

The Church.

COBOURG, CANADA, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1843.

VOLUME VII.—No. 15.]

[WHOLE NUMBER, CCCXXVII.]

Poetry.

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS.

As sung at St. Paul's, after the Evening Service on the Feast of St. Michael and All Angels, 1843—during the closing session of the late Convention.

I.
Solely, at even-tilde,
Our vesper hymn arose,
As round the altar, side by side,
We stood at twilight's close:—
While, all unheeded these sacred notes within,
Roll'd round the temple walls the world's unshallow'd din.

II.
Once more, while round us now,
The night's deep shadows fall,
Ere parting pray'r we meek, forgiving vow,
Shall close our festival,
The fervent strain of deep, united praise,
Here, round thine altar, Lord!—thy servants' faint would raise.

III.
Praise—for the gift of peace,
Which, like the dew from heav'n,
To our weak hearts for love's increase,
Thy Spirit here has given;
For faith made strong—for hope renew'd,
And patient zeal for truth with charity enud.

IV.
Lord of the Church!—thy name
In grateful hymn we laud;
Send down thy Spirit's quick'ning flame
Through all our hearts above;
Till every heart among her children dear,
Glow with the holy fire which thou hast kindled here.

V.
In words which angels sang,
When 'neath the list'ning sky,
Their sweet, triumphant anthem rang,
Answer'd by hosts on high,
We sing thy glory, and thy name implore
On earth, as now in heaven, unbroken evermore.

VI.
GLORY TO GOD ON HIGH,
What noble hymn could rise,
From hearts made one by charity,
By faith, whose longing eyes
Looks for the promise, to Christ's body giv'n,
To be with her on earth, e'en as he is in heav'n?

VII.
GLORY TO GOD ON HIGH:—
ON EARTH GOD WILL AND PEACE;
Deem not that we it reach the sky,
The glorious sound shall cease;
The Church triumphant all the song hath heard,
And angels join with saints in blest, responsive word.

VIII.
The brotherhood of priests
Begin the thrilling strain:—
Its burden,—voice by voice increas'd,—
Through many a soft refrain,
Commencing in one fervent tide of song,
Swells through the sacred dome from all the adoring throng.

IX.
In words, by angels sung,
Echo'd by faithful souls
From age to age—on every tongue
The high thanksgiving rolls,
And saints in rest, the great departed band,
In joint accord with us, around us seem to stand.

X.
The angels thou, are here,—
The compeers of that band
Whom Michael led, or such as lead
The voice of God's command,
Bright loyal spirits, that in order due
Their high behests fulfil, to all their duty true.

XI.
The strict-tow'd world without,
Our mutual anthem hearts:—
The faint soul forgets its doubt,
The faithless quell their fears;
Till on each ear the voice of holy prayer
Falls like an angel's tone, subduing strife and care.

XII.
As slowly, ray by ray,
From arch and altar-stone,
Th' extinguish'd lamp-light fades away,
And darkness reigns alone,
How sweet, how holy, seems the lingering spell
Which binds us to the home our spirits love so well.

XIII.
REDEEMER!—is there one
Who from thy courts can go,
Thankless that love, in trial won,
Thus on each soul a light be shown?
Forbid it, Lord!—in thine own grace impart,
To bind in links of gold firm soul and trusting heart.
—New York Churchman.

ORDINATION OF THE REV. ARTHUR CAREY,
—THE EPISCOPAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY.
(From Bishop Onderdonk's Address to the Convention of the Diocese of New York.)

It is well known to you, my brethren, that the ordination just mentioned has been a matter of very extraordinary publicity. The course which this has taken has had connections and bearings which have brought to view important principles whereon I deem it a duty to express to you, and place on record, deliberately formed and conscientious views and convictions. At the foundation of the whole lies the fact, that when in this ordination, the prescribed call was made on the people for the showing of any impediment or notable crime on account of which either of the persons presented should not be ordained, two presbyters of the diocese, avowedly acting in their capacity as such, read each a written form of objection and protest, charging one of the candidates with unsoundness in the faith. The charge thus preferred had been previously laid before me, fully investigated, and found to be not sustained. This was stated by me to the congregation as the reason why there was no just cause for the delay in ordaining an accused person provided for in the rubric. The solemn service proceeded accordingly, and all the persons presented were ordained. With a strengthened conviction of having acted justly and righteously in this matter, I deem it to be highly proper in itself, and peculiarly demanded by the trying circumstances in which the young brother concerned has been thrown, thus publicly to express my unshaken confidence in him, and to commend him to the confidence and affection of the Church.

