

The Wesleyan.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A COMMITTEE OF WESLEYAN MINISTERS, IN CONNEXION WITH THE BRITISH CONFERENCE.

VOL. II.

TORONTO, CANADA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1842

No. 11

Theology.

A CHRISTIAN PASTOR.

How much is intimated by the phrase *a Christian pastor!* What glowing zeal—what dignity of purpose—what simplicity of motive—what superiority to profit or to pleasure—what abstractedness of calm and holy meditation—what solemn feelings of responsibility from the charge and care of souls—what eager looking for the day of God! To conceive aright of its fulness of interpretation, we must transport ourselves to those convulsive times, when the followers of Christ were as sheep appointed to the slaughter,—folded in a wilderness and dwelling among wolves. We must watch those meek and venerable men, who seemed already dead to every earthly interest, diffusing amongst the abodes of poverty, and the habitations of death, the blessing of that Gospel by which themselves had been transformed, and leaving everywhere behind them the vestiges of heavenly mercy. We must watch them in their solitary intercourse with God, pleading, with many tears, for the salvation of the perishing and the restoration of the lost. We must see them, when bloodshed and murder stalk around, and the roaring of the lion resounds through every pasture,—standing unmoved, like their great exemplar, the Shepherd and Bishop of souls, and awaiting, with a man of lowly resignation, that onset which should thus be diverted from the flock. When the yells and shout of an infernal joy proclaim the triumph of hell, as the blood of another victim is poured out, or the ashes of another confessor are scattered to the winds,—we must mark their self-consecration and their cruel recompense,—and see them, invariably, as they were the last to faint, the first to suffer. Shame and poverty, and the loss of all things, we must witness as their chosen patrimony,—the bitterest contempt their undisputed honour,—the post of greatest peril their appropriated station,—and the carnage of the amphitheatre, or the tumultuous outrage of the popular assembly, their expected and customary passport to immortality. It is thus we must judge of an office into which so many inconsiderately thrust themselves, and which, however altered in its attendant circumstances, remains essentially the same as when the seal of its investiture—as pre-eminence in toil and danger, and to possess the foremost rank in ignominy, in torture, and in blood. Remember, brethren, that he is unworthy to be called a Christian, and still more to be acknowledged as a minister of Christ, who does not “bear about” with him, like these despised yet venerable men, “the dying of the Lord Jesus,” and hide beneath his robe a heart that would not quail before the fire of persecution or the sword of martyrdom. *Minister and martyr* are terms distinguishable, not by diversity of character but by change of time; and where the one is inapplicable, the other is misplaced. It is a satire on our principles, and awfully prophetic of our destiny,—like the sop of Judas from his Master’s hands, when he was meditating to betray that Master with a kiss.—*Rev. R. S. M’All, LL.D.*

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

I deny that the Romish Bishops came down by uninterrupted succession from the Apostles. I never could see it proved; and I am persuaded I never shall.—*Rev. John Wesley, Works, vol. iii.*
I set out for Bristol. On the road I 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 this was a fair and impartial draught; but if so, it would follow that Bishops and Presbyters are (essentially) of one order.—*Id., vol. ii.*
Lord King’s “Account of the primitive Church” convinced me many years ago.

that Bishops and Presbyters are the same order, and consequently in the same right to ordain.—*Id., vol. iii.*

The uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable, which no one ever did or can prove.—*Id.*

With regard to the kind of views, now so industriously propagated, we are completely at issue with them; and form distinct and almost opposed conceptions of the true nature of the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ. Are the Tractarian Divines learned? I would respect their learning. Are they meek? Imposing them, I would imitate that meekness. Are they diligent Pastors? May I have grace so far to be like them! But when in order to make out the line of the Ministers of the Lord Jesus, they drag me through crowds of some of the worst men the world ever saw, and meekly denounce unnumbered holy men, with their evangelical fruits of holiness around them, as intruders into God’s fold, and unchurch their communions; when, according to them, religious experience is fanaticism, and communion with God only certainly and safely maintained in outward “ecclesiastical expression;” when preaching the word is only tradition, only the conveyance of objective truth, and not a channel of living influence; and when there is no certain ground for attaining the divine favour in the case of sin after baptism;—there are, in all these, consequences so fearful and antisciptural that the most candid mind possible can come to no other conclusion than that *this is one of the most deep-laid and desperate schemes of the great enemy to blind and mislead the good, and make worse the bad, that ever was developed since the Papacy became rampant.*—*Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine.*

