Poctry. (

THE ROYAL MARTYR.

Unbappy Charles! Oh, might we blot the page, Which tells our Fathers' worse than civil rage Purge off the blood and shame of kindred strife. And the foul traffic for thy barter'd life! Oh! tutor'd early in that erring school Where every art was known, save how to rule: Taught by the frock'd and pedant Monarch's plan, All but the science of Thyself, and Man; Born with affections for a Crown too kind, Free, gentle, courteous, gallant, and refin'd; Hapless in temper, fortune, station, time. And curs'd with goodness which in Thee was crime! mind which chequer'd by distinction nice Made all its private virtue public vice: Alike irresolute for good or ill, In action nerveless, only strong in will; Betray'd, rejected, injur'd, on the throne, Lov'd, mourn'd and envied, in thy fall alone!

For mark, when Royalty's brief tale is told, And the worn robe of Empire waxes old; as maring unward after each new blow. The Martyr leaves his destiny below! Then no unprincely doubts his bosom tear, No thoughts but those a Monarch may declare; No wish was his, which Kings should shrink to frame, No look but such as Majesty became. Mor'd but as some spectator of his woes, He sees the drama hastening to its close; Scorns the brute force which seeks in vain to hide Its bastard growth beneath unmanner'd pride; linshaken hears Sedition's foul deceit. Religion's mockery, and Law's solemn cheat: The cold reproach, the contumely keen, The rude, harsh taunt, and insult of the mean : The low-born gibe, with which the rabble pay Their debt of vengeance when the great decay. Till at the last, secure of death, he views The goal Rebellion's bloody foot pursues: Tis then he throws all worldly state apart,
And binds the Christian's buckler round his heart; Faith, Hope, and Meckness, surer arms supply, And teach the King to fall, the Saint to die E'en when in studied bitterness of hate. His pulace-court receives the mournful state; Heaven has his thanks which, chastening him, has shown How near the scaffold rives to the throne. There sorrowing crowds their Prince's wrongs confess, And rugged lips, unus'd to blessing, bless; Scarce think the dreadful pageant can be true, Nor dare believe what Guilt has dar'd to do. There not the woman tears of passion flow, But all is frozen to one blank of wee; Silence of grief, or hearts which speak in sighs, And sad Astonishment with doubting eyes; Untimely throes, whose midwife is Despair, And Horror, stiffening with uplifted hair. Enough of Earth! now Heaven alone remains. And but one stage of sorrow more detains: Prayers till the space between, and when they cease, His last "Remember!" stamps the pledge of Peace! REV. E. SMEDLEY.

THE MARTYRDOM OF KING CHARLES I. (By the Rev. W. Gresley).

At length the nation was astounded by the announce ment that the King was to be brought to trial for his life. The trial of an anointed sovereign for treason, by his subjects, was a thing before unheard of in the annals of the world. Kings have in different ages been slain by the hand of the assassin, or fallen in battle with their subjects but never before was there imagined so presumptuous an infraction of human and divine law, as for subjects to arraign their Sovereign before them, and sit in judgmen on his life. It remained for England,-England, the boasted birth-place of liberty,—to set an example to the world of a crime subversive of the very foundation of social order, the results of which, terrible as they have already been, have, it is to be feared, as yet arrived at but a small part of their full development.

To regard the trial of Charles, however, as a solemn spectacle of a great nation sitting in judgment on their Sovereign, is altogether a false view of the circumstances of the case. The crime was perpetrated by a small knot of republican officers, against the will and in opposition to the feeling of the large body of the nation. Let was man, who had joined in the sin of rebellion, and now found themselves unable to restrain its dreadful issues.

The monstrous project was concocted by a few of the leading rebels assembled at Windsor, at which meeting it is said that Cromwell offered up a long prayer to God that lle would assist in their deliberation. The question was, whether the King should be simply deposed, and kept a prisoner for life, or whether he should be "presently dispatched" by private assassination, or brought to pub lic trial. The latter step was agreed on, as being, on the whole, most advisable. Accordingly, the House of Com-mons, or rather the small body of Cromwell's partisans, about eighty in number, who were still suffered to assemble, passed a vote whereby a high court of justice was appointed for the trial of the King,—a measure which, it is just to say, was rejected by the Lords without a dissentient voice. The high court was formed of one hundred and thirty-five members .- men selected from the House of Commons, the army, or the people generally,—all, more or less, the creatures of Cromwell. The twelve judges of the land refused to sit, declaring unanimously that the whole proceeding was illegal; but law and justice

had long since ceased to govern.

