

THE JEWISH CHURCH A TYPE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

(From "Episcopacy and Presbytery, by the Rev. Archibald Boyd, M. A., [late] Curate of the Cathedral of Derry.")

I have now to introduce the arguments in support of that arrangement of the ministry which obtains in the Episcopal Churches. We maintain that it is the doctrine of the Bible, and the opinion of the early Churches, that the ministry was not one of equality, that it consisted of different orders, and that from the first these orders were those which we designate as the episcopate, the presbyterate, and the diaconate.

In substantiation of this position, I affirm that the obvious and admitted analogy which subsists between the Churches of the Old and New Testament, requires that the ministry should consist of different grades.—There are two points connected with the Church of Israel which no one will have the hardihood to deny. The first, is that the Church was, not only in the general, but in its details, constructed by God himself. The second, is that the ministry of that Church was not formed upon the system of equality, but upon that of grades, which were pointedly kept distinct from each other.

It is equally clear that, on Divine authority, the ministry of Israel consisted of three ranks or orders. These orders were distinct from each other, in name, ordinations, and functions. They were distinguished even by the circumstance of descent. One entire tribe was set apart for the ministry, but only one family of it for the priesthood. And so complete was the distinction, that it was expressed in the difference of titles. The Levite was never confounded with the priest; nor again, the priest with the high priest of the nation. Besides this, there were acts connected with religious ministrations, which were the special duty of the Levites, others committed to the priest, others to the high priest; so that offerings might be made, atonements effected, and privileges claimed by the one order, in which the other had no concernment.

And that God intended that these orders should be kept sacredly distinguished from each other, is evident from this, that the crime of Corah and his company—a crime consisting in this, a desire to obliterate the line of distinction between the Levitical and the priestly offices, and to create equality where God required inequality—was visited as a sacrilegious infringement upon a divine institution, meriting the death of the offenders. There were indeed duties common to the priest and to the high priest, and for that reason the first and second orders are frequently (as is the case with the ministry of the Christian Church) expressed under the same title, and the ministry in general spoken of as consisting of priests and Levites. But there were also duties peculiar to the different orders which declared them clearly separate from each other. So that in every particular which could constitute distinction, the ministry was one of emphatic inequality.

It will next be observed, that it is the statement of the scriptures, that the Jewish Church was typical of the Christian. In strictness of fact, the churches of the Old and New Dispensations were not two things, but one and the same thing. The one was so engrained upon the other (Romans xi. 17, 18), as to be identical with it. Judaism was Christianity in shadow, and Christianity was the substance of Judaism. They were the first and second departments of the same mighty institution. And therefore it is the effort of the apostle, in his treatise addressed to the Hebrew Christians, to show how completely the religion of Christ had planted her steps in the footmarks of Moses; occupying the same ground, representing, (but more fully,) the same truths, and carrying out every institution into a more spiritual application. Everything in the one religion represented something in the other. The passover was the atonement in emblem, an institution itself, and yet the model of something kindred to, but better than, itself. Circumcision resolved itself into baptism; the temple was the Church Catholic in type, its two departments prefiguring the Church on earth, and the Church in glory. If this analogy ran through so many institutions, we see not why it should not be found in that of the ministry.—At least, I conceive it is natural to expect, that when this close similarity exists, and when the two churches were established and modelled by the same hand, impurity of orders—a striking and ordained peculiarity of the one—should be found existing in the other.—The Saviour, when he instituted the orders of Judaism, was not trying an experiment, the continuation of which was to depend upon the result. This is the course of fallible man, but not of the infallible God. And therefore there is ground for a strong presumption, that subordination should be found in the ministry of the gospel, simply because it characterized the ministry of the law.

constructed upon the principle of inequality, the ministry of the second should be so likewise. This seems to have been the view of the early writers.—Jerome remarks, "that we may know that the apostolic constitutions were taken from the Old Testament; that which Aaron and his sons and the Levites were in the temple; that bishops, priests, and deacons were in the Church."\* And in another part of his writings, "In the Old Testament, and in the New, the chief priest is of one order, the priests of another, and the Levites of another."†

