

# The Theological Instructor.

No. 11.

TORONTO, NOVEMBER, 1874.

VOL. I.

TO THE REV. CHARLES CHENEY,  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

REV. SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your sermon preached before what you call “The General Council of the Reformed Episcopal Church,” in May last, together with three other pamphlets bearing upon the subject matter of your discourse, and, having carefully examined them, I feel that duty prompts me to make some observations on the reasons you give in them for your extraordinary proceedings in the formation of a new sect: and I am quite sure, sir, that did you but see your conduct in the light of God’s word, you would, one and all, tremble in view of the Divine displeasure.

On the fourth page of your sermon, sir, you tell us that “the early Church was no better than that of every succeeding age, composed, not of angels, but of men, and of the most various and heterogeneous character.”

You have very correctly drawn the picture of the early Catholic Church, but, sir, are you not aware that in doing so you expose yourself and your misguided brethren in schism to no small amount of condemnation. What ancient worthy have you attempted to initiate in your recent schismatical movements? Do you find St. Paul or St. Barnabas,

although disputing upon some points, attempting to secede from Christ’s mystical body in order to form a new sect, simply because one happened to differ from some religious view or opinion of the other? This, sir, was impossible; they had not so learned Christ; and each one understood the Divine intention with regard to unity—John xvii. 21; and that a society founded subsequently to our Lord’s establishment of his priesthood could have no claim to the promise given to the first bishops of the church: “Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.—Matt. xxviii. 20.

And surely, sir, if the American Church was willing to bear with yourself and friends in your avowed and unconcealed opposition to Church principles, so long as you did not attempt to change her established and scriptural usages, you should not be the first to say, “We shall leave the Church altogether unless the large majority of its communicants yield at once to our views and feelings on all theological questions.

In every pamphlet, sir, you have had the kindness to send me I find the acknowledgement that because the church authorities

would not allow you to change her time-honored services, or to omit the most scriptural parts of her liturgy, you felt it your duty to depart from her and enter a sect that never had a beginning until the year 1874—nearly two thousand years since the venerable Church which you had left had received her commission and ministry from Christ. On page 15 of your sermon you acknowledge that nine-tenths of the clergy in the United States are against you, and that you tried in vain to stay the flood of error but could not, for your "Reformers" could not convince the Church that they had any more theological learning than was necessary to make them honest churchmen.

On page 6 of the letter written by the Rev. James A. Latane to the Right Rev. Bishop Johns, dated at Wheeling, Va., Jan. 12, 1874, the Rev. gentleman complains that at the last general convention a large majority voted down every Canon that you and your party could frame against the Church, and on that account he concluded he had a right to leave her hallowed walls, and enter a sect where he could teach heresy untrammelled by either the rubric or the prayer-book.

On page 8 of the Rev. M. B. Smith's letter to the Right Rev. Bishop Odenheimer, he declares that "the majority having made the Canons he had no alternative but to withdraw from the service of the Church, because they refused himself and others the liberty to change the prayer-book. This last complaint against the

Church is found on page 9 of this extraordinary letter. Thus, from your own shewing, you have no shadow of authority for your schism, and still less to your own claim to the character of a bishop in the Church of God.

The reference then, sir, that you made to the primitive church was a very unhappy one for your cause, for notwithstanding the differences of opinion that existed among Catholic Christians in the beginning you are not able to point us to a solitary case of secession among either the clergy or laity; and nobody was found who dared to violate his baptismal vow by even threatening to withdraw from that Church to which our blessed Lord himself belonged and of which he is still the head, simply because the baptized were obliged to be subject to the law of Christ, that is, to obey them that had the rule over them. Heb. xiii. 17.