As stated above, in this case, in the very extraordinary manner in which it has been treated, and from the extensive notoriety which has hence attached to it, has brought to view a variety of important principles which I deem it my duty to notice. In doing this I shall, for obvious reasons, treat them as much as may be in the abstract.

The first point naturally presented to our notice, is the provision of the Ordinal under which this objection was made. What are its true meaning and legitimate operation?

It is confessedly a call upon the people. The clergy, either personally or by those who, in the due order of the Church, are their regularly constituted representatives, are reasonably supposed to have, in their respective dioceses, sufficient opportunities of becoming acquainted with the characters and qualifications of candidates for orders. Their position as watchmen and stewards of the Lord requires of them that they carefully keep themselves informed, as they may, who are candidates for orders, and what grounds of trust there are in their aptness and meetness for the ministry.—Certain of them are personally concerned in testing the sufficiency of those grounds by special examinations; and the publicity given to the admission of candidates ought to be considered by every conscientious clergyman as a call upon him to avail himself of all fitting opportunities of becoming acquainted with their characters and qualifications, and to assist the diocesan, in his peculiar weight of responsibility, by his information

in the premises as he may be able to impart. The bishop, therefore, may, by the time the day appointed for ordination arrives, be reasonably supposed to be in possession of whatever his clergy may have to impart respecting the fitness of those expected to be ordained.

In a measurable degree, similar remarks may apply to the laity. It is very gratifying and encouraging to see our laity, especially those of influence in the community, take an interest in the affairs of the Church—the interest, I mean, of uniformly devoted heart and affections, and of solicitude, prayers, and labors of love, growing out of their personal experience and manifestation of the sanctifying influences of that heavenly grace, of the divine imparting of which the Church is God's instrument and agent. I would distinguish this most emphatically from the cases often obtruding themselves, of an unchristian fondness for religious disputation, and a concern for the Church hardly distinguishable from mere indulgence, in another line than those which worldly mindedness usually supplies, of a litigious disposition, a love of opposition, and a desire for distinction in controversy and in troublesome agitation. From such concern in religion no good is to be argued except as it may lead better men to more watchfulness, care, and effort for the Church's well being. But when our pious and intelligent laity endeavor to keep themselves informed of the Church's concerns, the publicity necessarily given to the admission of candidates for orders, secures in a good degree their watchfulness and care also on this momentous subject, and their opportunity of aiding the proper authorities in attaining to an entirely correct knowledge of those who are in training for the ministry.

It is not to be expected, however, that the laity, or as the Church designates them, "the people," will generally be informed as to the admission, character, and progress of candidates for orders. It therefore seems to have been always a right and prudent custom for the Church to call upon them in some form or other, at the appointed time of ordination, to bear testimony against any one presented for orders before the holy ceremony proceeds. And there is a well known union of the authority of liturgical commentators in favor of interpreting this call upon the people as intended for them in contradistinction from the clergy. I can conceive of no case in which a clergyman can properly avail himself of it except, being present as one of the congregation, not in his clerical capacity, and therefore virtually one of the people, he perceives one presented for orders, in whom he knows of the existence of an impediment or notable crime for which he ought not to be ordained, of which he has not had a previous opportunity of apprising the bishop, and which he has no reason to suppose has been brought to the bishop's knowledge.

All laws are to be construed on the principles of sound common sense, and so as that the good obviously intended to be accomplished by them should neither be defeated nor marred by the understanding of them with which they are executed. The rubric following the call upon the people states the object of the call to be, that the person objected to shall be found clear of the crime charged upon him before he be ordained. If then this has previously been done—if the charge has already been laid before the bishop, and examined by him, and the party found clear of it—it is obviously a case not contemplated by the rubric. The object of the rubric has been gained. The party has been found clear of the charge. There is no law to meet the case, but the holy common law of order, reverence, and silence in public worship. The rising to bring a charge of which the accused has already been found clear, is a violation of this law unattended by any other. Else the solemnities of this peculiarly hallowed portion of our ritual would be in danger of perpetual interruption by the repetition of charges over and over again examined and proved to be unfounded.

