

# The Theological Instructor.

No. 12.

TORONTO, DECEMBER, 1874.

VOL. I.

## THE FIRST VOLUME OF THE "INSTRUCTOR."

The first volume is with the present number brought to a close, and the second volume will commence with the January number. We heartily thank our numerous friends and patrons, for the aid they have given us in extending the influence of our Magazine through the length and breadth of the Dominion; and we beg a continuation of their kind attention. We have recently received words of cheer from different quarters. One good loyal brother writes to us on the 6th inst. as follows:

"It gives me great pleasure to know that *The Instructor*" is to be continued, and I will do all in my power to increase its circulation in my neighbourhood. For my own part I greatly prefer "*The Instructor*" to any other paper or magazine that comes into my house. The way in which you have used up that Jesuitical society; the brass band of the Pope in this country; I mean the so-called "*Church Association*" and "*the other sects,*" should command the admiration of every sound churchman who is zealous to maintain the great bulwark of Protestantism in the land. It is with great pleasure I send you enclosed the amount of my subscription for next year. And that you may have strength

to uphold the true church against all her inside and outside enemies, is the prayer of your friend and brother in U. L. T."

The above are but specimens of the many kind words we have been receiving from different points in the Dominion and from the United States. We beg to assure our friends that we will spare no pains to make "*The Instructor*" for the year to come, all that they can desire. It is a Theological Instructor for the family; and as formerly our instructions in every case, shall be drawn from the Holy Scriptures, as the sure word of prophesy.

See terms on 2nd page of the cover.

Another friend, very learned in his profession, expresses great pleasure in renewing his subscription to *The Instructor*. A U. S. correspondent declares his belief that our reply to the New Heresy is unanswerable, and must be productive of good, and wishes us every success in advocating the true faith of the Gospel through the columns of our Magazine. Another friend from the Diocese of Iowa, U. S., expresses his great satisfaction in the Churchly character of *The Instructor*.

**THE NEW HERESY.**

The dangerous heresy of the New Schism, or the Cumminites, detected in the light of the Holy Scriptures," is now ready for delivery, at Rowsell & Hutchison's. Price 10 cents.

**SPECIAL NOTICE.**

At the request of many friends we will in a day or two have the whole of vol. I of "*The Instructor*" bound in a good stiff cover which we will forward to

subscribers for 75cts. Please send in your address to the Rev. D. Falloon Hutchison P. O. Box 1669, Toronto Ont. To those who are not subscribers the price of last year's volume, bound, will be \$1.25.

Agents wanted to canvass every county in the Dominion to whom liberal wages will be given. Address "*Theological Instructor*," P. O. Box 1669 Toronto.

**THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD,**

In our last issue of "*The Instructor*" we replied at some length to the unreasonable charges made against the Church by the Rev. Charles Cheney, of Chicago, Dr. Cummins, and others, shewing the unscriptural character of the new Sect from the plainest passages of the word of God. We wish in this number, to direct our readers' attention to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures in relation to the Christian Priesthood, and we do this because every one of the gentlemen referred to denounce the Priesthood of the Church of England as an innovation which they tell us is fraught with such serious consequences as compels them to come over from the United States to teach us the first principles of the Christian religion. In return, we are obliged to request them to banish anger, hatred, and malice from their bosoms, and to receive with meekness the engrafted word,

which is able to save their souls: James i. 21.

From the beginning of this world's history, a priesthood had been appointed by Divine authority. Abel we are told offered up an acceptable sacrifice to God, which pointed to the great sacrifice of "the seed of the woman," Gen. 3, 15. which in the fulness of time was to be offered upon the Cross for man's transgressions. In the Patriarchal dispensation there were divinely appointed persons to offer up sacrifices to God. The sacrificer we now call a priest; in those days they were known by a different name, yet they performed the office of a priest under the title of patriarch or prophet. It is the office we are seeking after, and not any particular name known to a particular people or nation. The long list of Aaron's line continued to discharge their office so long as they pointed forward to our great

High Priest, their own promised Messiah; but when Christ came, and they rejected him, by that very act they sealed the doom of their order; and, as a consequence, their priesthood ceased; for it could only be accepted through a prospective faith in the great Redeemer. The patriarchal and Aaronite priesthoods were simply the ordained types of the Lord, and the blood of their sacrifices proclaimed the great truth, that without the shedding of blood there could be no remission of sins: Heb. ix. 22.