Thus was this excellent Monarch, in the full vigour of manhood, his hair blanched with sorrow, majestic even in his misfortunes, brought to trial for his life before men already determined to condemn him. The demeanour of Charles on this most dreadful occasion was such as to elicit the admiration even of his enemies. When he was first brought before the so-called high court of justice sitting in Westminster Hall, he looked upon them with a stern air, yet without any manifestation of trouble, and took the seat assigned to him in full front of his judges. When the indictment was read, and the King was desired by the President to plead, he at once refused to do so .--Without any alteration of countenance, or hesitation of manner, he desired to know by what authority they presamed by force to bring him before them? and who them power to judge of his actions? He told them that he was their lawful King, and they his subjects, who owed him duty and obedience; and that he would not so much betray himself and his royal dignity as to answer any thing they objected against him, which were to acknowledge their authority; though he believed that every one of themselves, as well as the spectators, did, in their conscience, absolve him from all the material things which were objected against him.

An irrepressible murmur of approval ran through the assembly; and the soldiers and officers were scarcely able to keep order in the court: indeed, several incidents occurred on that memorable day, which showed how harshly the whole proceeding grated on the scelings even of those who had before been enemics to the King.— When the name of Lord Fairfax was called over amongst the list of judges, a loud voice was heard to answer, has more wit than to be here." In fact, Fairfax had refused to take any part in the trial, and used the small power which was left to him to prevent its fatal issue.—
When the impeachment was read, in which it was said that the small power was read, in which it was said that the small power was read to the small power which was left to him to prevent its fatal issue. that the suit was instituted "in behalf of the good people of England," the same voice exclaimed in a still louder tone, "No, nor the hundredth part of them! It is salse! Cromwell is a traitor!" upon which one of the officers bade the soldiers fire into the box whence those presumptwos words were uttered; but it was quickly discerned that it was the general's wife, the Lady Fairfax, who had uttered both those sharp sayings; and she was presently persuaded or forced to leave the place, to prevent any new disorder. But the words which she dared to utter expressed the general sense. The spectators in the galleries gave vent by their murmurs and exclamations to their excited feelings: even the people offered up their prayers for the King's preservation, for the King's preservation, and by their generous tears expressed their returning love for him. But their sympathy came too late. Cromwell's brutal and fanatical

soldiers, armed with partisans and halberts, repressed the the Presbyterian party in England offered him his liberty man, passed the following resolution in relation to The and New Testament, where he says that, "having attended feeling of the multitude; and, being instigated by bribes, and life, if he would accede to their conditions, he per-or urged to madness by their fanatical preachers, cried sisted to the last in his refusal. or urged to madness by their fanatical preachers, cried out "justice! justice!"—a name, alas! how often perverted

to the vilest uses of treason and delusion! Three times was the King brought before this mock-tribunal, and as often declined their jurisdiction. On the fourth day, after a few witnesses had been examined, who proved that they had seen him at the head of his army at Edgehill, Naseby, and other places,-for this was the amount of the charge brought against him, -sentence of death was passed. During the whole of these trying and excuse many things; but it would never sourcast him seenes, his behaviour was such as does honour to his to deprive the Church of God of an order instituted for memory as a King and as a Christian. Firm and fearless, be maintained in each reply the utmost perspicuity of ministers in the Church: he would with more comfort thought and expression;—mild and equable, he rose into cast himself on God's goodness to support him in and thought and expression;—mild and equable, he rose into cast himself on God's goodness to support him in and no passion or over-excitement: his soul, without effort or defend him from all affliction, how great soever, that affectation, maintained a perfect self-possession, and might befall him, than deprive himself of the inward seemed to look down with pity on all the attempts of tranquillity of mind, for any politic consideration that human malice and iniquity; nay, when subjected to the might seem to be a means to restore him."

Thus, with the alternative before him of liberty and soldiers, he calmly submitted to insult without one passionate word or murmur.