What law do the Wesleyans transgress by peevishly maintaining their present position? what law of God? what law of the land? If any law of God or of the land forbids us to worship the God of our fathers, after the manner which some are pleased to call “idolatry,” let it by all means be produced.—*Id.*

In the New Testament the reader is not once instructed to demand that his Ministers shall trace their succession through the Christian centuries; nor is he once warned against men who cannot verify the long genealogy. “Beware of false prophets,” cries the great Teacher; but when he furnishes the test by which they are to be evaluated, the golden dream of “succession” is dissipated: “By their fruits ye shall know them.” (Matt. vii. 20.)

It does not appear that the necessary registers (of the bishops) have been kept with anything like the care due to so great an interest, or handed down with the stamp of authenticity from the early churches. We await, also, the resolution of such difficulties as arise in the case of rival bishops; and in that of heretics returning to the orthodox communion and permitted, without re-ordination, to retain their clerical rank. And, once more, we need the proof of an unvarying and canonical regularity in the modes of induction to the sacred office [in order to establish the claims of the “Successionists.”]—*Id.*

AN ENLIGHTENED CHURCHMAN’S VIEW OF THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.—It is the principle—the wretched, the unscriptural, the demoralizing, the destructive principle of those men, that this apostolical succession constitutes the Church, and makes idolatrous Rome the spouse of Christ! It is to this principle, we say, not only that those passages of Scripture to which we have referred, but the whole of the word of God, from Genesis to Revelation, stands, in its entire spirit and tenour, in direct and hopeless opposition. . . . But take the scriptural principle, as we have advanced it, and whither are we led? That

Round being a false idolatrous, and idolatrous Church, a comparison of which with the Christian Church, as it is described in the Scriptures, is a fair and just, and is supported by the most abundant and most conclusive evidence. . . . It is not only that, in the urgent and unshaken stance of the Reformation, it is affirmed of the present succession, as an unscriptural and illegitimate, but that the Catholic doctrine of the Twenty-third Article applies, and that, notwithstanding the distinction of cities and languages, the Roman Church, the Lutheran, the German, the English, and whatever other Protestant Churches hold the truth, preach the doctrine, and exhibit the practices of Christianity, are to be received by us as sister Churches, that if we do not so, we perpetrate a signal act of injustice against them, we are acting in opposition to the doctrine and will of our Lord, and may expect, in consequence, to be visited with the marks of his angry displeasure. . . . How was it under the Jewish theocracy, when the priests and Levites, the regularly consecrated ministers, whose offices were secured from intrusion by sanctions resembling which we have none in the Christian ministry, had forgotten and forsaken the truth? God raised up prophets and teachers, not taken from the house of Aaron, or tribe of Levi at all, whom he used as instruments for the denunciation of his judgments, or the visitations of his mercy. . . . And now hath he so limited himself that, beyond “the holy apostolic line,” (more frequently the line of Satan,) no man shall be endowed by his Spirit to denounce his wrath, or proclaim his mercies, to apostate Churches and idolatrous nations? How absurd! How untenable! How incapable of reception even into the mind of the man instructed in Scripture and enlightened by the Spirit. . . . In truth, in the darkest ages of the Christian dispensation, as well as of the Jewish. He has raised up witnesses to his truth, multitudes of whom sealed their testimony with their blood. He endowed them abundantly with his Spirit. They spoke and acted as to them only speak and act but they who are taught of God. Such men were Whittaker and Wesley in our own land, raised by the baptism and consecrated by the Spirit of God, as great instruments for using into the our slumbering Church. And not only so, but they were abundantly honoured with the highest honour of all, namely, of turning many to righteousness, and therefore shall they shine as stars in the firmament for ever and ever. . . . These are truths which were universally received by men of Evangelical principles in our Church of the last and a former age—by the beloved Wiberforce, by the venerated Thornton, by the judicious Macaulay—by Venn, and Cecil, and Newton, and Scott, and Simeon, and a host of others. Are we now content to leave their principles? Are we to be gradually urged forward till we find ourselves fixed down amidst the unscriptural rubbish of old High Church, and new Puseyite principles? If so, our strength and our glory are departed from us—and, with solemnity be it spoken, our God may be expected soon to leave us too. . . . We consent not to be deluded. We stand on the doctrines preached by the Apostles, vindicated by the Reformers of our Church, and revived during the last age by the class of men, some of whom we have just named. From these apostolic doctrines, from these scriptural principles, we shall, God helping us, never remove; and we now invite all our readers, in this crisis of our Church’s history, to contend for them earnestly and boldly as the faith once delivered to the saints.—*London Record.*