In the beginning of our dispensation the holy ministry appointed to offer the Christian sacrifice are called sometimes apostles, sometimes bishops, and sometimes presbyters; for as St. Paul says the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change of the law: Heb. vii. 12.

We have been referred to a passage in the New Testament, which says that every Christian is addressed as a royal priesthood: 1 Peter ii. 9. But this is no proof against a true ministerial priesthood among us, any more than that a similar expression in the Old Testament proved that the sons of Aaron were not definitely consecrated as priests of the Lord. Does St. Peter tell us, "Ye are a royal priesthood:" 1 Peter ii. 9? So God told the Jews the very same thing, thus: "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation:" Ex. xix. 6. Nor is the application

of the term to our blessed Lord, as in a special manner the priest of the New Testament, a contradiction to the idea of a continued line of priests following his advent, any more than it was a contradiction to the fact of a line of priests preceding it. A priesthood to carry on His work of atonement, seems to be as much a part of the Divine purpose as a priesthood to prepare the way of the Lord.

That the two priesthoods co-existed in the typical Mosaic covenant is a very powerful argument in favor of a similar state of things in the New Covenant, which is its true anti-type. And when St. Peter applies a passage of the Old Testament to establish the fact of an inheritance of a royal priesthood being fulfilled in all the disciples of Christ, the identity of language tends to prove the unity of purpose pervading both covenants, and the certainty of both priesthoods re-appearing in the same harmonious co-operation in the Christian Church. Through Christ's precious atonement, every Christian has access to the Throne of Grace, and this power of access and offering himself and his gifts to God constitutes the priesthood of the individual Christian. The grace of priesthood is bestowed on him in holy baptism. The baptized man is consecrated for ever to God's worship and service, by participating in his measure in the priesthood of Christ. This is given both for receiving the Sacraments and for making offer-



ings and sacrifices acceptable to God. Thus it will appear that the two priesthoods co-operate, and are necessary to each other. For as the priesthood of the baptized is bestowed through sacraments, so the ministration of sacraments involves the necessity of the ministerial priesthood; and, without the priestly character in the baptized, the acts of the ministerial priesthood would be devoid of their intended efficacy. Both priesthoods flow from Christ. He first glorified the Father in offering up a perfect and acceptable obedience, and afterwards offered himself as an atoning sacrifice, that He might communicate himself and sanctify in like manner all His brethren. Thus in himself he laid the ground-work of a two-fold priesthood. Every individual Christian shares through Him the power of offering up acceptable service to God; the Christian minister shares through Him the additional power of offering for his brethren, and communicating gifts to them by virtue of the priesthood of Christ.

Having made these explanations of the individual priesthood of Christians and of the particular priesthood of the clergy, I now proceed to give further light upon the latter. In 1 Corinthians ix. 15, we read as follows: "Do you not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? even so hath the

Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." Tythes was the original grant of God to His priests, and here when the maintenance of the Christian ministry was in question, reference is at once made to the law which provides for the sons of Aaron. But if Christian ministers were not priests, and had no sacrifice to offer, how could the law, which had been made expressly for the priests, be referred to in their behalf, unless that same law recognized them as true priests. St. Paul evidently had no doubt of his own priestly character.

In the 11th verse of St. Jude's Epistle, the sin of schism or separation from the lawfully appointed teachers is referred to, and the effects of such schism is said to be "the perishing in the gainsaying of Core." That gainsaying consisted of resisting the authority of God's priests, when, with other wicked people, they said precisely what the new sect has said: "Ye take too much upon you ye sons of Levi, seeing all the congregation are holy;" that is, they are all priests—"wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?" Num. xvi. 3. Why therefore does St. Jude warn such rebels of the effects of Core resisting God's priests, if there were no priests in the Church by Divine authority? for if these were not priests, of the New Covenant, no one could perish in resisting them.