On the sad particulars of his execution we will not dwell at large; suffice it to say, that his soul being prepared, not merely by the religious exercises of a few days, but by the devotion of many years spent in self-denial and obedience to God's laws, he met his death with the holy fortitude which became a Christian, but not without having first prayed to God for the forgiveness of his memies, and having addressed to them many words most suitable to the times, and worthy of the remembrance of after ages:—"Now, sirs," said he, "believe it, you will never go right, nor God will never prosper you, until you give God his due, the King his due,—that is, my successor,—and the people their due. I am as much for them as any of you. You must give God his due, by regulating rightly his Church, according to the Scripture, as any of you. which is now out of order: to set you in a way particularly now I cannot; but only this, -a national synod freel called, freely debated among themselves, must settle this, when every opinion is freely heard. For the King," [here he seems to have been interrupted, or overcome by his feelings, and did not express himself fully], "the laws of the land," he said, "will clearly instruct you for that.
.......... For the people, truly I desire their liberty and freedom as much as any body whatsoever; but I must tell you that their liberty and freedom consist in having government,—in having those laws by which their lives and their goods may be most their own. It is not their having a share in the government,—that is nothing appertaining to them." He then declared that he died a Christian, according to the profession of the Church of England; and, after a brief conversation with the excellent Rishon Jaxon. who attended him with pious fidelity during his last hours, he calmly laid his head on the block; and a single stroke of the axe severed it from his body!

At the instant when the blow was given, a dismal universal groan was uttered by the people, as if by one con-sent, such as was never before heard; and, had they not been dispersed by the soldiers, it is likely that their indignation would not then have ended. The same feeling of grief and dismay pervaded the whole city. Many persons closed their houses.—passed the day in fasting and prayer within their secret chambers, in hope to avert the wrath of God for this tremendous crime. Women are said to have fallen into untimely parturition,—others were seized with convulsions, or sunk into such a melancholy as attended them to their graves. A like sensation pervaded the whole land, as soon as the report was spread of this fatal execution. Every one looked on his neighbour with silent astonishment. Scotland itself repudiated, with indignation, all consent or participation in a deed to which she had but too much contributed. Even foreign nations under whatever form of government, exclaimed, with one voice, against the enormous crime, and rejected the example with horror, as a most beingus insult on law and

It may truly be said, that all Europe shuddered at the fearful omen, and that the world itself will probably not outlive the moral consequences of that dreadful deed.

The murder of Charles has been rightly called a mar-A martyr is one who dies for religion's sake; and such was unquestionably the cause of Charles's death. It was a sincere attachment to God's true Apostolic or piscopal Church which brought him to the scaffold. Charles believed the visible Apostolic Church to be, as it is, the institution of God; and no power on earth could move him to desert it. His attachment was no blind party zeal;-that would have sunk beneath the sufferings which he endured ;-but it was a fixed and firm attachment to the cause of God's true religion, shewn forth, not only in his public acts as regarded religion, but in the most virtuous and exemplary life. If the nation had not for its sins been subject to God's just wrath, Charles was a monarch whose benign influence might have brought the Church to a higher state of excellence than has been witnessed before or since. What might have been the condition of England during the two centuries which have since clapsed?—what might it be now, if the plans which he devised for the good of the Church had not been impeded by the violence of sectarianism?-nay, what might have been the present state of the world itself, if the English Church, established on a firm foundation, and continually enlarged, so as to meet the wants of a growing population, had retained the love of her children, and spread her arms into distant regions, making each colony a new branch of God's pure kingdom, instead of itself sinking under the assault of a wild sectarianism, and spreading, as it has done, in every quarter of the globe its pernicious chisms and divisions?

Under the circumstances of unparalleled difficulty in which Charles was placed, it would have been next to inpossible for him not to have committed some errors. We know that there were passages in his life for which he never ceased to ask God's pardon with fasting and prayer until his dying day. It were absurd, however, of persons in the present times to pass judgment on his actions upon mere modern principles. They who would rightly judge of Charles's conduct must place themselves which he lived, before they can be compe tent to decide.

For instance, it has often been alleged against him, as a want of true policy as well as justice, that he attempted to force the English Liturgy upon the people of Scotland. It is false to say that he endeavoured to force upon them Episcopacy, because Episcopacy was the law of the land when he came to the throne. But they who thus accuse Charles of intolerance forget that, when the Presbyterians of Scotland, aided by the English rebels, gained the ascendant, they did actually force the Presbyterian form of government on the people of England,—they drove out her ministers—proscribed her liturgy and services. It was rendered penal to use it even in private houses. The truth is, that the right view of toleration was entirely unknown in those times. It was not till later days that the true principle was acknowledged, that, while it is the duty of government to provide instruction in the true form of worship for all the people, yet it is contrary to true to force any one to accept it. It is remarkable that one of the principal causes of complaint made by the Parliament against the King, was his unwillingness to enforce the penal statutes against the papiets: and vet this very Parliament stirred up the people to rebellion by the wild cry of freedom of conscience, and civil and religious