To this argument two objections are urged, which it may be necessary to notice. The first, is that the analogy, fully carried out, must plead in favour of the doctrine of the papal supremacy, inasmuch as the high priest of Israel was a single individual, and should therefore be represented in the Christian Church by an individual. To this we reply, that the objection is based upon a wilful disregard of the fact, that the analogy has been carried out in this respect to the letter; inasmuch as the antitype of the Jewish priests was the Lord Jesus, the first in every sense in the episcopate of Christianity. He occupied and still does occupy the same position towards the Church that his typical representative did to the Church of Israel. Though removed to another scene of ministration, he is still her universal Bishop. But the type being primarily fulfilled in his work and person, it remained for him to pronounce in what form his office—the office of personal superintendency and control—should be continued to his Church. He might have restricted the episcopate to an individual; and had he done so, we should have been bound to admit that individual's pretensions. But He has not done so, because under Christianity the Church altered her character. From being of one nation, she became of all nations; from being peculiar, she became Catholic. And therefore he delegated his office upon earth not to one man, the solitary tenant of an order, but to many men, the co-equal members of the same order. And therefore in that period, when attempts were made to infringe upon the rights of the episcopal order, by the exaltation of one bishop above others, the principle was established, "that the episcopate was one, of which each held a part, although having an interest in the whole."‡ So that throughout the world there is but one high priesthood, although that office is, as to its functions, and for the fit discharge of its duties, distributed among many individuals.

The second objection is of the same kind. It is urged, that if the Jewish priesthood is to be held as typical of the Christian, we must consequently espouse the dogma of transubstantiation, inasmuch as the sacrifices offered in the Levitical Church were clearly typical of the atonement made by Christ for his people. The answer to this weak objection is simple. The offerings of the temple called for a substantial antitype, and it was furnished in the actual sacrifice made of himself by our Redeemer. So far the type has been duly fulfilled. And if the correspondence be not carried further by the repeated offering of the same sacrifice, it is because scripture itself has forbidden us to carry the correspondence further. The apostle, in his exposition of this subject, shews that the fact that Christ was the antitype of the Levitical sacrifices, involved the necessity of his being but once offered—the repetition of a sacrifice denoting its insufficiency. And, therefore, "by one offering He was to perfect for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14). But though the Christian minister may not offer up a substantial Christ, it is not his duty and his privilege still to ground every petition, every intercession, every hope, upon that blood of sprinkling? Is it not his office (and that by a special provision of Christ's) to offer up the eucharistical sacrifice, in the memorials of the Redeemer's wounded body and outpoured blood,—the appointment of memorials by Christ himself forming one of the intimations, that the notion of a transubstantiation was vain? In this manner is the parallel between type and antitype maintained to the last. And if it be not maintained in corporals, it is because God, the author of both economies, has pronounced the parallel complete without it.

ON THE TERM "PROTESTANT."

(From the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal, November, 1842.)

The Editor has received the following letter of remonstrance, which he is glad to insert, as it gives him an opportunity of explaining himself in a matter of some importance:

"To the Editor of the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal. Sir,—In the leading article of your last Number, on National Education, you have given your readers a specimen of the intolerable insolence of the Popish schismatics in an extract from the True Tablet, viz., 'a Protestant gentleman who styles himself Lord Primate of all Ireland, unaccountably passes by the style and title of Archbishop of Armagh.' In another part of the same extract, where mention is made of 'the venerable Catholic Archbishop of Dublin,' you remark in an editorial parenthesis 'meaning no doubt the Rev. Dr. Murray.' Of course in this parenthesis you express your opinion that the said Dr. Murray has no right to the title of 'Catholic,' much less of 'Archbishop of Dublin.' But throughout the whole article you do not scruple to give to the sectarian subjects of Dr. Murray, the title of Roman Catholics, while you never once assume for the members of your own Church the title of Catholics of any kind, either Roman, Anglican, or Irish, but call them throughout mere Protestants.

"Now, Sir, with great respect, allow me to submit to your consideration, whether it is not the using of such language, and the concession it implies, which has at least in some measure, fostered the arrogance of the Romish sect, and tended to raise to it the importance it has now reached. That such language should be used by the low church party, who make common cause with the rabble of Protestant Dissenters, is to be expected. But from the pen of a sound Churchman like the Editor of the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal, it certainly does appear strange and inconsistent. If the Romanists in this country are schismatics, how can they be Catholics or Roman Catholics? And if members of the united Church of England and Ireland are in this country the only Catholics, why not give them their proper name? Why speak of 'Protestants and Roman Catholics,' and not rather of 'Catholics and Romanists?' I am aware that in late Acts of Parliament, the Popish recusants of the canons are styled unanimously, 'Roman Catholics,' but this surely is no sufficient reason for a true Churchman's adopting a phraseology which admits, that while Popish recusants are some kind of Catholics, his own brethren have no pretension whatever to that venerable title. We have heard of late abundant censure of certain writers who have been found guilty of an attempt to un-Protestantize the National Church; are they deserving of praise who do not scruple to un-Catholicize the National Church? It would be no easy matter, I apprehend, to point out the exact time when the said National Church was Protestantized, for, as has been happily remarked, our Protestantism however useful at political meetings and Reformation Societies, &c., is always left at the Church door. When once we enter the sacred building, we hear only of the 'holy Catholic Church,' 'the good estate of the Catholic Church,' 'the Catholic faith, &c.'—not a word of Protestantism.