CHRISTIANITY PRACTICAL AND EFFECTIVE.

The scriptural system, instead of a collection of speculative notions, brings truth immediately home to the heart. It does

not present truth abstractedly and abstrusely, but relates it to man’s present condition. It finds a man, dresses each man as a man, and takes the helplessness of his present condition into account upon what all the royal roads of duty and happiness proceed.

It is necessary for the conviction of gainsayers to draw out occasionally the proofs of Christ’s Deity, to show that neither the language, nor the connexion and order of the sacred writings, will in any way permit these proofs to be explained away, and this is sufficient to carry deep conviction to every unbiased understanding. But how much deeper is the conviction from the Scriptures themselves, when simply and truthfully they represent infinite love descending from heaven to save a lost race. God manifest in the flesh, and shining to the eye of faith through the veil that obscured his glory, and revealing the Father, not by arguments, but by the divine energy of his works, and the divine holiness of his words, till each who is taught by the Spirit exclaims with unshaken confidence, “My Lord and my God.” There is a reality and a vital power in the divine method of the Scriptures themselves, which more powerfully affects the mind than the exactness of human systems can do, and though it be necessary to select and continue passages of Scripture for peculiar objects, the more closely we can keep to the Scriptures, in their original connexion, and living unity, the better.—*J. Douglas, Esq.*

Biblical Literature.

OF THE KINDS OF WORDS AND THEIR VARIOUS USES.

Continued.

GENERAL NATURE OF EMPHASIS

16. *Definition of emphasis.* In the use of language, cases arise where the ordinary signification of a word receives, if I may so speak, *accession or augmentation.* This may be effected in two ways; the first of which consists in the use of a word in an honorary or in a degrading sense, e.g. *rex* *Emphaticus* or *dux* *terribilis*, of which I would be irrelevant to treat here. The second class of words are those, which receive augmentation in their extent or force of meaning. These constitute what may with propriety be called *emphatic words.* Emphasis then may be defined, an *accession to the ordinary signification of a word, either as to the extent or force of its meaning.* (Morus, p. 321. ii.)

Emphasis comes from emphaticus, which signifies to show, or make conspicuous. It is to language what a nod or a sign is to looks, i. e. it makes more significant. Examples: when the Jews speak of Moses by the appellation of *the Prophet*; or the Greeks say, *the Orator, the Philosopher, the Poet*, meaning Demosthenes, Plato, and Homer; these respective appellations are *emphatic.*

17. *No word of itself emphatic.* It may be easily seen, then, that no word of itself is *emphatic.* Each word has by itself a certain power, and designates a definite idea of a thing either small or great in which there can be no emphasis. It is not because a word designates any thing which is very great or very small, that it is *emphatic.* Were this the case, then such words as *God, the world, the sun, the king,* would be always *emphatical,* which surely no one will assert. (Morus, p. 322. 3.)

It emphasis be an occasional *accession of force to a word, then the ordinary meaning of the word, be the signification ever so important or forcible, of course is not *emphatic.**

18. *Kinds of emphasis.* Emphasis is either *occasional, or constant.* We call it *occasional,* when it is connected with words in some particular place, or at a certain time. From the animated feelings of the speaker, or from the importance of the sub-