevent men from making an impartial examination of the grounds on which it rests, but also have a still more fatal effect, in that they incline men, if perchance they do enter into the examination, to do violence to the conviction of their own minds, and to set aside the impression conveyed by the testimony, under the idea that there must be something essentially wrong in the Episcopal scheme itself. § 1. Objection 1. The Episcopal scheme is uncharitable, for it condemns all others.

Answer. As charity aims, or should aim, at the welfare of mankind, and as the welfare of men is inseparably involved in their reception of and adherence to the truth, it follows that that which is most true must be most charitable. The only question, then, is, whether the Episcopal scheme is true, if, so, charity requires that we should teach it, and forbid our keeping it back.

§ 2. Objection II. But it is exclusive, therefore it must be untrue.

Answer 1. As truth is one and not manifold, the exclusiveness of the scheme is, at first sight, an argument in favor of its being true.

Answer 2. As the Christian religion, of which Episcopacy professes to be a tenet, is itself exclusive, "I am God and there is none else;" "no man cometh unto the Father but by me;" "neither is his salvation in any other;" "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved;"—the exclusiveness of Episcopacy makes in favor of its being a genuine Christian doctrine; and as there is to Christians not only "one (only) Lord, and one (only) God," but also "one (only) Faith, and one (only) Baptism," the exclusiveness of that which professes to be an article of this one Faith, and to be the authority for that one Baptism, affords a prima facie probability of its being a genuine article of that one faith, and the true authority for that one Baptism.

It is, I believe, chiefly, if not wholly, on account of the exclusiveness of the doctrine, that we who maintain it are exposed to hatred and reviling; and if we may judge from the language of our revilers, shall have to endure persecution, if it shall be in their power to inflict it. If we would be content to teach Episcopacy as one among many schemes equally true or equally doubtful, it should seem, from their latest writings, that we should not be disturbed; but because we teach it, as the Scriptures and the Church have delivered it to us, exclusively, therefore the work hath us. Just so, if the early Christians could have been content to profess their religion, as one of the six hundred tolerated by heathen Rome, and had been liberal enough, according to the modern usage of the term, to regard all religion as pretty much alike, they would have had no need to endure the cross, the stake, or the teeth of wild beasts; but because they taught their religion as the Scriptures and the Church had delivered it to them, exclusively, therefore the world hated them.

While, therefore, the charge of exclusiveness is an argument in our favor against whom it is brought, seeing that we bear it in common with the primitive martyrs; it is an argument against those who bring it, seeing that they do so, in common with the very heathen.

Objection 3. But you hold it in common with the Papists: therefore it must be Popish and unchristian.

Answer 1. This is an old device of the Papist, to weaken the hands of the defenders of the Church of England, the great bulwark of Protestantism, by contriving to raise up imputations of Popery against them, that by thus confounding in men's minds the distinction between Catholic and Roman Catholic, they may beguile them to the latter, under pretence of the former; or may lead them through aversion to the latter, to cast off some portions of the former, and so render themselves open to reproof; or, at any rate, may weaken and divide the Catholic opposers of Popery, by infusing among them doubts, and suspicions, and jealousies. One main instrument made use of by the Papists in former days for this purpose, was the dissenting pulpits. In the sixteenth century, one Cummin, a friar, contrived to be taken into the Puritans' pulpits, where, as he stated at the council, "I preached against set forms of prayer, and I called English prayers English mass, and have persuaded several to pray spiritually and extempore; and this hath so taken with the people, that the Church of England is become as odious to that sort of people whom I instructed, as the mass is to the Church of England, and this will be a stumbling block to that Church as long as it is a Church." For this the Pope commended him, and gave him a reward of 2000 ducats for his good service. Are there not many at the present day, of whom, if they were to apply to the Pope for a reward on the same score, all the world could witness that they have well deserved it at his hands?

Surely our opponents have some reason to feel misgiving,

when they find themselves thus treading in the footsteps of the heathen revilers of Christianity, and of the Popish hiring underminers of the bulwark of Protestantism.

Answer 2. The question is not, whether the doctrine be held by Papists, but whether it be scriptural. If it be scriptural, of which I hope to afford reasonable proof, then either we must be content to hold it, as we do many other things, e.g., the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, in common with the Papists, or we must be content to acknowledge the Popish religion to be, in this respect, more scriptural than our own. This, I, for one, am not prepared to do; and therefore, believing the doctrine of the Apostolical succession to be catholic and scriptural, will never so far betray the cause of truth, as to consent to surrender it to the sole use of the erroneous Papists.

Objection 4. But it is not merely Popish, it is Judaical; and, therefore, must be unchristian.