In speaking of the individual Christian, and the Church of which he is a member, you say on page 5, "Is it not the aggregation of these spiritual units of that which it helps to compose," and you add, "So perfect is the resemblance between the saved believer and the spiritual Church that the one is a microcosm of the other. The essential characteristics of the true Church are a *spotless* righteousness, a *perfect* peace with God, and a joy of which the world knows nothing." These, we confess, are all very desirable things, but if they be what you say, "the *essential* characteristics of the true Church I fear no such Church has ever

been found on earth, and in that sense Christ our blessed Lord was the only perfect Churchman that ever lived. Your error on this point, sir, is the same as that of the most pestilential and sacrilegious of all the sects, I mean the Plymouth Brethren, which, as a sect, has neither part nor lot in Christ further than other sinners who remain outside the holy covenant. Dr. Martin Luther tells us in opposition to you, to them, and to other sects that the Church has a body as well as a soul, but it appears, sir, that you ignore the body altogether, and believe in nothing but the soul of Christianity. But a greater than Dr. Luther, sir, has told us the very same thing. Christ, our Divine Saviour, hath said it. "Let the tares grow together with the wheat until the harvest, lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up the wheat also."—Matt. xiii 28, 29, 30.

Now, sir, let us come to the test of God's word. Were there no profane and impious persons admitted into the Jewish Church by God's own authority? Alas! the painful facts are recorded for our instruction in the old Testament scriptures; while the profane stiff-necked people that were admitted into it by circumcision were, in unmistakable language, called "the sons of God." For thus saith the Lord to Pharaoh, king of Egypt, "Let my son go that he may serve me, and if thou refuse to let him go behold I will slay thy son, even thy first-born."—Ex. iv. 23.

Nor in the Christian dispensation is the Church much

better, that is, so far as your standard of religion is concerned. Human nature is still the same. Judas betrayed his Lord, and Peter denied him, although they were both not only called into the Church by Christ himself, but unto the highest functions of the priesthood. And he who knows all about his Church represents it in the first paragraph of the 25th chapter of the Gospel by St. Matthew as composed of ten virgins, five of whom were wise and five foolish, but all of them had a right in the kingdom, and lived and died in it.—Matt. xxv. 1. The Gospel net, the Lord declares; catches bad fishes as well as good ones, and the figure employed here is easily understood as meaning good and bad Christians, and, like the tares, the bad ones are to be separated from the good, not by the Reformed Council of New York or Chicago in 1874, but by the infinitely wise Jehovah at the end of the world—Matt. xiii 47, 48, 49. Even the babes in Christ, who had just been born again in baptism, were represented by St. Paul as carnal, thus he says. "And, I brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ—1 Cor. iii. 1. Away then, sir, with your vain and unscriptural idea of a spiritual Church without a visible body. The divine plan is, and I am sure it is the best, that the good and the bad should remain together until the last day, and this is the reason why St. Paul forbids us to judge in spiritual matters, simply because we are

incompetent. "Why dost thou judge thy brother...for it is written we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ; so then every one of us must give an account of himself to God.—Rom. xiv. 10.

In the 3rd chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul calls all the members of that Church the children of God; but, sir, were they children according to your ideas of a spiritual Church? Let St. Paul answer the question himself. He tells them he had laboured in vain among them, and assures them that although they were in Christ (Gal. iii, 27), yet Christ was not formed in them.—Gal. iv., 19, 20. But notwithstanding all this, he declares them all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus — Gal. iii 26. It is useless, sir, to multiply passages for the whole Bible is on the side of the Church, and in opposition to your Council of New York and Chicago. All this is reasonable enough: the Church is the school to fit us for a higher life in heaven. We can not get our Christian education in a day; it requires a lifetime in which to graduate for the great college above; and, sir, you know the comparison is perfect, no child finishes his education the day he enters school; but in your sermon, sir, you declare your conviction that the Christian has finished his education in Christ almost before he enters the Church at all; for on page 6, you declare "the *essential* characteristics of the true Church are a *spotless* righteousness, a *perfect* peace with God, and a joy of which the world

knows nothing"; and the *sect* that teaches this absurdity, repugnant as it is to every book of the Divine word, you tell us is a Scriptural Church!! Verily, whatever it may be called, it is a slander on the Bible to call it a scriptural one.