My solemn and deliberate consideration of this case calls me to the duty also of viewing this portion of the ordinal in another aspect. The term *protest* has been much applied to the action contemplated by it. I have not been able to see the propriety of it. In this and the few similar passages in the liturgy, the Church seems to act upon the principle simply of aiding the constituted judge in arriving at a correct decision in the matter, not of bringing antagonistic influences to bear upon him, of placing him in an attitude of opposition, or of throwing virtual menaces and public accusation in his way. It would provide him with means for deciding aright, and leave the decision with him. Should this be offensive to the Church, her remedy is found, not in its irregular and hurried arrangement, not in public accusation so obviously subjected to all the malign influences of personal passion and ill-will, but in the regular and orderly subjecting of the offender to the responsibility duly and orderly provided. I object, therefore, to the propriety of action under provisions now before us being shaped or regarded as a protest.

But it may be asked, Will you take entirely from the clergy and people of the Church the privilege of protest when their rights are endangered, and inquiry bears away in the councils and acts of those in authority? There are—the history of man in every department of his social character evinces that there mournfully have been—extreme cases in which all the ordinary provisions of law are wickedly deprived of their influence for good, and individual and social rights demand the interposition of such law as the emergency renders imperative. Then even resistance, and forced changes in social relations, have been found unavoidable, and submitted to as lesser evils. There may be emergencies when people in reference to their pastors, and pastors and people in reference to their bishops, may have no alternative left, consistent with conscientious duty to the cause of God, but openly to protest against the measures of those to whose decisions ordinarily they are bound reverently to submit. It is hard, however, to conceive of this as justifiable save where the process of regular accountability has been found insufficient; and equally hard to view it in any other light than as an extreme measure involving the charge against the party whose acts have elicited the protest, of gross ignorance or palpable unfaithfulness and injustice.

I am also called, in the present connection, to say a word on the subject, much discussed of late, of the responsibility, in their official acts, of the bishops and clergy. It applies also to the laity in the various departments in which they are invested with prerogative and duty in ecclesiastical concerns. Responsibility is undoubtedly as much the law of God's house as it is of the various social and civil connections which He has established among men. On this, however, as on other deeply interesting points, it is of the greatest importance that we bear in mind an essential and fundamental difference between this house of God, His holy Church, and those unions among men which are of a merely secular and civil character. In these, the primary authority rests in a good degree with the individuals composing them, in their primary capacity. They have associated for their common benefit, and to secure that end have each surrendered a portion of original inherent right, and each is, by that right, a judge, with inherent prerogative, as such, to see that his privileges and interests are duly regarded in the operation of the compact, and has his share of the power which is lodged in the body, to dissolve, change, or remodel itself at pleasure.

These principles, with such modifications as are deemed fitting, are incorporated into the civil compact wherever it exists with any recognition of civil freedom. They include the doctrines that the power of the whole

is derived from each, and that each is responsible to the whole—doctrines, however, which every form of that compact, guarded with any security against anarchy, sees and practically admits the necessity of qualifying by sound and wholesome regulations.

The Church is a department of the social compact differing from those of a secular and civil character. It has not resulted from men's voluntarily seeking the good which it may impart, or yielding to the necessities which may have driven them into it, by the surrender by each, for the good of the whole, of immunities and prerogatives naturally his.