"I am, Sir, with much respect a constant reader of your valuable Journal, and  
"A PALLET OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN IRELAND."  
The Editor fully agrees with some of the observations contained in this letter. He well knows how much importance is in a name, and how much mischief may be done by a careless, or an artful use of it. It is needless, therefore, to say, how much he regrets

the manner in which the term Catholic is conceded to Romanists, by persons from whom a more cautious use of language might reasonably have been expected.—On the occasion of the Queen's late visit to Scotland, the Romish bishops were not merely allowed, in their addresses to the Queen and Prince Albert, quietly to assume the style of "The Bishops of the Catholic Church in Scotland," but, in the answers to their addresses, this absurd title was actually given to them by Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Anson.\* These official documents appeared in the True Tablet of Oct. 8, on the very same page with a letter, in which it is attempted to be proved, that the Queen's children ought not to be prayed for in the Romish chapels, as "the opinion of many is, that the Prince of Wales is not baptized, and those who are not of this opinion doubt at least, the validity of his baptism."† Within these few days also, a specimen of outrageous insolence, worthy of the True Tablet itself, has been copied from a Romish paper into the Dublin Evening Mail:

"THE TITULUS.  
"The Rev. Dr. Stoford, titular bishop elect of Meath, will be consecrated on Sunday next, at Armagh, by the titular primate, the Most Rev. Dr. Beresford."

Perhaps, also, as a general rule, the Editor would prefer the use of the term Romanist, to that of Roman Catholic; but, as the latter term, to say nothing of its having been adopted by the Legislature, has been commonly used by English and Irish divines, whose churchmanship is beyond all suspicion, it may still be admitted, especially where nothing in the immediate connexion renders it liable to be misunderstood.—Still, if any one thinks it better wholly to avoid the use of the term, the Editor is far from feeling disposed to question the prudence of his caution.

He must acknowledge, however, that he views the use of the word "Protestant" in a wholly different light. No doubt the word may seem to have a contentious sound, and in some degree to give countenance to the charge, that our religion is made up of negative articles and opinions. And besides, it may entail on the Church an appearance of being mixed up and identified with all the sad varieties of sectarianism and heresy, down to the very lowest grade of Deism. For all these, if they do dissent from Popery, will demand to be acknowledged as Protestants, and, as such, to be admitted to fraternize with the Church, whenever it may suit their convenience to claim a right to make common cause, and to meet on the platform of a common Protestantism. It may also be urged, that the word seems to carry an admission, that our religion has no higher origin than the particular transaction which gave occasion to the name, and that the English Reformation is the offspring of Continental politics. Nor is it unlikely that to some it may convey painful recollections of party animosities and triumphs, anything but akin to the spirit of the Gospel, and fully as opposed to the spiritual character and claims of the Church, as the lowest state of Infatuation can possibly be imagined to be.

These inconveniences do undoubtedly attach to the name "Protestant." At the same time, the Editor is free to confess, that there are many very weighty reasons, which appear to him to render it highly improper to affect to disclaim the use of the word. "Far from being ashamed of the name of Protestant, we ought to show, that a sincere and immovable attachment to the Catholic Church, in its constitution, discipline, authority, privileges, and offices, is perfectly compatible with, or rather is itself a practical act of protestation, against the errors and corruptions of the Papal Church." Such is the language of the Bishop of London, in his late Charge; and most thankful is the Editor to be allowed to adopt it, as the expression of his own most matured convictions. Archbishop Laud will tell us, that, as the Lutherans are Protestants, and the Calvinists are Protestants, so "the Church of England is Protestant too." (Against Fisher, sect. 35, § vi. p. 102.) And in another place he asks: "Now if the sacraments be protestant signs professing, why may not men also, and without all offence, be called Protestants; since, by receiving the true Sacraments, and by refusing them which are corrupted, they do protest the sincerity of their faith against that doctrinal corruption which hath invaded the great sacrament of the Eucharist, and other parts of religion? especially since they are men which protest their faith by these visible signs and sacraments." (Ib. Sect. 24, § iii.)