Answer. As our Lord instituted the Sacrament of Holy Baptism in a Jewish rite, namely, in the washing wherewith the Jews admitted proselytes; and instituted the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, or Lord's Supper, in a Jewish rite, namely, in the Mincha, or bread and drink offering; in each case exalting a carnal ordinance into a means of spiritual gift or grace: it is rather an argument in favor of our doctrine than otherwise, that it finds for the Christian ministry, the dispensers of these Sacraments, a prototype in the Jewish dispensation, like that which we find for the Sacrament themselves. Accordingly, St. Clement of Rome, and St. Jerome, (whom especially I cite, because especially appealed to by our opponents,) both concur in speaking of the orders of Christian ministry under the very terms (High Priest, Priests, and Levites) which obtained under the Mosaic dispensation. And with this agree the sayings of the Apostles.—"Ye are a royal Priesthood," said St. Peter, addressing the Christian Churches in the very language which Moses had used toward the Israelites. Compare 1 Pet. ii. 9, with Exod. xix. 6. "Christ hath made" (Rev. i. 6.) "The Priesthood is changed," said St. Paul, "not destroyed." (Heb. vii. 12.) But if there be a Priesthood upon earth, as all these bear witness that there is, and as the Prophets had foretold there should be, in the Christian Church, (Isaiah lx. 17; lxi. 6; lxvi. 21. Mal. i. 11.) then what is there to hinder distinction of orders in the Priesthood?

§ 5. Objection 5. But are not these sayings of our Lord, "Be ye not called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren; and call no man your father upon earth, for one is your father which is in Heaven. Neither be ye called Masters, for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant." (Matt. xxiii. 8—11.) "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." (Mark x. 42—45. See also Matt. xx. 25—28. Luke xxii. 25—27.) Are not these sayings directly subversive of all claims on the part of the Christian ministry, to authority and degree?

Answer 1. The best comment on the texts will be furnished by the lives of those to whom they were addressed, even the Apostles of Christ. If we find them exercising the authority of fathers and rulers over the Christian flock, as the Epistles of St. John, St. Peter, and St. Jude, (who were of those immediately addressed,) and the Epistles of St. Paul, (who was afterwards admitted to the same office,) distinctly show, then, one of two things must follow, namely, either that all these were Judaizers and Anti-Christians; which terms the irreverence of the present age has not, as yet, I think, applied to the Apostles themselves, though it has freely done so to their companions and commended disciples, St. Clement and Ignatius; or else, that the texts do not really furnish the objection supposed by those who urge them: which will, probably, be the more readily admitted, when it is considered, that immediately after uttering these words of reproof to the Apostles, our Lord added, "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me." (Luke xxiii. 39.)

Answer 2. The very words of the texts refute the objections which our opponents would ground upon them; for they unite in showing that the only way authorized by Christ to dignity and exaltation in His Church, is by discharging the offices of the ministry, and thus serving the Christian people: "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." Nor is it possible to see how men can be more truly the servants of others, than the Christian ministers are of the people committed to their charge; seeing that they are bound to wait upon them, and minister to their wants, whether they be high or low, rich or poor; not only when they assemble as guests in the courts of their Master's house, but also at their own houses. They are the servants of those with whom the greater part of our revilers would think it scorn to come in contact. The poorest beggars, the foulest sinners, in the most noisome dwellings, and under the most loathsome diseases, may command the attendance of the ministers of the Church, who are under a vow to afford it; and count it a privilege and a happiness to do so, if they may have hope to save a soul from death. But they who are thus ordained to minister to the wants of Christ's household, are said by him to be rulers over it. "Who then is that faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season?" (Matt. xxiv. 45. Luke xii. 42.)

[The remainder of this chapter in our next.]

LAST DAYS OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

When I came to court I found the Queen ill-disposed, and she kept her inner lodgings; yet she hearing of my arrival sent for me. I found her in one of her withdrawing chambers, sitting low upon her cushions. She called me to her, I kissed her hand, and told her it was my chiefest happiness to see her in safety and in health, which I wished might long continue. She took me by the hand, and wrung it hard, and said, "No, Robin I am not well," and then discoursed with me of her indisposition, and that her heart had been sad and heavy for ten or twelve days, and in her discourse she fetched not so few as forty or fifty great sighs. I was grieved at the first to see her in this plight; for in all my lifetime before I never knew her fetch a sigh, but when the Queen of Scots was beheaded. Then upon my knowledge she shed many tears and sighs, manifesting her innocence that she never gave consent to the death of that Queen.

I used the best words I could to persuade her from this melancholy humour; but I found by her it was too deep rooted in her heart, and hardly to be removed. This was upon a Saturday night, and she gave command that the great closet should be prepared for her to go to chapel the next morning. The next day, all things being in readiness, she long expected her coming. After eleven o'clock, one of the grooms of the chambers came out, and bade make ready for her the private closet, she would not go to the great. There she stayed long for her coming, but at the last she had cushions laid for her in the privy chamber hard by the closet door, and there she heard service.

From that day forwards she grew worse and worse. She remained upon her cushions four days and nights at the least. All

* From the *British Magazine*.

† Wheatley on Common Prayer, in notes to Dr. Hook's Call to Union.

‡ Hooper's Fourth Sermon on Jonah.

§ Madox Vindication, &c., 155.

* North American Review in *Burdwell's Temple*, p. 166.