It is acknowledged that the



opening of Revelations represents the Church of Christ. In the fourth chapter of that prophetic book, the Church is there pictured in acts of devotion and adoration; but the images are all borrowed from the temple. The throne, the Shekina, the four and twenty elders clothed in white, the seven lamps burning, the seven branched candlesticks, the sea of glass, the altar of incense, the harps, are all parts of the same hallowed scene; and, if the description of the Reformed Episcopal Meeting House was intended in the inspired record, we would be tempted to imagine that it was a very imperfect representation. And it is quite remarkable that the four and twenty elders representing the ministry are clothed in the very robes, not of the Jewish elders, but of the priests, while they are surrounded with all the elements of the temple service, and in no way resemble the elders of the synagogue. The number twenty-four correspond with the number of courses into which the Aaronic priests were divided, and each of those courses had a president who was called "the Elder" or "Presbyter:" I Chron. 24: 4.

In Rom. xv. 15, 16, we read the words of St. Paul: "Because of the grace that is given me of God that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ unto the Gentiles, ministering the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost."

The above passage of Holy Scripture is full of meaning, and direct to the point. The word rendered minister is *λειτουργων*, literally, a priest, and itself or derivatives are so used in Heb. viii. 2. A *minister* of the sanctuary—now, we all know that Christ is not only the priest but the high priest of the sanctuary. In Heb. viii. 6, He is said to have a more excellent *ministry*, because He is the mediator, that is, priest of the better covenant. In Heb. ix. 21, the vessels of the priests are said to be the vessels of the ministry, *λειτουργιας*, *i. e.*, the priesthood.

In the 11th verse of the 10th chapter to the Hebrew we read, "And every priest standing daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices," in this passage there can be no doubt of the meaning of ministering *λειτουργων* it means offering sacrifice the apostle tells us. But St. Paul says, more than that, "that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ—*ministering* *ιερουργουντα* literally translated as a priest, the gospel of God that the offering up—another sacrificial term—of the gentiles might be acceptable. How silly, then, in Mr. Cheney and his friends in schism to tell us that the word *ιερως* is not used in the New Testament as a term for the Christian clergy—they might just as well contend that the *elder* sons of Her Majesty are not members of the Upper House because they are never termed "My Lord." Surely they ought to know that offering

sacrifices is only one of the functions of Eldership, separated from it, indeed under the law but restored to it again by the gospel—by the authority of the great High Priest himself.

A sectarian writer, Vitranga, feels the weight of this text as being against his theory, and he admits that St. Paul does in the passage just quoted refer to the prophesy of Isaiah.—Is. lxiv. 21, and that the passage certainly marked the existence of a priesthood in the Christian Church; but he gets over the difficulty by supposing that it refers not to the ministry, but to the exercise of priestly power by the people at large, yet it is evident that St. Paul did not think so, for he says “the grace that is given unto *me* that *I* should be the minister, &c.

The prophesy, or prophecies, the apostle referred to are found first in Is. lxvi. 21, when speaking of *all nations* coming into the Church, that is the Catholic Church, he says “and I will take of them for Priests and for Levites saith the Lord”—*i. e.* they were to be in the stead of Priests and Levites—and again in Jeremiah xxxiii. 18, “neither shall the Priests, the Levites, want a man before me to offer burnt offerings and to do sacrifice continually.” These prophecies are plain enough, and so also is the declaration of St. Paul as being in accordance with them, “that I should be a *priest* of Jesus Christ to the gentiles ministering,” &c.

But in 1 Cor. x., 18-21, St.

Paul if possible, is still more explicit.

What say I then? that the idol is anything, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing? But I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils, ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils, ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils. Now according to the Rev. Mr. Cheney, Dr. Cummins, and others of the new sect, there can be no meaning attached to the above words of inspiration, the cup of the Lord and the cup of the devils; the Lord's table and the table of devils. The one here is said to be opposed to the other, just as truth is opposed to falsehood.

He plainly teaches that in the Lord's Supper Christians sacrifice to God.

On this account, in the New Testament the Holy Eucharist is the centre of all worship and the only service which the Lord has commanded, Mat. xxvi. 26, and which by example as our great High Priest he first celebrated. He also gave his first apostles and their successors unto the end of the world, power to do just as he did, Mat. xxviii. 20, John 14: 12; which he does in the following awful language: “As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you—Receive ye the Holy Ghost—whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto

them," John xx. 21-22-23. The Father sent him as a priest to make atonement for the sins of the world, so he sends his messengers forth as priests under him, and yet the priesthood belongs to himself who gave it, and through his ordained priests according to his promise he continues to offer up the same sacrifice he offered up once for all on Calvary, agreeable to what he promised in Malachi 1: 11, and chap. 3: 4, just as through his servant Noah he preached to the wicked antedeluvians in his day, 1 Pet. iii. 19; for Noah was said to be a preacher of righteousness, 2 Pet. ii. 5.