It is a mistake to suppose that Protestantism is opposed to Catholicity, in the true use of either term: a mischievous mistake, if allowed to pass uncorrected: most mischievous, if encouraged by the affectation of abstaining from the free and unrestrained use of a name, sanctioned by our laws, and by the coronation oath of our Sovereign, not less than by the usage of the highest authorities in the Church. The word Protestant is totally misunderstood and misrepresented when it is taken as the opposite of Catholic. The terms are not contradictories. Far from being so, the word Protestant is applied to our Church, in order to assert its possessing the true note and characteristic of the Catholic Church,—fidelity in guarding the deposit of truth, and in witnessing against error, and corruption, and novelty. So long as heresy, and schism, and error exist, every true Catholic must be Protestant. It is perfectly certain, that our great divines did not believe, that, in calling themselves Protestants, they adopted a name which either implied sectarianism, or conceded Catholicity to Rome. They believed, that, in the essence and spirit of Protestantism, the ancient Church were as truly Protestant as the Church of England is. "If," says our illustrious Bramhall, "if the repudiation of the Bishop of Rome's absolute universal monarchy, by Christ's own ordinance, be the essence of a Protestant, then the Primitive Church are all Protestants." (Schemie Guarded, p. 258, Gravenagh, 1658, 8vo.) And again, Archbishop Laud,—whom it is impossible to charge with low, or latitudinarian views:—"For the Protestants, they have made no separation from the general Church, properly so called,—but their separation is only from the Church of Rome, and such other Churches, as by adhering to her, have hazarded themselves, and do now miscall themselves the whole Catholic Church; may, even here the Protestants have not left the Church of Rome in her essence, but in her errors, not in the things which constitute a Church, but only in such abuses and corruptions as work toward the dissolution of a Church." (Against Fisher Sect. 25, § xviii.) So that, in fact, the real meaning of the name "Protestant" is the upholding of truth against the errors and novelties of Rome; and truly it is an illomen for

the Church, if her sons should be ashamed to bear it. Her Articles, as far as they bear on the peculiarities of Rome, are plainly Protestant—"mainly directed"—as Bishop Bull has justly said,—against its "errors and corruptions." Beyond all controversy, they were as expressly constructed for the purpose of compelling the clergy to join in a protest against Romanism, as the Nicene Creed was for the purpose of enforcing a protest against the heresy of Arius. "They are unquestionably," says the Bishop of London, "as to the points of difference between the two Churches, neither more nor less than a solemn and emphatic protestation against the errors of the Church of Rome."\* And if so, how is it possible, to reconcile an honest subscription, with a disclaimer of the name or character of Protestant?

Nor is it easy to understand, how any man can take the oath of Supremacy, and make the declaration of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, in the Ordination Service, as every man must do, who is ordained a priest in this Church, and yet scruple to call himself a Protestant. "He that takes this oath," says Bishop Beveridge, "doth, ipso facto, renounce Popery, for he renounceth the Pope himself, and all that supremacy and authority he pretends to in this kingdom."† And in like manner, Dr. Nicholls expounds the declaration and promise which the priest, in our Ordination Service, is obliged to make, touching the sufficiency of Holy Scripture. "Our Church," he says, "does engage the person to be ordained to promise this, in opposition to the doctrine of Tradition, which is enjoined in the Church of Rome."‡ If, then, to renounce the temporal and spiritual supremacy of the Pope, and the Romish doctrine of Tradition, be in effect to declare one's self a Protestant, no man can be ordained a priest in our Church without making this declaration, and that, with all the solemnity of an appeal to the Almighty.

So long then as Rome continues in error, and this Church perseveres in truth, so long is this Church essentially Protestant.—Protestant in its doctrine; Protestant in its discipline; Protestant in all the circumstances of its ecclesiastical position; and God forbid, that any considerable number of her sons should ever be so misguided, as to treat this honoured name with disrespect; or so infatuated, as to imagine, that, by endeavouring to sink the name, or renounce the attitude of Protestant, they are likely to withstand the errors of Popery; or rather,—for some persons actually seem to entertain a notion of the sort,—to outmanoeuvre or outface the schismatic emissaries of Rome.

A DEFENCE OF THE STUDY OF DIVINITY.

(By the Rev. Hugh James Rose, B.D.)