The foundation of the Church lies not in man's agreement, but in God's requirement. Nor does man's association in the Church relate to him as a being having rights to be secured or prerogatives to surrender, nor as one who has a high, honorable, and pure moral sense to bring to bear upon the happiness and welfare of the community to which he belongs. The Church is appointed for man as a being weighed down with frailty and corruption, and by his sinfulness shut out from the mercy and exposed to the just anger of his God. It is not a society formed by him for the purpose of concentrating and calling into exercise his powers of self-government, and of promoting his own and others' welfare and interests. As God's instrument and agent of mercy, it takes man as a frail, guilty, and helpless being, that he may be thus put in the divinely appointed way of grace and salvation through Jesus Christ. Its powers and prerogatives come directly from heaven. Its human agents, in the accomplishment of the holy and blessed ends of its institution, have their powers and prerogatives from God, and not from men. Indeed, as if to illustrate this holy and heavenly character of the Church, the appointment of such agents was not only independent of the Church, but anterior to its full Christian organization. The ministry was appointed to gather, organize, instruct, and guide the Church, not the Church established with power to employ the ministry. The primary powers of the Church, then, are not diffusive, but concentrated. They are not in the members, but in the head. They were committed by the Head to the ministry. In this, however, it is evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, and thence collecting from its practical development, the great principles designed to be incorporated into the full ecclesiastical organization, divine sanction is given to qualifications in administering the polity of the Church, which clearly recognize therein an efficient interest given to the subordinate pastoral associates of the chief ministers of Christ's flock, and to the members generally of that holy body. Whatever may be the modifications of this, it is of obvious propriety and importance that we bear in mind this evangelical view of the true theory of Christ's Church. A very valuable consequence of this may, by the divine blessing, be expected to be, my beloved brethren of the clergy and laity, the constant realizing by each of us, in his proper sphere, of the solemn truth that when we engage in the service of the Church of God, we are employed in an agency, not to carry out a human scheme of benevolence or usefulness, nor to promote an end deriving value from its popularity or acceptableness with men, not to devise and execute the most ingenious, improved, or ready modes of showing results; but an agency—with reverence and godly fear be it undertaken—in the accomplishment, by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, of the exceeding great and precious object whereby God, in the exercise of ineffable mercy, is in Christ Jesus, reconciling the world unto Him. Press we then ever to our hearts the obvious truth, that then only can we expect to be enlightened and efficient agents in this work, when our hearts are controlled, our characters formed, and our lives preserved, by that great principle of evangelical faith which only gives consistency, and in which only we can expect efficiency, in whatever we may do in the cause of the Church.

But my principal object in this course of remark, was to show its bearing on the question of our responsibility as ministers and members of the Church, in what we do simply as such. Is it to the public? I can see no principle on which this can be justly maintained. How is it possible for a body of men held together by no common principles of religion to judge of religious matters? Taking the gospel for our guide, we must see in the Church and the world essentially antagonistic bodies. The Church was formed, not to co-operate with the world, but to oppose it, to attack the wicked principles and practices which it is in bondage, and to come to no terms with it on any other principles than its entire surrender to its opposition to the pure and holy spirit of the gospel, and its submission to the rule which Christ through His Church would establish over it for its good. Alas! brethren, I need not ask you whether the world is now such as to afford any confidence of its judging aright in matters pertaining to the kingdom of God. No, surely; and let me affectionately say to both the clergy and laity, ever conscientiously acting upon the principle myself, that for what we do in our several departments of service to the Church, we owe no responsibility to the world; in other words, to the public. From the world we have derived no power. We hold no commission from it. Let us ever, by the grace of God, be careful that in our intercourse with it, we adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things; and then go forward in our Master's work, indifferent, save for its own sake, whether the world is pleased or offended, and indeed looking for the ill-will and opposition from it which that Master and His divine word have prepared us to expect.

In natural connexion with this point, a solemn sense of duty bids me to exhort my diocese, through this its representative body, always to frown upon the bringing of controversies or differences on sacred subjects before the world, through mediums and in ways, whose principal operation may be expected to involve their exposure to the scoffs and jests of unenlightened hearts, the insolence of the ignorant, and the blasphemies and impieties of the profane. Good men, as did apostles, may differ, and differ seriously and even warmly; but surely they should be equally jealous of unnecessarily exposing the things of God to that carnal mind which is radically incapable of spiritual discernment.

But although no responsibility is due from us to the world, or the public, yet, is it not due to the Church as a body? The view above given of the great principles on which it pleased our Divine Lord to organize His Church, seems clearly to indicate that responsibility therein, in its progress to ultimate right of decision, unlike that in human organizations, is towards concentration, and not diffusion. Power and prerogative in the Church, came from Christ to the first order in the ministry, and thence to the lower orders, and to the brethren or laity of the Church. As the last gave not power or prerogative, it is difficult to conceive how they can demand responsibility to them as of right. From the earliest times, however, the apostles and elders, and their successors, have very rightly and wisely taken counsel of the brethren in the exercise of their prerogative; and this principle has equally wisely and rightly, in various parts and periods of the Church, led to national and diocesan organizations, which have given distinctive rights and prerogatives to all orders of men in the Church, bishops, clergy, and laity. And I gladly avail myself of this opportunity of repeating the sentiment often expressed, of my conviction, that the particular organization of our branch of the Church, is in admirable adaptation to its peculiar state and position, and well calculated,

if thoroughly understood, and properly carried out, to promote order, harmony, and security, and to answer the great spiritual ends for which the Church was established. But I think a careful study of what may be called the genius of that organization, will perceive that the responsibility which it recognizes or provides for, is eminently of the above mentioned concentrative, and not of a diffusive character.