In carefully noting the institution of this sacrament, we cannot fail to receive information of its sacrificial character. When Jesus says, "Do this in remembrance of me," or, "for a memorial of me," He plainly referred his disciples to that out of which the Holy Eucharist originated, viz., the Passover Supper. He alludes to Lev. ii. 2-9, where "*the memorial*" in sacrifice was that portion of the victim which was laid on the altar and offered to God, in order to bring the whole oblation to remembrance before Him. The very expression, "*Do this,*" implies a sacrifice; the word is ποιετε, and means offer a sacrifice: See Ex. xxix. 36-39, Ex. x. 25, Lev. iv. 20, Ezra vi. 19. St. Paul says of Moses, "Through faith he kept the Passover:" Heb. xi. 28. The word "kept," the same as "Do," εποιησε, offered

the Passover. They tell us there are no priests of the New Testament; they might just as well tell us there is no Saviour in the New Testament; for no one is permitted in the Word to separate the atonement from the application of it by means of those priests which Christ has appointed to represent him on earth. With strict propriety and justice too, St. Paul could declare "We have no altar:" Heb. xiii. 10; and our Lord's words are addressed to us today as well as to the multitude and His disciples,— "When therefore thou bringest thy gift to the altar:" Matt. v. 23. The New Sect has plainly told us, "They have no altar," and we believe them; for they can have no altar without an authorized priesthood; and this they cannot have, for the great author of schism has no authority to give them, but the Holy Church throughout the world has an altar, and a sacrifice too. She ever had an altar and sacrifice, and while time lasts she ever will have an altar and sacrifice. For thus saith the Lord "from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the GENTILES; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the GENTILES, saith the Lord of Hosts." Malachi i. 11.

A commemorative sacrifice, of course, just like the sacrifice of the Passover; for every subsequent Passover to



the first one was a commemorative sacrifice among the Jews. The sacrifices of the law were prospective, but the sacrifice of the Christian altar is reflective; both bear precisely the same relation to the great sacrifice of Calvary. Wherever there is an altar there is a sacrifice, and wherever there is a sacrifice there must of necessity be a

priest to offer the sacrifice at the altar. Reader, we ask you to judge who believes in and love the Holy Scriptures." Is it the men who denounce their teaching, or the Church which joyfully believes the testimony of the sacred book, and acts upon their teaching according to the Divine direction?

---

#### THE IRISH CANADIAN AND THE NEW HERESY.

We have to thank our friend Boyle, the editor and proprietor of *The Irish Canadian*, for weekly copies of his paper, which we read with very great attention and pleasure. Its Editorials are able, and give manifest evidence of the no ordinary ability of the writer. To us the news of the dear old land that gave us birth, is read with satisfaction.

The Romanism of *The Irish Canadian* is another question altogether, although, as an honest man, our friend Boyle must necessarily give us lots of it. He has kindly noticed our "New Heresy," and some of his expressions we object to. He tells us some one belonging to Mr. Gallagher, must have been a Catholic! Why is it that our separated brethren of the Romish persuasion are not satisfied with their own name, without constantly using our name and title, Catholic, a title which never belonged to them? Gallagher was a Catholic until he joined the New Heresy. Roman-

ism is of modern date, compared with that of our ancient communion, and even if some of Gallagher's relatives in the past were Romanists, they could not have been such before 1570, which was the date of the Rise of the Romish Church in Great Britain. It had no organized existence before that period in our Country, therefore all the Gallaghers before 1570, must have been in communion with the Church of England.

Then again our Catholic and Apostolic, Church has something else to do besides protesting against Rome. The title Protestant is a political title, but religiously our church holds her own title, She is the Catholic Church of England, by which title she was known long, before there were any Romanists in the world to protest against. Our Church is not only the Church of the Apostles and Martyrs, but it is also the church of St. Patrick, notwithstanding the Rev. Father Burke in a very eloquent speech,

recently delivered in Ireland declared very confidently that our saint was a Romanist, because when ascending the hill of Tara, the historian does not say he had a wife with him. But if the historian omitted to mention Mrs. St. Patrick, he did not omit to tell us that St. Patrick's grandfather was a priest named *Potitus*. and that his father was a deacon named *Calphornius*, who had a family of two sons and five daughters by a lawful wife. A very respectable family, our friend himself will acknowledge for a Romish Ecclesiastic to have. The record of all this is found on page 49 of Murphy's Edition of the lives of St. Patrick and St. Bridget: a work issued by none but Romanists.