liberty As the troubles of Charles I. commenced from bis attachment to the Church, so it was his resolute mainte-nauce of his principles which eventually brought him to his death. After his imprisonment, when men's minds began to turn in his favour, and there was a general disposition to rise for his rescue, the Scots could not obtain from him, as the price of their assistance, any promise to support Presbytery in England. He consented, indeed, to its establishment in Scotland. Strong political prejudices conspiring with the interests of Sany of the leading men of that nation, who, in troublous times, had seized on the bishops' lands, and were unwilling to restore them, had infused into a great portion of the Scottish people a spirit, which, according to their respective bias would call religious zeal, others a dogged fanaticism.— But the same principle which induced Charles to forbear to enforce on the Scottish people, against their will, that which he in his heart believed to be the true Apostolic form of Church-government, still more obliged him to refuse his concurrence in the unreasonable wish of the Scots, that he should enforce Presbyterianism on the English. - a form of discipline which he believed to be as repugnant to the feelings of the nation itself as it was contrary to Apostolic usage. And so, afterwards, when

"He was well pleased," he said to the commissioners, preserve the Scripture-bishop, he would take away the bishop by law. He confessed that necessity might justify continual use, and for establishing a succession of lawful

restoration to his throne, on the one hand, or continued imprisoment and suffering, and probable death, on the other, he deliberately chose to abide by the dictates of his conscience, and died a MARTYR to God's true religion.
The infidel and the latitudinarian of the present day

will of course join in condemning Charles as a fanatic or a bigot; but the Christian Churchman will revere him as a martyr and a saint. Dark was the day for England which saw the death of

her most holy King. Deep were the sufferings which she thenceforth endured; nor is the stain of guilt yet washed out from her rebellious hands. Much cause have we with fear and trembling "to implore the mercy of God, that neither the guilt of that

sacred and innocent blood, nor those other sins by which God was provoked to deliver both us and our King into the hands of cruel and unreasonable men, may at any time hereafter be visited on us or our posterity." A Pint A same amounts a district of the control of

LORD CHANCELLOR KING AND HIS WRITINGS ON CHURCH GOVERNMENT. (From the New York Churchman.)

The recent publication, in Philadelphia, under the paonage, and in pursuance of a vote of the Presbyteria Pastoral Association" of that city, of Sir Peter King's Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church, within the first three hundred years after Christ,"—one hundred and twenty-seven years after the last previous edition, seems to render expedient some inquiry into the pretensions of the author, the character of his writings, and their effect upon the age in which he lived. With a view to promote such an inquiry, I wish to lay before your readers some few facts which I have met with in the course of my reading.

Sir Peter King was born at Exeter, England, in 1669. His family were dissenters, and he was educated in the principles of dissent from the Church of England. His father was a grocer, and endeavoured to bring him up to his own business. The employment was, however, disagreeable to the son, who was inclined to studious habits, and in them employed his leisure hours. His principles as a dissenter not allowing his admission to the English Universities, he was advised by his maternal uncle, the celebrated John Locke, to pursue his studies at Leyden; aud, on his return from that university, he entered the Inner Temple. When he came to the bar, his talents and industry soon procured him distinction. His taste leading him to the study of ancient writers, he early turned his attention to ecclesiastical history; and in 1692, when but twenty-two years of age, he published his best known work, that above alluded to. It was a work of some industry, but produced by an immature indement. Its conclusions were drawn rather from terms than facts; and occasionally from the modern ideas attached to these terms, rather than their ancient and proper sense. Dr. Calamy, a dissenting minister, in his Abrilgement of Baxter's History of his Life and Times, (1692.) says of this work-" At this time came out a book of an ecclesiastical nature, written by a young gentlesian, but drawn up with such strict care and exactness, that a man who had apent all his days in conversing with the Fathers and primitive writers of the Christian Church, would have no need to be ashamed of the performance." The dissenting divines of that period, however, have not left such evidence of their acquaintance with Christian antiquities, as to induce us to rate this commendation very high. Dr. Calamy's approbation is easily accounted for, on the ground of the support which such a work as the *Inquiry* was calculated to give to dissent. The leading object of the writer was to show, that, in the primitive Church, a bishop had the charge of only one congregation, or parish, and therefore was not a diocesan, but a parochial bishop—the mere pastor of a single parish. The work, however, though published currently with his uncle Locke's Letters on To-teration, and shortly after the Revolution, which gave to England a Presbyterian king, (a circumstance which had nuch elevated the hopes of the dissenters.) does not seem o have attracted much attention. Indeed, such was the ilence with which it was regarded, at a time when there was abundant excitement concerning its principal topics broughout England, that Scluter remarked, more than wenty years subsequently, that "the less learned, and nore prejudiced adversaries, of the Church of England, nave made their boasts of it, and from its not being answered yet, have proclaimed it an unanswerable vindicaion of their separation from her.'