I cannot refrain from adding a few words on the dignity and grandeur of the study, on the irresistible claims which it possesses to the devotion of the highest talents and the richest endowments, from its intrinsic character, from the extent of the research to which it leads, from the grandeur of the objects it investigates, and from the permanent elevation of the intellect through the knowledge it bestows. For we are destined too often to hear a cry and a clamour of a different kind. We are told that these studies are old, that they go over ground already so often trodden, as to leave no scope for talent, no room for discovery; that they confine the powers of the mind, capable as it is of higher flights and nobler darings, of assisting the march of intellect, and the progress of knowledge.—In a word, Divinity is not Science; this is the head and front of its offending, and this is at present an offending hardly pardonable. But why this unnecessary warfare, why this unreasonable comparison of the general with the particular, this unjust depression of the superior before the inferior? Why is it not seen, that the charge which the votaries of science bring against our study, of confining the views and degrading the faculties, may be far more justly directed against their own? True, indeed, it is, that science, in her highest estate, has been, and may be, used to elevate the mind from a contemplation of the works of God, to the contemplation of God himself. True it is, too, that in her highest estate she educates and exercises some of the most valuable faculties of the human mind. But of those who devote themselves to science, how few can boast this happy result, how few rise beyond the mere congestion and arrangement of facts; and how many, therefore, may pass away from the world with half their faculties undeveloped and dead? They have been at best instruments, mere instruments, for promoting the march of intellect; but what has been the march of their own? They may have accelerated the progress of knowledge, so called, but what knowledge have they acquired for themselves? Intellect and knowledge are not the joint stock of the world, which every one is interested in augmenting. Mankind, as a class, can be elevated only by the elevation of every individual whom it embraces; and we mistake miserably, if, in the desire of promoting the progress of light and knowledge in the world, we do not lay the foundation in the progress and elevation of our own minds.

Such a progress, we assert with confidence, is the effect of the study of Divinity. In the mighty road of knowledge which it embraces, what is introduced which does not for its own excellence deserve admiration, which does not of its own nature tend to exercise and elevate the faculties, and to pour on them the light of permanent and precious knowledge?—Where does Divinity lay its foundation but in the loftiest speculations, the being and attributes of God, and his moral government of the world? What is its proper province but the mind of man, its nature, the laws by which it is guided, its strength and its weakness? Where does it look for proof of the superiority of the moral system it inculcates, but to the study and contemplation of all that the wise and great and good, the philosopher and moralist of other times have achieved by the light of unassisted reason? I should insult you by offering any proof, that intimately linked as the history of religion is with the history of man, the most intimate knowledge of history is an indispensable requisite in the formation of a great divine; and that his character is equally incomplete without an extensive and intimate acquaintance with several of the languages of the ancient world, a research into the laws of human thought. Thus, then, of all men, the divine is perpetually conversant with those deep and mighty questions which, if here below, they have received no solution, and admit none, have ever exercised, and formed, and strengthened, the minds of the greatest and wisest of mankind. Literature sheils forth all her stores, and all her refinements for him; and science herself is not beyond the pale of his research. Whatever strength the mind can receive from perpetual exercise and devotion to the most difficult and laborious study, whatever refinement it can obtain from converse with the loftiest thoughts, the purest minds, and sublimest writings, that strength and that refinement is ours; ours is the study to which the great and wide universe sets the limit, and which grasps within itself all the perfections and dimensions of human science.

Who then shall presume to say that this study retards the growth of man's mind, and so prevents the fairest flower of God's earthly garden from blossoming into the perfection of beauty? Who shall disparage that study which exercises, exalts, strengthens, and purifies, and which has for its end the conduct of an immortal soul to a state of enjoyment adapted to its requirements, and as immortal as itself? To him who believes that the grave is the last house of man, I appeal not; but to all who believe that beyond that house there is another not made with hands, be the blessed conviction produced in him by the influence of Revelation, or the light of reason, be he believer or unbeliever, I do appeal to judge in the controversy, whether any scientific study, any study of that matter which must die to the passing spirit, even if itself were eternal, can be comparable to that higher study which directs all its efforts to the improvement and exaltation of the undying spirit itself. To the Christian I appeal yet more strongly, and ask of him, if the Bible be the Word of God, if Christianity be no fond dream of man's imagination, if it alone contain the germs and seeds of eternal and unperishing truth; whether it is not more, yea far more important than the knowledge of those forms and laws of matter which, by the very decree of the Wisdom to which they owe their being, are to perish with the world to which they relate.

THE COMBINED HUMILITY AND GLORY OF OUR SAVIOUR.