---

### HAS ARCHBISHOP LYNCH FORGOTTEN HIS CATECHISM?

As bearing on the assertion of Archbishop Lynch and others, that the "Infallibility of the Pope" was always part of the faith of the Roman Church, we give the following quotation from Keenan's "Controversial Catechism," a book which "appears under the expressed patronage of the Roman Catholic Bishops Carruthers, Gillis, Kyle, and Murdock, whose letters of recommendation all bear date within the last thirty years." It had also the benefit of the *imprimatur* of the American Archbishop Hughes. These are the words to which we would call attention:—

"Q. Must not Catholics believe the Pope himself to be infallible?"

A. This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic faith; no decision of his can oblige under pain of heresy, unless it be received and enforced by the teaching body, that is, by the Bishops of the Church."

A Protestant invention! This very thing is now asserted by Archbishop Lynch, who declares the infallibility of the Pope as an article of the faith for all Romanists to believe, therefore according to Keenan's Catechism Archbishop Lynch is a Protestant!!! for he now adopts the *Protestant* invention." We always thought the Protestants were right, and now we are sure of it, for Archbishop Lynch thinks so too.

---

### FASTING COMMUNION.

To the Editor of the Theological Instructor.

SIR,—I begin this second letter on the above subject with a translation of a passage of S. Ambrose, who was made Bishop of Milan, A.D. 374, and so represents the period immediately

after the Nicene Council (A.D. 325). He says (in Ps. cxix. No. 48) "Do thou, too, anticipate the wiles of the tempter, prepare first the Heavenly Banquet. A fast has been appointed, take heed thou neglect it not. And if hunger would drive thee to thy daily breakfast" (or "luncheon") "or want of self-restraint would refuse the fast, nevertheless the rather keep thyself for the Heavenly Banquet. Let no feast that can be prepared draw thee away so that thou be deprived of the Heavenly Sacrament. Put off a little, 'tis not long to the end of the day: nay, on most days as soon as the hours of mid-day come, we have to go to the Church, sing the hymns, celebrate the Oblation. Then assist prepared, that thou mayest receive to thee a defence, that thou mayest eat the Body of the Lord JESUS, in which is the remission of sins, the entreaty of the Divine reconciliation and eternal protection. Receive\* before the Lord JESUS in the hostelry of thy

mind; where His Body is, there is Christ. When the adversary shall see thy hostelry occupied by the brightness of the Heavenly Presence, he, understanding that all avenue for his temptations is intercepted by Christ, will flee and depart and thou shalt pass mid-night without offence; for the Evening Sacrifice admonishes thee never to forget Christ. Thou canst not forget when thou climbest up into thy bed, that Lord to whom at the close of the day thou pouredst forth thy prayer, *who filled thee and hungered* with the feast of His Body; for what thou shalt have thought of in the evening thou wilt soon review when thou awakest; the Lord JESUS Himself will awake thee, will admonish thee to arise, and to take the arms of prayer at what time the tempter is wont to assault."

We may now observe:—

1. That S. Ambrose, as well as his great convert, S. Augustine, looked upon Evening Communion as an exceptional occurrence. They did not offer the sacrifice in the evening at their own fancy, but when obliged by ecclesiastical rule or received custom: and, what is more to the point, they required the preparatory fast to be kept all day; except in the single case in which S. Augustine allows the custom of some Churches that received the Holy Gifts after dinner, (or supper) on Maundy Thursday, for the special commemoration of the institution after "eating." S.

---

\* *i.e.* I suppose 'beforehand', in anticipation of the assaults of the tempter. The argument that Christ is present because His Body is, exemplifies the simple faith with which the ancient Church accepted the words of Him, "by whom all things were made"; "This is My Body." At the same time the fathers knew not a carnal presence, and never indulged in the novel mode of trying to explain the mystery, called transubstantiation which is responsible for a great deal of the war that has raged round this "Sacrament of Love."