In 1699, Sir Peter King obtained a seat in parliament, which he continued to hold for many years, and was one of the committee of the House of Commons, for the imeachment and prosecution of Dr. Sacheverell.

In 1702, he published a "History of the Apostles" Creed, with critical observations on its several articles." This work also exhibits proof of industrious research; but such as read this valuable work," says Mosheim, " would do well to consider that its learned author, upon several occasions, has given us conjectures instead of proofs, and also that his conjectures are not always so happy as to ustly command our assent."

But the work which attracted the most notoriety in the

uthor's life-time, was one entitled, The Rights of the Cluistian Church Asserted, published in 1706. Of this work Dr. Calamy says, "there has not been a book published in many years that made more noise. Some were much taken with the manner of this book, and by that tempted to think better of the matter and argument. I pretend not here to act the part of a censor, or an advocate; and could not be either, without several distinctions. Far be it from me to pretend to justify the matter in all points, and much less the manner of treating some divinnstitutions. The warm invectives of this book have kindled much indignation in some against the author or authors." This, let it be remembered in the coining of course who appears to have held the author previously in con-

siderable estimation. In this work Sir Peter advocated the Erastian principle hat the church was simply and exclusively the creature of the state-whatever any community might be pleased to make it-that there was not and could not be any succession either of the Church or its ministry—that religious offices were appropriated to particular men for the ake of order only-that ecclesiastical officers were as much subject to deprivation by the magistrate, as civil officers-that the king was the head of the Church in the fullest sense—that not only an independent power of ex-communication, but even of ordination in the clergy, is nconsistent with the magistrate's right to protect the commonwealth—that the consecration of the elements at the Lord's Supper might be called conjuration, rather than

any thing else, &c., &c. Dr. George Hickes, one of the non-juring bishops, in the Preface to The Christian Pricathood Asserted, published in 1707, mentions some circumstances strongly implying doubts of Sir Peter's belief in Christianity, sarcastically places him in the synagogue of the libertines, and expresses the hope that when Sir Peter should publish again, he would do-what for some reason he had never done-but his name to the work, and thereby show the world that he was neither ashamed nor afraid to own what

he had written. A singular proof of the great sensation produced in England by the publication of this work, is in the fact, that the House of Commons, upon the completion of the trial of Dr. Sacheverell, for his famous High Church Sermons, in 1709, and on the very day after they had or-dered these sermons to be burnt by the common hang-

* Service for the Thirtieth of January, being the day of the Martyrdom of the bleased King Charles L.

and blasphemous libels, highly reflecting on the Christian "with their expression, that they did not intend to force religion, and tend to promote immorality and atheism, his conscience; yet the manner of their pressing him and to create divisions, schisms, and factions among her looked very like it, after he had so solemnly declared that majesty's subjects; and ordered that the said books be it was against his conscience. That he did concur with this day burnt by the common hangman." Sir Peter them in their distinction of hishops; and if they would King was then a member of the Rouse, had been one of the managers for the impeachment and trial of Sachoverell, had acted in it with much energy, and had received, with the other managers, "the thanks of the house for the faithful management of the trust reposed in them." It is not easy to conceive a more awkward predicament in

which a parliamentary author could be placed.

Mr. William Laic, in the second of those Letters to Bishop Houdley, which have so long been justly celebrated for fine reasoning and beautiful diction, calls the author of the Rights of the Christian Church "a scandalous declaimer against the ordinances of Christ," and says that he "has been treated by the greatest part of the nation as a free-thinking infidel; because he has reproached every particular Church, as such, and denied all obligation to communion; because he had exposed benedictions, absolutions, and excommunications; denied the divine right of the clergy, and ridiculed the pretended sacredness and necessity of their administrations, as mere niceties and trifles; in a word, because he has made all churches, all priests, all sacraments, however administered, equally vaid, and denied any particular method uccessary to salva-

Jones, of Nayland, speaking of this work, says: "In the last century (17th) great dauger arese to society from enthusiastic notions of religion. Of later years, a grand levelling hath been adopted, which tends to confound all right and property among mankind, and strikes at the authority of God himself in Church and state. One of the first books in which this was openly doue, was called The Rights of the Christian Church. It undertook to prove that the Church is the creature of the state, and the state the creature of the people, and that God himself, as the governor of Israel, became such in virtue of a conbetween himself and the people at Horeb.