With you, sir, the Church is all wheat *and no tares*, and all wise virgins and no foolish ones, and all good fishes without any bad ones. Against all these vain assertions of the sectarian world our loving Saviour warns us, saying, as the temptation comes from New York or Chicago, or any where else, "Lo, I have told you before."—Matt. xxiv. 25.

On page 7, sir, you tell us that your little schism "acknowledges no authority as co-ordinate with the written word of God." Do you insinuate, sir, by that assertion, that the Church which you left does any thing else, if so, her whole history proves, to the world, that you have wickedly misrepresented her. You know, sir, she still holds to the Article which says that whatever cannot be proved from Holy Scripture is not required of any man to be believed; but sir, if you acknowledge the written word I have just given you, I call upon you in God's name to repent, and acknowledge your error, or else show that I have not quoted the passages, against you, correctly. I simply ask you to imitate those noble Bereans you tell us you so much admire. Just like them "receive the word with all readiness," and search the scriptures daily to see are these things so. We fear you will not, because you

dare not, for the Holy Scriptures are against you, and that in every particular where you dissent from the teaching of the Church.

You speak of an Evangelical believer! What other kind of a believer is there? Verily the new sect has to coin new expressions! Where is the phrase Evangelical believer applied to any one in the Bible?

Right well, sir, you know, or at least you ought to know, that you have misrepresented Christ's Spouse, the Church, when you say, on page 8 that she urges tradition as interpreters of the New Testament. The whole English speaking world, sir, knows that your assertion against your mother and her children is a slander.—Psalm l, 20. for she and they abhor that tradition which rejects the commandments of God. It is true the Church does appeal to the fathers, not as she does to the Holy Scriptures. but as witnesses to the faith of the Church in their day; and the interpretation of the word which has been handed down to us by a succession of writers from the beginning she holds to be the true interpretation; but tradition, unconnected with the inspired word of God, she utterly rejects; and she is ever ready, nay she is anxiously willing to have her faith tested by the "law and the testimony."—Is. viii., 20. She thus teaches her children to receive the word with all readiness of mind, Acts xvii., 11, and on this account they are more noble than the men of the new schism who receive nothing but what they themselves have concocted in New York and

Chicago, even as the Bereans were more noble than those of Thessalonica for doing the very same thing.—Acts xvii., 11. How absurd, sir, must your statement appear even to yourself that it was tradition that led the disciples to believe that St. John was not to die.—John xxi. 23. It was not tradition, sir, that taught them that mistake! They simply misunderstood the words of Christ as related in the 22nd verse, "L. I will that he tarry till I come." To us our Lord's meaning is plain enough. It was the will of Christ that St. John should tarry, that is, live until the destruction of Jerusalem—even as he said in another place "There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."—Mat. xvi. 28. Or as St. Mark expresses it "till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.—Mark ix. 1. That is the kingdom of God's vengeance upon the Jews. And surely, sir, you should have understood this much of the holy gospels. You talk about uninspired men putting their constructions upon the Divine word. Do you not yourself, sir, attempt the very same thing every time you preach to the people? Was not that interpretation your own which you put upon the text you preached from in New York, and which we find on page 5 of the sermon you had the kindness to send me from Chicago.