Ambrose very likely speaks of the same day's oblation in the passage above. At the same time he felt the great beauty of the rarely recurring "Evening Sacrifice" as much as any man, and indeed urged it on his hearers as an inducement to keep the fast, by the neglect of which they would be "deprived of the Heavenly Sacrament."

2. That the passages I have quoted, are simply specimens of the teaching of the early Church on the subject.

3. S. Augustine, as quoted in my last letter, explains the origin of the custom; and, even if he could be mistaken about S. Paul, testifies that in his day fasting communion was no novelty, but a practice of the whole Catholic Church from time immemorial.

4. We do not accordingly rest the practice in any express requirement of Holy Writ. The great mass of Christians of all ages have not been so ungenerous as to refuse the honour universally paid to so great a sacrament for want of an express injunction of Scripture. The Spouse of the Heavenly Bridegroom has not been so unloving as to wait till He bids her before seeking out acts of tender adoration: all too cold is her warmest service, but "she hath done what she could."

5. We cannot appeal to any Œcumenical Council, simply because there was no neglect great enough to call for such intervention while the Church was united, but testimony to this

duty is borne by various local councils.

6. We do appeal, if any "seem to be contentious," to the "custom" of the "Churches of God;" and such a universal custom has more force than a disciplinary canon of a general council, which would lapse unless continually promulgated. Pending decision by a council, we can only say what we trust a council would confirm,— "Let the ancient customs prevail."

7. The fact that this fast rests only on ecclesiastical authority may be a good reason for not holding too strictly to it. Surely it is better to communicate after food than not to communicate at all. On the other hand, it seems right not to violate such an ancient and reasonable practice from mere negligence or sloth.

8. It is by no means clear that the New Testament Scriptures mention only non-fasting or evening communion, though, if they did, that would not affect the validity of the contrary custom, especially if introduced by S. Paul. If a custom for which S. Augustine could find no origin nearer to him than the time of the Apostles, and which has prevailed ever since, is to lightly set aside, what are we to say of the promise of Christ and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. However, at Troas (Acts. xx.), St. Paul preached at night, but celebrated some time after midnight, early in the morning, before break of day.

Wishing you every success in your manly determination to

uphold the Catholic character of  
our Church against foes without  
and false sons within,

I remain,  
Yours truly,  
CATHOLICUS.

---

### RATIONALISM.

*To the Editor of the Theological Instructor.*

SIR—On page 148 of your September number you say: "That the Holy Apostles received their commission to preach, and to govern the Church of God from the Blessed Redeemer himself, we take it for granted none will be disposed to deny." I commend your charity, but I impugn your knowledge. Many do actually deny what you so confidently assume; and not only fanatical ignoramuses like the Plymouthists, but men of learning and distinction and influence. I shall just give you two typical instances, Dr. DePressensé is a French Protestant minister of great learning and ability. His various works on ecclesiastical history are well known and extensively read. From his "Early Years of the Christian Church" I copy the following words: "It is incontestible that in the primitive Church some private Christians, not invested with the apostolic office, had more influence than the majority of the Apostles; it is enough to cite the names of Stephen, Philip, and James!" he uses the word "office" but eviscerates it of all its force, by making the number "twelve" the only apostolic distinction; for thus they represented the whole spiritual Israel. "His (the apostle's) authority is not in

any way defined; it varies in the case of various apostles according to the nature of the *gifts* of each—it was to give place to a more spiritual apostleship."—Bk. 1, p. 49-50, Am. ed. Dr. Bryce, professor of Civil Law at Oxford, is a layman and the author of a learned book "The History of the Holy Roman Empire." He gives us the reformed idea of the Church "*a mere association* of Christian men, for the expression of mutual sympathy and the *better* attainment of certain common ends." page 327. And to shew that this is no mere chance statement, this brief clause is honoured with special notice in the index—"Effects of the reformation upon the Church." I will not ask your space to comment on such religious rubbish, as a Churchman I deny that this is reformation doctrine;—it is mere destruction. There is but half a step between it and infidelity; and I hold that sincere Protestants, orthodox maintainers of the old Creeds, should refuse any shelter to it under the much-abused name of Protestantism. It is the like of this that makes many in the present day regard the word with suspicion; why don't the Church Association hunt up such books, and warn the public

against them? The hunt would not be laborious. There is a world of misbelief latent in the little sentences I have extracted for you, and they are well worthy of consideration.