In 1713, Sir Peter, who had been knighted by Queen Anne, while he held the office of Recorder of Landon, published a second edition of his Inquiry into the Constitation, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church. When the first edition was published, the author was young and obscure; but in the intervening time, by his writings, and activity in the House of Commons, he had attracted no little distinction. Still the work does not appear to have received much attention from the writers of that period. Schiter says that he was a stranger to it till some considerable time after the second edition appeared, yet finding that men of letters expressed an ear est expectation of an answer, be determined to use his best endeavours to vindicate the truly apostolical consti-tution of the church, and to plead the cause of injured antiquity, and to correct those palpable mistakes, and unfair representations of the venerable fathers of the Church, so obvious in almost every page of those plausible collections. His answer, with the title of An Original Draught of the Primitive Church, is generally admitted to have satisfied Sir Peter himself, of the incompetency of his Inquiry; and he now, from a dissenter, or occasional conformist, became a member of the Church of England.

But Schiter's, though the most effective and best known inswer to the Inquiry, was not the only one. Hishop Smalridge wrote another, which is comprised in the folio edition of his Sermons. An edition of Schater's Original Draught was printed at Columbus, Ohio, a few years since, and probably may yet be found at the bookstores. The modesty, caution, and respectful manner of the author. are in the highest degree commendable. His work is a

very thorough refutation of the Inquiry.

Yet Mr. Wesley, when he undertook to set up a new sect in this country, [United States] failing of other means to effect his purpose, (for he had ascertained by actual application that the English hishops would not ordain ministers to be under his jurisdiction and beyond theirs; and, it is said, made a similar application to a Greek bishop who had visited Landon, to ordain preachers, and even consecrate him to the Episcopal office,) declared in his letter to Dr. Coke, &c., of September 10, 1784, that "Lord King's account of the Primitive Church convinced me, many years ago, that bishops and priests are the same order, and consequently have the right to ordain." Lord Mansfield had, however, on the other hand, told him that "ordination was separation." Following Lord King, he effected the separation, and Dr. Coke tells us that he was afterwards sorry for it. If he had read Sciater's work, he

might probably have been spared this sorrow.

When Dr. Coke came to this country to bring about this separation, while on his passage he read Sir P. King's book, I think, (for it is some years since I rend his jourral, and I quote from memory.) for the first time, and be expresses himself very cautiously in regard to any favourable convictions produced on his mind by Sir Peter's rensoning.

But the truth is, that Sir Peter's Inquiry cannot be so ferred to by either Wesley or Coke for the course which e pursued. Mr. Wesley tells us in his journal, (Jan. 20 1746,) that he had then fust "read over Lord King's Account of the Primitive Church. In spite of the vehement prejudices of my education, I was ready to believe that it was a fair and impartial draught. But if so, it would ful-low, that bishops and presbyters are essentially of one order; and that originally every Christian congregation was a Church independent of all others." Now, if Mr. Wesley was really convinced by the Inquiry, his convictions wer in favour, not of the Episcopal, or even the Presbyterion but of the Congregational mode of Church government, viz., that all Christian congregations were independent of each other, with but one order of the ministry; yet Dr. Coke was already a Presbyter when Mr. Wesley professed to raise him to a higher order; and Dr. Coke himself pro-fessed to ordain Mr. Ashury to three several orders on as many different days! The American Conference of 1784, moreover, declared that they "were satisfied of the validity of Dr. Coke's and Mr. Asbury's Episcopul ordina-The American Methodist Church, as constituted under Mr. Wesley's instructions, is nearly as far as possible removed from the theory of Sir Peter King's Inquiry

and is, literally, in its form, a high-toned Episcopacy.