Your ideas, of what on page 9 you call the Evangelical believer, makes the preaching of the gospel superior to every other ordinance of Christ. Here again, sir, your

knowledge of Christ and His Church is very much at fault; for when the priest approaches the altar, and offers the sacrifice that Christ has commanded to be offered there (Mat. xxvi. 26, 27, 28), he as much preaches the gospel as when he ascends the pulpit. And this is the meaning of St. Paul when he says to the Gallatians who had never seen Christ in the face, and who therefore had never witnessed the crucifixion, "*Oh foolish Gallatians, who hath bewitched you that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified among you*"!—Gal. iii. 1. That is, he had been crucified among them in the Christian sacrifice which pointed to Calvary; so that every time they had assembled for holy worship "Jesus had been evidently set forth crucified among them." At all events, it is not for you, sir, nor for me, nor for any one else to place one ordinance of Christ against another or as greater than another, for they all have their use. And on this point the Church needs no defence, for the best preachers of the age are priests of her communion. Baptism and the laying on of hands, or confirmation, are reckoned by St. Paul as among the first principles of the doctrine of Christ.—Heb. vi. 1, 2. And certainly in the commission given to the apostles and their successors, our Lord places the making of disciples by baptism as antecedent to teaching—thus: Πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς — Διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν, which being interpreted is "Go

ye therefore and make disciples of all nations by baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.—Mat xxviii. 19, 20; whether prayer, praise, sacraments, or preaching. Our God has proclaimed himself to be a jealous God, and he reasonably requires that all his ordinances should be honoured alike; and therefore, sir, you are at great fault in honouring one as superior to the other, and you ought not to tell us, as you do on page 9 of your sermon "that the preaching of the gospel is superior to every other ordinance." Here again God's word is against you—1 Cor xi. 23. You tell us that it is the preaching of the gospel that sets forth the death of Christ. Surely the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist is represented, not by tradition, mind you, not by ecclesiastical councils, and canons, but by the written word of God as "showing forth the Lord's death until he come"—1 Cor. xi. 26. Sectarians, sir, do not understand the Divine word—the oracles of God were never given to them, but they were given to the Church, and the holy Church throughout the world reverences the word to-day more than all the sectarians in christendom—and she is the keeper of it.

On page 13 of your printed sermon you say: "The group of services in the Prayer Book of that Church, which comprises the ordinal, is prefaced by a declaration, solemn in its language and far-reaching in its scope—"It is

evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.'

"It is clear from these words that two points were intended to be definitely and dogmatically stated: 1st, that Bishops constitute a separate order from the Presbyters, instead of being Presbyters chosen to preside over their brethren. 2nd, that this view of the Episcopate rests at least *in part* upon the testimony of the Scripture.

"But vainly have we searched the word of God for the proof of this declaration. Some of us have painfully tried to believe that there was no inconsistency between the assertion of the ordinal and the results of our Scripture study. But driven from one stronghold after another, each has proved a failure, and as honest men we were compelled to admit that nowhere in the Bible could we find even a trace of distinction in order between the bishop and the presbyter "

You tell us "that vainly have you searched the word of God for proof of this declaration"!! Now, sir, if you be honest and sincere in searching after the truth, I will now, with God's assistance, help you out of the difficulty. In the old dispensation God appointed three orders of the ministry—first, the High Priest; secondly, the Common Priest; and thirdly, the Levites—corresponding with the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, of the

Christian dispensation. Thus Christ himself gave his authority to the Apostles, and they gave power and authority to presbyters or priests, and also to deacons. In the Acts of the Apostles we find these three orders, apostles, presbyters or priests, and deacons every where recognized. In the very first chapter of that book we have an account of the election of Matthias as apostle, that he might take the apostleship of Judas. St Luke informs us that the apostles ordained them elders in every church, the original word being presbyter, or priest, which is an abbreviation of that word, and signifies a prayer.—Acts xiv. 23. In Acts, 6th chapter, we have an account given us of the election and ordination of the seven deacons. In Acts xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, and chapter xvi. 4, apostles and elders are mentioned as distinct classes of ministers, nor were these elders laymen, for the distinction seems carefully made between apostles, elders, and brethren. I will now give you a specimen from the Epistles. The 1st chapter of St. Paul to the Philippians opens with a salutation, "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Here, sir, are three orders for your information: first, the apostles Paul and Timothy; secondly, the presbyters or priests, here called bishops, for the word means overseers, because they had the oversight of the flock; and thirdly, the deacons or ministers. Now, sir, you will mark, if you please, the apos-