(By Daniel Featley D.D.)

Jesus receiveth Baptism. The way itself taketh a long and tedious journey; Jesus came from Nazareth to Galilee. The fountain of all purity is washed, and was baptized. The Lord and author of baptism receiveth his own badge and cognizance from his servant, Of John. The boundless ocean descendeth into the river, In Jordan. Well might, saith Barroddus, the heavens be opened, that the Angels might behold this wonderful sight. A strange and wonderful baptism indeed, in which he that was washed was purer than the Pont itself, in which the person is not sacrificed by the Sacrament, but the Sacrament by the person. A strange and wonderful baptism, in which he is baptized with water, who baptiseth with the Holy Ghost and with fire. A strange and wonderful baptism, in which the person baptiseth is the Son of God, and the two witnesses the Father and the Holy Spirit. A strange and wonderful baptism, in which not the Church door but heaven gates were opened, and instead of a Sermon from the mouth of a mortal man, there was heard a voice from heaven saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Observe, I beseech you, in this and other strains of the sweet harmony of the Evangelists, how the Basses and Trebles unsever one the other; how they depress our Saviour most in his humanity, there raise him highest in his divinity. In the passages of one and the self same story, where you find most pregnant proofs of his infirmity and humility as man, there you have also most evident demonstration of his majesty and glory as God. What greater humility than to lie for many months in the dark prison of the Virgin's womb, and to be born of a poor handmaid? this sheweth him to be a true man; yet what greater glory than to be conceived of the Holy Ghost, and to have a regiment of heavenly soldiers, to guard him as it were into the world, and a choir of angels to sing at his birth? this demonstrateth him to be God. What greater argument of his humility than to be born in an inn, lodged in a stable, and laid in a manger? this sheweth him to be *verum Sacerdotem*, a man in distress and great necessity; yet what greater glory than to be manifested by a star, and presented by the heathen sages with gold, frankincense, and myrrh? this demonstrateth him to be God. What greater humility than to be carried up and down from place to place by Satan, and to be tempted by that foul fiend? this sheweth him to be a man; yet what greater glory than to be attended on, and ministered unto by (Matt. iv. 2) angels in the desert? this demonstrateth him to be God. What greater humility than to suffer himself to be taken by the High Priest's servants, armed with swords and staves against him, as if he had been a malefactor? this sheweth him to be a man, and that of little or no reputation among the rulers; yet what greater glory than with the breath of his mouth to cast down that demon that assailed him, and make them fall (John xviii. 6) backward to the ground, in such sort that he might have trampled them under his feet? this demonstrateth him to be God. What greater humility than to be nailed to the cross, and to die in torments? this sheweth him to be a mortal man; yet what greater glory than at his death to eclipse the sun, and obscure the heavens, and move the earth, and cleave the rocks, and rend the veil of the temple from the top to the bottom, and open graves? this demonstrateth him to be God. In like manner here in my text, what greater testimony of humility, than to descend into the river, and suffer himself to be baptized by John? yet what greater glory than at his baptism to have the heavens opened, and the Holy Ghost in a visible shape to descend upon him, and God the Father from heaven to acknowledge him for his Son? this demonstrateth him to be God.

RE-OPENING OF THE TEMPLE CHURCH, LONDON.

(From the London Times.)

It is natural to anticipate with eagerness, and to contemplate with something of exultation, the re-opening of a long closed religious edifice; and when, as in the case of the Temple Church, the charms of antiquity combine with the claims of sanctity to render it a liberal, yet reverent restoration, every one must enter into the feelings, blending in some degree the pleasurable and the proud, with which the modern Templars looked to their ancient church, so worthily honoured by its present guardians—so hallowed by associations of the past. Invested by age with no common historical interest, its site hallowed by memories of the enthusiastic, though mistaken piety of its warlike founders—its existing form presenting a noble specimen of Gothic architecture in all its chastened beauty, its solemn dignity, and grand simplicity,—it has been restored with a liberality which, lavish as it was, was not only directed by the purest taste, but controlled by the most discerning judgment; and, above all, by that deep reverence for the venerable antiquity, and that due regard for the nature and sacred character of the building, which allowed not even generosity to be misled, nor permitted an ardent desire for the accumulating of all the honours which respect could dictate or wealth supply, to alter the edifice one jot more than was requisite to lend renewed durability to its antique beauty, nor to heap upon a Christian church a too meretricious adornment. On the one hand, then, we were gratified at finding the design of the building little changed; and that, even in details, the alterations were not only in the way of renovation, but principally, in the strictest sense, of restoration. The church is a noble exemplification of the unquestionable, but often forgotten truth, that the true sublime depends not upon size; and, that simplicity is, after all, a main element, alike in the beautiful and the grand. Nothing can be more simple, yet nothing