Dr. Baugs, a distinguished Methodist minister of this country, (in the most singular work, of modern times, which I recollect to have met with, for confused and illogical reasoning, and perversion of facts,) in an attempt to prove, in opposition to the actual policy of his own church, -which makes bishops a distinct order by consecration, from presbyters or elders-that the terros bishops and presbyters, signify the same order, relies for his testimony chiefly on the Inquiry. He says, "that the reader may rely upon every quotation as correct, I will remark, that the author has fully verified all his quotations by inserting the originals in the margin of his book." But if Dr Banus had read Sciater's Draught, as we shall see subsequently that he professes to have done, he would have known that Sciater has proved conclusively, that many of these quotations of Sir Peter, professedly made from the originals, and given as such in the margin, are mutilated in various ways, so as not to be relied on, and are often construed more according to modern ideas and notions, than the practice, sufficiently attested by others, of primitive antiquity. But Dr. Bangs adds in a note, "I am aware that Sciater has attempted a refutation of Lord Chancel-tor King's Account of the Primitive Church; and in a few particulars he may have succeeded; nor am I pledged for all the conclusions which his tordship adduces from the early writers of the Church. The quotations speak for themselves, and every one is at liberty to make his own inferences." I must still, however, claim the benefit of languages, or prophecy, or curing sickness or diseases, or the previous question, are the quotations admitted to be such like. But as we are sure that these extraordinary correct? Till Sciater's proofs to the contrary be set aside, the inferences drawn from them are inadmissible in any argument. Perhaps I am wrong in saying above, that Dr. Bangs professes to have read Schater, yet the manner n which he speaks of Sclater's book implies as much.

In the Lectures on Ecclesiastical History by Dr. Compbell, of the Scottish church, [Kirk] Sir Peter King's Impairy seems to have been used as a basis for the Lecturer's theory. Bishop Shinner, in his Vindication of Primitive Truth and Order, directly charges Dr. Campbell with plagiarism, in copying large portions of the Inquiry. Probably Dr. Campbell supposed himself in possession of a rare copy of a forgotten book, nearly a century having passed since it had been reprinted, and that he might therefore save himself much trouble by absorbing its matter, so important to his cause, in a work whose publication was intended to be postbumous. Dr. Daubeny makes the same the Holy Ghost, in this degree and charge in his Discourses on the Connexion between the Old indeed to enter into Holy Orders.

Rights of the Christian Church, and some other books: to the progress of this controversy, and particularly "Resolved, That the said books are scandalous, seditious, marked the ground on which, from time to time, it has been placed, I can have no difficulty in tracing the road over which the professor has travelled; and there is little doubt in my mind, that Sir Peter King's Inquiry was the one which the professor had before him when he put together that part of his lectures; because the same arrangement of argument and proof, the same mutilation of extract, the same want of appeal to that evidence which the Scriptures are competent to furnish, together with the same turn of expression, are to be met with in the publications of both writers, a circumstance not to be necounted for but on the supposition of one having copied from the other." The editors of the Christian Observer, speaking of Dr. Daubeny's confutation of the main principles of Dr. Campbell's Lectures, say, "We anticipated an easy victory, both from the known ability of Dr. Daubeny in this field of theological controversy, and from the weakness of the arguments with which he had to contend. Without any disposition to withhold from Dr. Campbell the general esteem which he has so justly merited, we find ourselves compelled to agree with Dr. Daubeny in the opinion, that no addition of credit will be derived to Dr. 'amphell's name by the publication of his Lectures."

The Inquiry also appears to have been of much use to Dr. Mitter in his Letters on the Christian Ministry. He even classes Sir Peter King's opinions as the concessions of an Episcopallan! A fact which is no trifling additional proof of the general want of accuracy with which Dr. Miller has been so often charged.

It was not till 1725, twelve years after the publication of the Inquiry, in its second edition, that Sir Peter was appointed Lord Chancellor. It is said that the public expectation was disappointed by his conduct in this office, as a greater number of his decrees were reversed by the House of Lords, than in any previous case. He resigned this office in 1733, and after having suffered much from a paralytic affection, died in the following year. While Lord Chancellor, he preferred Mr. Sclater, the author of the reply to the Inquiry, in the church, thus proving his favourable opinion of Mr. Sclater's work; a work which to one has ever attempted to confute.

While Sir Peter was Lord Chancellor, he was, one day. dining in company with the famous William Whiston, when Sir Peter reproved those who dissented from tho English church, merely because it was not in all respects what they wished it to be, saying that "their userbluess was bindered by their scrapkes." "But, my Lord," said Whiston, "would this principle [i. e. their scruples] be admitted in your court of Chancery?" Sir Peter allowed that it would not. "Then, my Lord," rejoined Whiston, how can you suppose it would be received in the chadcory of housen?