There is nothing which runs at all counter to the great Scripture principle, that the ministers of Christ are responsible to Him through those whom He has invested with authority over them, and these again to their own order in the Church, and both under such regulations, qualifications, and checks, as in sound Christian judgment may, from time to time, be duly and orderly appointed. A practical illustration of the fitness of this, is afforded by the manifold evils attendant on public appeals, especially in matters in which the mass of the members of the Church themselves can hardly be deemed competent to judge. And it should be remembered that a public appeal to the Church, must almost necessarily involve the evils of one to the world.

I should, however, be much misunderstood, if deemed to deny that there may be circumstances demanding a departure from this principle. I refer only to the soundest and safest general rule, from which a regard for good order would seem to require that there be no departure, save where there is the strongest ground for the conviction, that a great evil had better be encountered, than a greater.

I am very certain, my brethren, that I need not remind you of the tenaciousness with which I have uniformly endeavored to adhere to those great Catholic principles, which, revealed in the gospel, have ever been held valuable and important, as incorporated into the evangelical system, by all pure branches of the Church of Christ; nor of the readiness with which I have always thought it incumbent on the Christian minister to defend them; nor of the little regard which I have deemed due to any offence which might thus be given, or loss of popularity that might thus be encountered. Whether these principles have had, levelled against them the fulminations of papal tyranny and usurpation, or those of Protestant zeal for erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's word, my devotion to them has strengthened with years, reflection, and experience, and with it my determination, God being my helper, to continue faithful and consistent in that devotion.

But, as you well know, I have never felt it a duty to require those over whom I have influence or authority, to view all these points exactly as I do.—Unity in necessary things is perfectly consistent with tolerance and liberty in others, and certainly with the fullest influence in all things of that indispensable ingredient in an evangelical character, the charity which hopeth all things, suffereth long, and is kind.—Nothing is more evident in the history of the Reformed Catholic Church in England and in this country, than that a wide latitude of opinion among its bishops and clergy on points not involving essentials of the Catholic faith, is entirely consistent with unity in that faith.—Its liturgies and articles have ever been viewed in different lights by men equally conscientiously attached to them, and maintaining with each other both personal and official communion characterized by the truest Christian courtesy and harmony. Tendencies towards extremes in what may be denominated the Catholic, the Calvinistic, and the Arminian views of our standards, have always existed without rending our unity or disturbing our harmony. On this principle—strong as my own preferences in the matter, and fearlessly and honestly as I have endeavored, on all proper occasions, to advance and defend them—I have ever endeavored to act. I have not shrunk from laying fairly before the hundreds of young men who, in a greater or less degree, have pursued their theological studies under my direction, fully and fairly what I believed to be not only the essential principles of the Christian faith, but also all their various bearings, connections, and results, in the great Catholic system which I believed to have been handed down from the days of inspiration. Never, however, have I—and God forbid that I should ever depart from the principle!—felt myself at liberty, nor ever have I had the inclination, to erect my views on these latter points into stern requisitions, without compliance with which I should frustrate the evidently honest, disinterested, and pious desire of well qualified young men to be received into the ministry. Having duly tested their moral, spiritual, and intellectual fitness, and satisfied of their soundness in the essentials of the faith, I have gladly ordained them, most cordially bid them God speed, and done what I could to promote their happiness, interests, and usefulness.

All this I have thought, and doubt not that I shall ever think, the necessary result of that latitude of opinions and views which the Catholic Church has ever allowed to individual mind, and the encroachment on which, by the despotic bigotry of Papal anathemas, and the intolerant spirit of Protestant sectarianism, has led to some of the sorest evils which have ever befallen the Christian world.

And on the same principle of conservatism, unity, and Christian charity, I have freely and cordially received clergy on the dismissal of brethren in the Episcopacy, who I knew differed widely from me on points which I deemed by no means unimportant.—This accustomed token of unity of spirit and the bond of peace will never cease to bless our Church as long as the ancient and well-tried principles of Catholic union prevail, the dictates of Christian courtesy are respected, and the pure and holy affections of the gospel are cherished.