tle's language in addressing the bishop or apostle Timothy, of the church of Ephesus. This Timothy was a young man, very likely younger than very many of the elders at Ephesus; for St. Paul charges him, "Let no man despise thy youth," and every line of St. Paul's epistle to him proves that he, Timothy, was invested with episcopal authority over the presbyters, which I shall soon prove to have been these. The whole Epistle is designed to teach him how he should rule the elders. Every part of the charge is addressed to him personally. "This charge I commit to thee, son Timothy; these things write I unto thee, that thou mightest know how to behave thyself in the house of God.—Tim. ii. 18; iii. 14, 15; iv. 6.

In this Epistle he is instructed to exercise ecclesiastical discipline, "that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine." "Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses." "Them," that is, the elders, "that sin, rebuke before all, that others may fear." "I charge thee that thou observe these things, doing nothing by partiality."—1 Tim. i. 3; 1 Tim. v. 19, 20, 21.

Mark again, sir, the rules given him in respect to ordinations. The 3rd chapter of the 1st Epistle is taken up with describing qualifications which he should require in those who are to be admitted to Holy Orders. Thus he says that the deacons must first be proved—must be grave, not double-tongued, not given to

much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre, holding the mystery of the faith in a good conscience. They that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, that is, a higher degree, viz., that of a priest or presbyter.

In the same way the proper qualifications of a priest are given. A bishop or priest, he says, must be blameless; and these descriptions are to guide him in observing the directions afterwards given, "Lay hands suddenly on no man"—1 Tim. v. 22; and again, "The things which thou hast heard of me the same commit *thou* to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also."—2 Tim. ii. 2.

Now, sir, we would ask if Timothy was nothing but a priest, and not an apostle or bishop, what right had he to receiving accusations against his brother priests, and rebuking them before all? These things could not have been done by him if ministers were all equal in the primitive Church.

I will now turn to the Church of Ephesus, and, according to my promise, find unmistakable proof that there were elders there at the very time St. Paul addressed Timothy as their bishop. In the 20th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we are told that when St. Paul was on his way to Jerusalem, having tarried at Miletus, he sent from there to the neighboring Church at Ephesus that the elders might come to him and receive his final charge since "they should see his face no more." And how does he address them?



Precisely as those whose functions are entirely *pastoral*, whose duty and business it is to feed the flock, to rule them and instruct them. He directs them to remember the warning he had given them for the space of three years, to take heed to themselves and to the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers, to feed the Church of God; but there is nothing said here about one of them having authority over another to depose him, not an intimation that any one among them, or that the whole of them united, had any right to ordain and make other elders; but widely different is the charge he gave to his son Timothy, who was directed to "lay hands suddenly on no man." and to commit the power he had received from this Apostle to faithful men who would "be able to teach others also."—2 Tim. ii. 2.

Let us now examine another case. It is that of Titus. Eusebius tells us in *Lib. iii. chap. 4*, that Titus was appointed over the churches of Crete, as Timothy was over those of Ephesus; and all ancient writers unite in making the same assertion. Now, hear what St. Paul says to him: "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I have appointed thee." Nothing, sir, can be plainer than this Apostolic instruction. This is the very "pattern showed us in the mount." St Paul says,— "I left thee in Crete that *thou* should set in order what was wanting, and ordain elders or

priests in every city." St. Paul received his authority from Christ—he gave authority to Timothy and Titus, and they gave the same authority to others. Was there no succession in all this? First, Christ; secondly, St. Paul; thirdly, Timothy and Titus; fourthly, the others that they ordained or consecrated (one of them afterwards was called the Angel of the Church of Ephesus), and so on the sacred succession, like the rising and setting of the sun, like the continuation of every blade of grass, so the Episcopal succession continued until it comes down to our own beloved Bishop in Toronto.