It is worth a passing remark to observe the manner in which the luquity is referred to by those writers who wish to use it as authority for their own views. The suthor himself modestly styles his work, an Inquiry into the constitution, discipline, unity, and worship of the primitive church- expresses in his preface, a humble diffidence of his performance; and desires that another sense may be given of his several quotations, if necessary, for the better information of himself and others. But Mr. Wesley and Dr. Bangs constantly call it an Account of the Constitution, Sc. as if the author thought his investigation final, and his opinious conclusive. This change could hardly be accidental, if those writers were familiar with the book, and is, it seems to me, calculated to mislend. So in the latter writer and some others, we find his official title paraded at length, with the view, most probably, of increasing the influence of the work. "Land Chancelor King's Account of the Constitution, &c., of the Primitive church," is a designation which cannot be without its attractions. Yet the book to which attention is thus called, was the work of a young man of twenty-two years, in 1692, and was republished, whether with his smorton is uncertain, in 1713, whereas he did not attain the Chancellorship till 1725, when he had reached the ripe age of fifty-five, and had become a member of that very church, to dispute whose prefensions the work was written! Mr. Peter King was, his book being evidence. Congregationalist, or, as some may think, a Presbyterian, and a dissenter from the Church of England. Chancellor King was neither a Congregationalist nor a dissenter, but a member of the Church of England. He even reproved those who dissented from that church, because it was not in all respects what they wished, and beleved that their usefulness was hindered by their scruples. Further, if Lord King's name is of sufficient authority

to give currency to the opinious contained in the Inquiry, can its authority be less in sanctioning the opinions of the Rights of the Christian Church? Opinions, which are literally parallel with those inculented in the Independent Whig, and other deistical publications of the same period, which were intended to root Christianity out of Eugland. Sir Peter and his associates, on a certain occasion, which implies, that, at that time, he himself could not have been ontemplating any hulf-way measures to that end; "they plentifully vented their biasphemies upon the Roly Writings," says the Histop, and he furnishes some, almost atrocious, specimens. The admirers of the Inquiry would be among the first indignantly to repudiate and oppose such principles. Let them be enutious, then, that they do not wound religion in the house of its friends.

ON BEING MOVED BY THE HOLY GHOST TO UNDERTAKE THE MINISTRY.

(Frum Bishop Fleetwood).

He that hath seriously, and in good carnest, purposed in his heart to take upon him the office and ministration of a Deacon, or the order of Pricethood, with full intention serving God, for the promoting of his glory, and the edifying of his people; and in order to it buth lived, and purposes to live, a godly and a sober life, and to improve n reading and understanding the Ifoly Scriptures, other learned books to fit him more and more for the discharge of his duty, he who brings this disposition along with him, and this preparation and good purpose of advancing in virtue and knowledge, may very honestly and truly say, that he trusts he is inwardly moved by the Holy Chant to take the office he is seeking for upon him, as well because that, in general, every youl and perfect pift cometh from above; and that it is God who worketh in us both to will and to do, and that without him we can do nothing: and that he it is, who by his special grace preventing us, does put into our minds good desires: as also, in particu-lar, because he is moved to undertake this office, by arguments, authorities and motives, derived from the Holy Scriptures, which are the word of God, and dictates of the Holy Chost: no that he who is moved by them, is certainly moved by the Holy Chost; as he who is moved by what I say, either by word of mouth, or writing, is certainly moved by me. We have indeed no other way (ordinary, mean, and common to us all) of knowing that we are influenced and acted at any time by the Spirit of God, but by finding that what we desire, and what we do, is what we are willed and commanded to desire and do, by the Spirit of God in the Holy Scriptures. The Apostles indeed, and first Christian Ministers, had another sort of call, and were moved by the Holy Ghost, in much another way and manner, to undertake the Ministry, than we, or any since those early days, can pretend to: they had divine impulses, warnings, admonitions, invitations and calls to the ministry, such as they could not resist, and such as they themselves were sure came, and must have come from God; and they were, most of them, able to convince others also of their heavenly mission, by some extraordinary powers and abilities they were endned withal, either of calls and graces of the Holy Spirit were not promised to continue for ever, and sure that in fact they did not con-tinue long, in the Church; so we are sure that this is not the inward call, and movement of the Holy Glost, that the Church enquires after, in the question she puts to such as are candidates for Holy Orders; for that must be something that is promised, and something that is to continue as long as the Church is to continue, and that will be always necessary to its well-being: and that, I think, is only such a general influence of God's Spirit, as shall incline a man's heart to undertake the office of the ministry. and fill him with good purposes and resolutions to execute it faithfully, to the glory of God, and the good of mankind. This is what is necessary, this is what is promised, this is what we may expect: and he that is not thus far called, he that does not find himself inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost, in this degree and measure, is very unfil