In pursuance of my usual plan of pausing in my details of official acts for the purpose of expressing such views and giving such counsels as seemed to be called for by parts or circumstances related, I have now digressed much more at large than is customary. This has arisen from a solemn conviction of duty to the beloved clergy and people of my charge; and affectionately asking the union of their prayers with mine, that a blessing from on high may attend this humble effort to discharge the sacred requirements of office, I proceed in my narrative.

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

(From the Episcopal Recorder.)

The necessity of this, in order to an adequate exercise of the ministry of the Gospel, is in actual practice universally allowed. No denomination of Christians, adopt the ordination of ministers by the imposition of the hands of laymen. We are aware that the Congregationalists claim this as a just and true principle. We know also that it has been a late subject of discussion among the Presbyterians, whether laymen shall unite in the imposition of hands upon a minister. But the former class in practice, actually renounce this abstract claim, by confining the right to ordain, to those who have been previously ordained themselves. And if among the latter class, their actual principles of church organization, are after so long a time, still unsettled, as far as we know, they never permit laymen to engage in the act of ministerial ordination. In each of these classes, as in all others, the practical, manifest, working principle, is that of succession. C. ordains D, and is considered as empowered to do so, because he was ordained by B, who also received his power from A. To the people it seems to be a true succession from original authority somewhere. They can trace it back only for a very short course. Then it is lost to their view, in indistinctness and igno-

rance. But they still suppose it is a just succession, and in the chosen imagination that all things have been right in its course, they acquiesce in the authority of the ministry under which they are placed, and contentedly receive the professed instructions and seals of divine truth from them. The universal practical feeling is, that there has been a proper and unbroken succession from an original authoritative source, and in this confidence the majority of the people are content. We suppose few intelligent Christians in this country would profess a right in themselves to originate a ministry. Few would believe that Major B., and Captain C., and Dr. E., and Squire F., however excellent and good men in themselves, are empowered to set on foot a new church, and ordain one of their number as a minister of the gospel, and that to his instructions and authority hereafter, all the rest are necessarily to submit, as the divinely appointed authority of the ministry of the Church of Christ. The fact which accounts among intelligent laymen for their satisfaction in a ministry which has no actual succession of authority from an original divine source, is, that they really never look into the subject at all. The ministry which they receive, has been existing in regular succession beyond their memory, and they therefore hastily and unconsciously suppose, it must have existed in regular succession from the beginning; like the little bird who hides her head beneath the leaf, and because she sees not, imagines herself to be completely protected. It is the necessary claim of ministers that they have derived their authority in succession from the Saviour through his apostles, unless they give the necessary evidence, that they have received it directly from his immediate personal command, as the apostles themselves did. And it is the universally acquiescing feeling of laymen, that they are enjoying the privileges of the gospel, under a ministry thus regularly constituted by an unbroken apostolic succession. The only real question at issue becomes, therefore, a mere question of fact, where is there such a succession? And through what line of persons may it be traced? Under this question, we are compelled to say, it cannot be traced, and is not traceable, in any Presbyterian or Congregational line, so far as any evidence has yet been brought out.—Nay, the most intelligent and best informed writers among both these classes of Christians, when driven to this effort, are compelled to relinquish the claim. Like the story of the men who, attempting to reach something in a well, agreed that one should hang upon the branches of a tree, and another upon his feet, and so down, till the lowest one should pick up the object of desire. But when the chain was completed, the topmost man, weary of the load, cried out, "hold on there below, while I spit upon my hands," and let go his hold for this purpose of refreshment. Thus their chain falls entirely in the very point where it is of the most importance. For if they trace it for three centuries, possibly to the Reformation, the question is just as practical, and just as important, where did Calvin or Knox get their power to ordain? as it is in reference to any living minister who professes to have derived a similar authority from them or men like them.—Richard Hooker asked near three hundred years ago, in this very discussion, for some practical, clear, instance, of a church anywhere in the world, from the time of the apostles, that had not "the regiment of Bishops." But all the excited enquiry, and real learning of his day, could not furnish it. The instance has never been furnished since. Instead of practically settling the difficulty by actual proof, the false demand has been covered with clouds of very unreasonable abuse and reproach. But the demand is still of undeniable consequence in this discussion. No lapse of time can make that right which was originally wrong, nor give authority where originally there was none. In civil kingdoms, the fact of usurpation is forgotten in a few regular generations of the usurper's family upon the throne; and time authorizes the government which had no authority at first.—This cannot be the fact in the spiritual kingdom of the Church of Christ. There ages will not legalize, what was originally illegal. But Hooker's question is still unanswered. Dr. Neander, who we believe is now considered, ample and very respectable authority on the side opposed to Episcopacy, does not pretend to cloud the fact, that the Church was every where Episcopacy from the time of Ignatius and Polycarp in the second century; that the ministry has had an Episcopacy Succession from that time; that the first originators of Presbyterian ordination, Novatus, Felicissimus and Novatian in Africa, and in Rome, in the third century, were schismatics, and were considered so, and as such came to a speedy end; they were heretics because they did not deny, or corrupt the faith of the Church, but schismatics, because they separated from its government and ministry. He gives no single fact in his history, which offers the least countenance to the idea of presbyterian succession; but he expressly stated that the only attempts to establish one soon altogether failed. But though all the facts of his own history are against him, he still hazards the conjecture, for he does not attempt to sustain it by a single word of proof, that the original Apostolic Church, was without episcopacy. In order to maintain this, he is compelled to take the absurd position, in the face of the whole New Testament, that it was without any constituted ministry.—And then, in one hundred years, without any record of the fact having been left, as he expressly acknowledges, the Church became first presbyterian, with a separate ministry, and then, episcopacy, with an unequal ministry,—either from the necessity of the condition of man, or from the ambition to rule, in the nature of man. We have never met with a work which left the argument for Diocesan Episcopacy more perfect than this history, one great purpose of which was to set it aside. Without any hesitation, we should leave the question to the common sense of mankind, whether it was more likely that Ignatius and Polycarp, and Clement, companions and pupils of the Apostles, revering their judgments and will, in every thing, and professing to have been appointed by them, wholly perverted the nature of the ministry which they had established, or maintained and carried out the same system? And whether, therefore, when they are conceded to have been bishops with a diocesan authority, it is more probable, or certain that this was, or was not, the arrangement of the ministry which they had received from the Apostles? We confess, my history has so confirmed in our view the truth of the declaration in the preface to our ordinal, "it is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scriptures, and ancient authors, that there have always been these three orders in the Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons." The conclusion to our own mind is most evident, that while Presbyterians really act upon the assumption of an apostolic succession in their ministry, and yet in their own histories are compelled, by the powerful demands of truth, to relinquish the claim altogether, we are left to look elsewhere, for the apostolic succession which we seek and desire. But in the line of Episcopacy, this succession is not only certain, from the acknowledgment that there has always been this order, alone exercising the power of ordination; and therefore the abstract certainty in every age, that such guardianship would secure a regular transmission of legal authority; but also from the facility with which this line is traced in its inverted course to the times of actual apostolic authority and presence. Let our readers simply refer to Chapin's view of the Primitive Church, a book which has been generally circulated, for abundant familiar evidence of this fact. The conclusions seem to us very clear.—