To the same effect is our Lord's address to the bishops, or angels, of the seven churches of Asia. In each one of these churches, as for example Ephesus and Smyrna, history tells us there were many congregations and elders. Yet the warnings and admonitions are not written to these elders at all, nor to the church collectively, but to the angel or chief officer, as having the oversight of all. Examine, sir, what is said to the angel at Ephesus, where thirty years before there were many elders.—Acts xx. 17. Here we find in the year 96 its chief officer exercising the same authority over the clergy, investigating and rejecting their claims, which was described to his predecessor Timothy more than a quarter of a century before. The address is to him, "*Thou* hast tried them which say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars." Here are four uncontroverted links in the succession

which you cannot reject, and which, to a demonstration, proves the doctrine of Episcopal succession.

I have thus driven you from your stronghold of heresy and sin, and you dare not say I have not proved every point to you, and have shewed you convincingly that the *Holy Scriptures do teach* what the Ordinal teaches, that there is, and ever will be, a distinction between the bishop and his presbyters and deacons. And we hope to hear no more such vain assertions as that you have *vainly* searched the word of God for proof of the declaration of the prayer-book. "That it is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons." If the New Testament does not teach the truth of apostolic succession even far plainer than the prayer-book does, then it teaches nothing, and no truth can be proven from the Divine record, for nothing is plainer in scripture than the Episcopal succession. It is useless for you, sir, to equivocate on the change of words, for if presbyters were sometimes called bishops, they never were called apostles, they were called prophets, pastors, and teachers, but never apostles; and if bishops were originally called apostles—the name is nothing, it is the office we want to find out—we now know and recognize the same office of apostle, as that of a diocesan bishop, but a paro-

chial bishop is simply a priest; the former having the oversight of a whole diocese composed of priests and people, the latter having only the oversight of the flock, but not the pastors of the flock.—Acts xx. 28. Just as some thousands recognize Sunday as the Sabbath, though the Lord's day was never called the Sabbath in the New Testament, nor in the ancient church. Nor will it avail you any thing to tell us that there were no apostles but those who received their commission directly from Christ; for St. Paul called Epaphroditus, "my brother and companion in labor, and fellow soldier, *but your apostle.*"—Phil. ii. 25. In our translation the word is *messenger*, but in the original it is apostle, and on this St. Jerome observes, and I suppose you will readily acknowledge that his observations are just as likely to be correct as your own. He says, "By degrees others were ordained apostles by those whom our Lord had chosen, as that passage to the Phillippians shows: I suppose it necessary to send you Epaphroditus your apostle"; and Theodoret gives this reason why Epaphroditus is called the apostle of the Philippians. "He was entrusted with the episcopal government as being their bishop."

On page 16 you object to the title priest being given to God's ministers; but you ought to know that the word is only a contraction of presbyter, which is given them in the New Testament. You declare your conviction on the same page that we have one Great High Priest, which

is Christ, but that we have no other priests. Now, sir, will you be so kind as to inform us how there could be a high priest, where there are no ordinary ones. The very expression "high" most incontrovertibly proves that we have the ordinary priests; for with *one* order there surely can be no comparison.

On page 17 you repeat your "resolve to know no other standard of truth than the revealed word of God, whether it be in expunging baptismal regeneration from the Prayer Book, or limiting the Bishops." In the letter of the Rev. James A. Latane to the Right Rev. the Bishop of West Virginia, page 2, we have the reasons given why he and his confreres left the Church for a new sect. The following is his language: "There are expressions in the Baptismal Service which seem to teach that every infant, when baptized, is thereby regenerated." He does not venture so far as to say that no infant is regenerated in baptism, but he does deny that every one is regenerated in the holy sacrament. Now if one infant be regenerated in baptism, what is there to hinder every one that receives the sacred seal of adoption. Do you hold that God is a respecter of infants. Popery, sir, lies at the root of your unbelief, you have received Calvin's heresy instead of Christ's teaching: and Calvin learned it from the Romanists, the monks of the Augustine order, who are Calvinists to the present day. You would freely, perhaps, acknowledge the regeneration of all baptized infants,