more truly imposing—striking with a sense of blended grace and grandeur, than the interior architecture of the two rows of dark-coloured marble, rising in slender yet stately beauty like trunks of lofty trees, while the equally simple yet surpassingly lovely tracery of the arches which from their summits realize an enduring embodiment of the artless interlacing and the overhanging foliage of a noble grove. The round church at the entrance is spacious, and, opening into the body of the building, affords an unobstructed view right through the chancel, over which and nearly along the whole breadth of that end are seen splendid painted windows, the colours of which, bright in pristine beauty, are certainly as brilliant and as beautiful as any we remember to have seen—blending in softened hues the glowing purple or the milder violet, "the cloudy crimson or the misty blue;" through which streams "the dim religious light," admirably harmonizing with the restored colours of the roof, which, with the more subdued tints of the side windows, give an air of warmth and repose to the edifice quite in keeping with the general tone of its Gothic architecture. The continuity of view, so essential to the sense of grandeur, is not broken by any obstruction, the organ being in a side recess; the pulpit and reading-desk masked in the line of pillars on each side (though in the best positions for audibility); and the interior as little as possible broken up for purposes of seats—there being no pews, properly so called; the students' benches in the centre and stalls at the sides—so that the general impression, at first sight, is that of chastity and simple beauty, and every subsequent view serves to deepen the feeling of the softened harmony that pervades the whole, while over

"the spirit of the grey old time"

"Still bristles around the face an awe sublime,"—though no longer, from "the shining mail and banners free" of its early occupants "flashes the light of ancient chivalry." Everything, indeed, throughout the interior, manifests a just appreciation and a constant feeling of the sacred character of a church; this is equally apparent in the studious abstinence from all inappropriate adornments, and in a careful attention to all the important accompaniments of service, as exemplified in the liberal supply of Prayer-books and Bibles. The Benches have been evidently guided throughout by a desire to adopt just medium between a meretricious magnificence, out of keeping with the character of a church, and a cold correctness, equally at variance with the majestic style of the architecture. Their aim has been to make all adornments harmonize with the spirit of the ancient design, an allusion to which was not inappropriately made by the Master of the Temple, when referring, at the close of his sermon, to the restoration of the building. He deprecated (while applauding the homage paid by wealth to religion) a departure, in the decoration of such ancient churches, from the beautiful simplicity of their general design, which (he observed) in this case eminently exemplified how much better our ancestors understood the character of sacred architecture than their descendants; there should, he said, be nothing in the way of ornament calculated to attract attention too particularly to itself; while on the other hand, there ought to be a general tone in harmony with the grand beauty of a Gothic edifice.—Assuredly, the architecture of such buildings was the design of those who "dreamt not of a perishable home"—who felt that "feelings which from Heaven are shed" naturally ally themselves to sympathies of kindred, though perchance of subordinate nature;—and that while man is influenced by the spirit breathed into his "inner nature" through the medium of external objects, it might be well to enlist these influences on the side of the sacred and the eternal; and if in some sort a superstitious spirit, impelled by a natural and not improper ardour for the heaping on religion all imaginable honour, induced them to transgress the legitimate limits, and less the distinction, severing the subordinate from the superior, theirs was an error into which, perhaps, there is less danger of our falling than that contrary one, of imagining (in the words of an eloquent living preacher) "that in religion, more than in other cases, men can be entirely independent of associations;"—of supposing (as said Robert Hall) "that there need be no very great difference between a temple dedicated to the Most High and a common building"—the mistake of thinking that it can be wrong to invest the "outward and visible" appliances of religious worship with as much of attraction as is consistent with a due sense of the distinction so justly pointed out by the Master of the Temple, who remarked that there was nothing around him which could have the effect of diverting attention from the object and design of edifices so sacred; and though, indeed, it might be that to strangers accustomed to churches of humbler architecture, there might be something at first view exceedingly splendid in the aspect of the interior, the effect of a very little familiarity would be a feeling of entire appropriateness, consistency, and harmony—

"The arch and architrave divinely grand;  
"The airy fretwork of the canopy beamed;  
"The harmony of stone, the coloured light  
"That gleams through rainbow windows dimly bright—  
"How can we gaze, nor turn from earth to heaven,  
"As though some finer sense were newly given?"