All Christian denominations around us practically concede the necessity of an apostolic succession for authority in the ministry. But all Christian denominations, excepting the Episcopal Church, fail entirely in establishing the fact of this apostolic succession, and are compelled, in their own case, ultimately to relinquish the claim. The Episcopal Church makes out its claim without the shadow of reasonable doubt, and in the clearest manner. If, therefore, this succession is necessary, an Episcopal ministry is equally necessary, to a proper administration of the Gospel. Others furnish the premises for us,—and our conclusions become inevitable.

ON TEETOTALISM.

(From the Leeds Intelligencer.)

It is somewhat novel to have a Roman Catholic Priest travelling through the country to preach to as many as he can assemble to hear; and to administer what is called a pledge to as many as are disposed to take it. The evil of drunkenness is admitted; but it is doubtful whether the fermentive liquor, which by an immoderate use causes the evil, should be absolutely proscribed—if whatever is abused should be absolutely proscribed, must not no longer be eaten, to avoid gluttony, and the patient must be killed to cure the disease. But to whom is the pledge given by the disciple of Father Mathew, is it given to God or man? If it be a sacred obligation and given to the Lord Almighty, has not the Christian already made a vow to renounce drunkenness and to renounce every temptation to sin? If it be a pledge given to man, by one man to his brother, or to his father (if he recognise Father Mathew as his father), what is the obligation, and what is the penalty for violating the obligation of such a pledge? Is this pledge of greater, of less, or of equal obligation as the baptismal vow? It does appear unaccountable that this Father Mathew should triumph in obtaining this testimonial pledge from Roman Catholics, who before were under the most solemn obligation of their baptismal vow? It cannot be that men, who make no account of the sacred covenant of baptism, will regard an engagement to do what they had failed to do in violation of their former solemn vows. And if Father Mathew had no further object than the promotion of temperance, does he suppose the duties of morality, as taught in the Church of Rome, not sufficiently stringent to keep the members thereof from the immoderate use of fermented liquors.