Yours,

October, 10, 1873. OBSERVER.

### WHAT'S IN A DREAM?

A private letter printed in the *Boston Transcript*, relates the following curious circumstances in connection with the death of the late Bishop Lee, of Iowa:

"We have been very anxious the last two weeks over the illness of Bishop Lee, which terminated in his death on Saturday morning. The whole community are saddened by the event. Some two months ago he got up in the night and took a bath, and on returning to his room he made a mistake and stepped off a long flight of stairs, and landed at the foot with a tremendous crash, as he was very heavy, weighing over two hundred pounds. It aroused the whole family, and Mrs. Lee and Carrie sprang from their beds, and lighting each a candle, went to see what had happened, and found the bishop lying on the floor of the entry. He got up, however, without aid, and seemed to have received no injury except a few slight bruises, though his right hand was a little lamed.

"Mr. H. and myself called on him two days after, and while telling us of the circumstance of the fall, he mentioned this coincidence: He had a letter in his hand, which he had just received from his son Henry, living at Kansas City. His son wrote: 'Are you well: for last

night I had a dream that troubles me. I heard a crash, and standing up said to my wife, "Did you hear that crash? I dreamed that father had a fall and was dead." I got up and looked at my watch, and it was 2 o'clock, I could not sleep again, so vivid was the dream." And it made him anxious to hear from home.

"The bishop said he was not superstitious, but he thought it remarkable that Henry should have had the dream at the very hour of the same night that the accident occurred. The difference in the time there and here is just fifteen minutes, and it was quarter-past two by his watch, marking it at the same moment. It was as if he had actually heard the fall. And the fall finally caused the bishop's death. His hand becoming intensely painful, and gangrene set in, which, after two weeks of suffering, terminated his life. We are none of us spiritualists, as you know, but surely facts like this must go far to make us realize that there is a basis of truth for their hypothesis of spiritual faculties resident in man. How did Henry Lee become cognizant of the accident to his father?"

In Holy Scripture, the dreams of Joseph, Pharaoh's servants, of Nebuchadnezzar, of Jacob



at Bethel, of St. Peter, of Pilate's wife, Joseph and the Blessed Virgin, and a multitude of others were all fraught with singular meaning and instruction. Of them the celebrated Kitto, on page 317 of vol. 1, says: In our day, or rather among ourselves, such dreams would be but little considered, and we are therefore the more struck by the serious attention with which they were in ancient times regarded. Which was right—our long neglect of dreams, or the strong attention which they received in former days, and do still receive among many nations? There can be no question respecting the dreams of Scripture. They were certainly prefigurative—they were true, they were important, and the attention they received was most proper. There can be no doubt of this; the question, therefore, really is, Whether dreams have ceased to be significant—whether this door of intercourse with the future has been closed? The view of dreams set forth in Scripture, and which prevades the sacred books, is, that God does sometimes make known his will to man, and disclose his purpose in dreams:—"God speaketh once, yea twice, yet man perceiveth it not—in a dream, in a vision of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, in slumberings upon their bed, then he openeth the ears of men, and sealeth their instruction; that he may withdraw man from his purpose, and hide pride from man." So also the prophet Joel, quoted by St. Peter in the great day of Pente-

cost, regards dreams as a form of prophetic intimation—"Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams." The question is, Whether these things have ceased? It may be so; miracles have ceased; prophecy has closed; why may not significant dreams also have ceased? They may; but have they? Few of the dreams of Scripture, scarcely any, have reference to spiritual matters; and some of them are of no importance but to the dreamers, affecting them only as individuals. We cannot therefore say that they would be discontinued from any spiritual reasons; and still less can we say, that the state of man requires them less now than of old. If we believe there is a spiritual world, why should we be eager to shut up almost the only door of intercourse with it? The state of man may often require intimations more distinct than can be conveyed by *impressions* upon the mind. These more distinct intimations can only be conveyed by words or signs; oral communications have ceased. The voice of God walks not now in our gardens, and is not heard upon our mountains; but a most fitting mode of symbolical or pictorial intimation is left, when the world is shut out, the bodily senses are dormant, and the mind is alone awake, and is capable of receiving any impression that may be made upon it. We can not only see, but hear. There is nothing that man can learn in his waking state, which may