You felt that there was nothing in all you saw about you to detract from, rather than to enhance, the feelings of devotion; that it was something at all events, if not all, to have thus ministered amid

"The ancients combined  
"By art to unexcuse the mind,"  
incitements tending "to raise the heart and lend the will by a bright ladder to the world above;" and while listening to the "pealing organ" and the "solemn chant" of the Cathedral service (conducted, as it was, in a manner so subdued and so chastened as to be enough to silence for ever the cold and shallow stigmatizers of such chanting, as necessarily savouring in any degree of ought save the harmonious and the hallowed), its music seemed "lingering and wandering" (in Wordsworth's lovely language)—

"Like thoughts, whose very sweetness yielded proof  
"That they were born for immortality."

You felt that these were influences calculated "not to divert, but to inspire;" that they served "without offence, to ought of highest, holiest influence" (still borrowing from the great poet of our age), but to "recall the wandering soul to sympathies with what man hopes from Heaven;" and to produce impressions perfectly consistent with the beautiful liturgy (admirably read), and with the impressive and able discourse of the Master, which we should be desirous of describing from memory, did not respect, alike for the preacher and his theme, forbid us.

For ourselves, in the feelings which pervaded our mind at the close of this first, (in we trust) the long uninterrupted succession of future services in this noble church, were mingled gratitude to the benefactors of those societies whose funds they have with so much munificence expended in this highest of all objects; and gratitude, more remote in its application, to the founders of those ancient institutions, which thus act as conservators of so much that is valuable and venerable, and whose powers are so worthily applied to the employment of wealth in a manner calculated, beyond the more immediate results of their liberality, in the renovation of a building which is their noblest heritage, to afford an example worthy of every possible imitation in the restoration of similar memorials of ages assuredly nobler in their religious foundations, though not so orthodox in their religious faith as is our own; in preserving (that is) all that is valuable

\* Et ut sciamus traditiones apostolicas...  
† Jerome remarks, "that we may know that the apostolic constitutions were taken from the Old Testament; that which Aaron and his sons and the Levites were in the temple; that bishops, priests, and deacons were in the Church."  
‡ In Veteri Testamento et in Novo, solum ordinem Pontificum tenent, alium Sacerdotum, alium Levitarum.—Adv. Jov. lib. ii. tit. 220. See also Theodoret. Quæst. in 2 Paral. tom. i. 396. Ezech. Dem. Ec. iii. 2.  
§ Cyprian de Unitate Ecol. p. 103.

\* The following are Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Anson's answer to the addresses:—  
"Dalketh, Sept. 21, 1842.  
"Sir,—I have had the honour to lay before the Queen the loyal and dutiful Address from the Bishops and Clergy of the Catholic Church in Scotland, congratulating her Majesty on the occasion of her Majesty's visit to Scotland, and that the same was graciously received by her Majesty.—I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant.  
"A. BERKELEY.  
"The Right Rev. Dr. Gillis, Greenhill Cottage Edinburgh."  
"Windor Castle, Sept. 26, 1842.  
"Mr. Anson presents his compliments to Bishop Gillis, and begs to inform him that his letter and the Address which he accompanied it, forwarded from Dalketh, only reached his hands yesterday.  
"Mr. Anson has this morning had the honour of laying before her Royal Highness Prince Albert the Address of Congratulation which Bishop Gillis has sent, on the first visit of her Majesty and his Royal Highness to Scotland, and has received the command of the Prince to request that the Bishop will accept himself, and convey to the other Bishops and clergy of the Catholic Church in Scotland, who agreed to that address, his Royal Highness's best thanks for the kind expressions it contained.

\* Charge, p. 16.  
† Works, vol. ii. p. 130. Lond. 1824, 8vo.  
‡ There is no knowledge which lays open the human mind, no knowledge which unfolds in the history of man his principles and character, no knowledge which, disclosing the secrets of nature, shows the agreement between the works and the word of God, no knowledge which, elevating the imagination, refining the taste, and quickening the sensibility, gives to eloquence its power over the heart, there is no knowledge of this

description which by the Christian minister may not be made to help, in reference to this supreme end, the way not pursue.—Bishop Robert's Charge, in 1815, p. 37.

description which by the Christian minister may not be made to help, in reference to this supreme end, the way not pursue.—Bishop Robert's Charge, in 1815, p. 37.

description which by the Christian minister may not be made to help, in reference to this supreme end, the way not pursue.—Bishop Robert's Charge, in 1815, p. 37.