But why all this labour bestowed upon one species of offence? Why are other offences not noticed when drunkenness is attacked with so much fury? Why is drunkenness spoken of and treated as if it were the only sin, the great plague, which if removed, men would be doing things they ought to do; as if abstinence from fermented liquor were religion—yes, as if the Author of Christianity had not ordained that against which the pledge is taken as a sacramental element? or if drunkenness is to be banished by this means, why should not the same remedy be applied to every other offence? and if by such contrivances evil can be banished from the world, how much in the dark have former ages been? But if this means can produce a propriety of conduct greater than Christianity ever teaches, then, indeed, it has a praise and a power peculiarly its own, and the profession of Christianity may be renounced for the profession of teetotalism. If men will regard a pledge given to they know not whom, but pay no regard to the sacred vow required by their most holy religion, there must be some sinister object aimed at, there must be some design not declared. Father Mathew may talk of teetotalism, and may impose his pledges, and seek disciples, but such can only be from men regardless of their baptismal vows, from men of no fixed religious principles, from men of such character as may be conducted by him wherever he would lead them, even though it were to Papal Rome.

P E W S.

(From a Charge by Archbishop Sir Herbert Oakeley, Burt, M.A.)

Much has been written of late on the subject of pew, and much has been done, I trust, in awakening public attention to the very serious evils occasioned by the present system of appropriation, or, I should rather say, by its abuse. The system itself is not only upheld by the strong, and, in some respects, reasonable feelings of those for whose accommodation it provides; but it has been recognized and sanctioned by our law, ecclesiastical and civil, for many centuries; and I confess I cannot concur in the opinion that it would be wise, if it were possible, to abolish it entirely, and to insist upon open unappropriated seats, nor yet to require that those which are appropriated should be without doors, in all our churches. It is not difficult to imagine cases—that a small country parish, for instance, where the congregation consists of the principal proprietor, his tenants, and the poor—it is not difficult, I say, to imagine this, and some other cases, in which no inconvenient consequences would result even from the former of these plans: the same persons always occupying the same seats, the members of each family unseparated, no disorder, no dissatisfaction. This state of things has been actually brought about in some few places, and it is very pleasing to witness. But in populous parishes, in congregations comprising very various orders and degrees of persons, and large numbers of each class, would it be possible, with open benches only, to provide against frequent confusion and contention for seats—to secure invariably that decent order, and quiet, and freedom from interruption, which are essential in a place of worship—or to prevent, what I think would be an intolerable evil, the dispersion of families? We may indeed wish, heartily wish, that none would enter into the house of God without casting away such unworthy feelings as are here supposed likely to actuate some—that all were mindful of the spirit of the injunction, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." We may wish that the Christian community were restored to such a state of godly simplicity, that the ancient practice might be revived without any of the evil consequences which I have mentioned. But it is wise to proceed as if this were actually the case? Or is it not rather the very mistake into which some of our friends in the Church have fallen, in advocating an immediate return to ancient custom in this and some other matters, that they have overlooked, or too lightly regarded, the changes which have taken place in the state of society—in manners, in habits, in feelings? But these are considerations which may well influence our decision upon a question of this sort, lest while we are seeking to remove one evil we create others far greater; and when our Church, in her Communion Service, speaks of the restoration of the primitive discipline as a thing to be desired, but not attempted under existing circumstances, she points out to us a path of wisdom and sobriety, which we shall do well in other cases to follow.

But the abuses of the system deserve all the reprobation which has been applied to them, and for their removal, as opportunity may offer, we cannot too strenuously contend. They consist chiefly in the lavish consumption of space for the accommodation of the

* In Stanner Church, Sussex, lately rebuilt by the Earl of Chichester, the Earl himself and his family sit on benches in a sort of transept, and the rest of the congregation on benches in the body. The plan of appropriating pews without doors has lately been adopted at St. Martin's Church, Colchester, and, as I am told, with the best effect.