not be imparted to him in a dream. The fact is, probably—more than probably—that God still speaketh once, yea twice, in dreams, yet still “man perceiveth it not.” It may be that the circumstances of our high civilization are unfavorable to such perceptions. “A dream,” says the wise man, “cometh through much business,” Eccles. iii. 5. By multiplying our ideas, by increasing the objects of interest and attention to us, the materials of mental association become so various, and the activity of the mind is so much awakened, that ordinary dreams are probably much more numerous than in older and simpler states of society, and the impressions they make more faint. The late rising, and the number of hours devoted to rest, among us, is also favorable to the increase of puerile dreams; whereas men leading a less wildering waking life, sleep regularly and shortly, but soundly; and, rising early in the morning, have but comparatively few dreams. It is well known that dreams seldom rise during sound sleep: and all the sleep of men of simple oriental habits is sound. Hence dreams being more numerous and less vivid, they make less impression on the mind, and those among them that may be really significant, become less heeded. Nevertheless, history, biography, and the experience of most of us, supply not a few modern instances, in which dreams have been most important for warning, for

guidance, or for the detection of crime. Those of the latter class are not, perhaps, the most frequent in themselves; but they are most generally as authentically known, as their evidence is necessarily produced in the investigation of the case. Yet even in these cases, there has seemed a general disposition to underrate their importance, for which we feel unable to account, but from the general disposition among the men of the world to discountenance the idea of a particular Providence. This idea is necessarily involved in the belief, that God speaketh to man in dreams; and this very reason, which renders the belief distasteful to the world, should recommend it to the earnest consideration of those to whom that doctrine is dear.

Many of our readers will remember a case which filled the newspapers some years ago. One point in it, which was only mentioned, because it was historically necessary to complete the case, engaged our attention greatly at the time. A young woman was murdered in a barn, and buried under the floor. She was thought by all who concerned themselves about her to be still alive in another place: and the murder remained not only undiscovered, but unsuspected at the time, when the young woman's mother was warned *repeatedly* in a dream to search the barn. She did so; the murder was thus discovered, and the murderer (Corodor,) condemned and executed. Now,

from what other cause than a supernatural action upon the mind of the mother, could this dream have been produced? But men *would* not perceive or acknowledge this. The counsel on both sides, the judge, the reporters, the editors, all, with one consent, pushed this most prominent feature of the case aside. It did not elicit one serious reflection, one pious remark. It was to them only a dream. To us it was the finger of Providence; it was the voice of God, responding to the cry of innocent blood.

Other cases, perhaps more striking, might be produced to show that God has not ceased to speak to man in dreams, whether he will perceive it or not; and that Pilate's wife's message to her husband:—"Have thou nothing to do with that just person; for I have suffered many things this night in a dream because of him;" and St. Paul seeing in a dream a man of Macedonia praying to him for help, are not the last examples of such communications to mankind.

It would be curious to trace the ideas of dreams entertained by different nations. We have scriptural evidence that, among the Egyptians and Babylonians, dreams were more seriously regarded, and the task of interpreting them intrusted to a distinct and learned profession. Great importance was attached to dreams among the Persians; and it is reported, that Cyrus was cast forth at his birth,

because a dream of his mother's was interpreted to promise him universal empire. In the *Chou-king* of the Chinese, it is in dreams that the sovereign of heaven makes his will known to the sovereign of the earth. In Homer, dreams came from Jove; and by both Greeks and Romans it was believed, that in the solitude of caves, and groves, and temples, the gods appeared in dreams, and deigned to answer in dreams their votaries. Among the Hindus, dreams give a coloring to the whole business of life. Men and women take journeys, perform arduous penances, and go through expensive ceremonies from no other cause than a dream. Among the North American Indians *all* dreams are of importance, but some are of mysterious fatality to the dreamer, so intimately connected with his well-being, and even his existence, that to obtain their fulfilment, becomes the one object of his thought, and the aim of all his endeavours.

---

#### NOTICE.

We are compelled to request all those who have not paid for the last year's *Instructor* to remit to us at once, and those who wish to renew their subscriptions for the coming year will kindly do the same thing. Subscriptions are strictly in advance (see terms on second page of the cover.) The price of the Magazine alone without the four works mentioned is \$1 a year. We pay postage in every case.