were you sure that they were all *elected* from the beginning; but you cannot believe that a non-elect infant can possibly "become a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." On the contrary, the Church holds the certainty of all God's promises to the baptized, and every one which our merciful God has made to his children, he made in the covenant of their baptism, and by his authority his ministers are commanded to make disciples of all nations by baptizing them: and as nations consist of men, women, and children; so we are commanded to baptize men, women and children, nothing doubting but that God's promises are all yea and amen. And here, sir, I wish to correct an error which you and your friends strangely fall into, with all the sects. You talk and write about the Church teaching that baptism regenerates its subjects—but it ought not to be necessary to tell you and others who have been clergymen of the Church that she teaches no such doctrine. She holds that God's Holy Spirit regenerates, but that he pledges himself to do so in the holy covenant of our baptism. You talk about planting yourself on the Bible only. We take you at your word, and we ask you to hear its teaching on the subject of regeneration. We will begin with our Lord's words to Nicodemus "Except a man be born of water and the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." —John iii. 5. What do you think of that passage of holy

writ? Do you believe it? You know well that you do not. It is evidently tinctured, too much, with High Church doctrine to suit you and your friends in schism; for you tell us on page 17 you expunge baptismal regeneration from your prayer book; and yet you dare not even make the attempt to deny but that Jesus, in unmistakable language, taught and still teaches it in the passage I have just quoted—Born of water and the spirit; not born of the spirit without water, but born of water and the spirit, embracing the two parts of the same sacrament the outward and visible sign, water, and the inward part of thing signified, a death unto-sin and a new birth unto righteousness, and Jesus teaches both as essential to this the sacrament of our regeneration.

St. Peter in speaking of the eight souls who were saved by water in the days of Noah says, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth now save us."—1 Peter iii. 21. Do you believe that in baptism we are saved? You know, and declare, that you abhor the very idea of being saved in baptism: and yet the Church believes it, because she understands it. She knows that baptism is the seal of the covenant or contract, and that in the contract of our baptism God engages, yea swears by himself that he will be a God to us and our children.—Acts ii. 38, 39. This embraces salvation for time and eternity. By entering into the holy contract or covenant we are placed in a state of salvation, else what do the covenant and its seal mean?

are we unregenerate, unpardoned and unsaved, and yet received? and that too by the authority of him who cannot lie? We have only to say that we believe him when he assures us in his word that in baptism we are saved—1 Pet. iii. 21. The Holy Scriptures, sir, frequently speak of our salvation, but how do they represent us as being saved?

Hear, all ye despisers of the word what St. Paul saith, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy *he saved us*, by the WASHING of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.—Titus iii. 5. There it is, sir, chapter and verse for you. Do you believe the great truth—your sermon, sir, proclaims you an unbeliever! and you have wiped out the very mention of baptismal regeneration from your prayer book. Now let us dwell upon this passage a little. St. Paul says, "According to his mercy *he saved us*, but how or by what instrument did he save us, the Great Apostle answers, in the language of a true Churchman, "by regeneration's washing and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Oh yes, you tell us, that means the baptism of the Holy Ghost. But, sir, reflect a little. The first thing is we are saved *by regeneration's washing*, that is, baptism; and the next thing is the "renewing of the Holy Ghost," as the result of the "washing of regeneration." The very same two parts referred to by the Lord himself to Nichodemus, *water* and the *spirit*, St. Paul calls it regeneration's wash-

ing, that is, *water*, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, that is, *the spirit*,

You object, sir, to the phrase the renewing of the Holy Ghost as the result of baptism. Well, I will try and make it plainer for you. Come along with me to the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. This is the account given by St. Luke of the first Whit Sunday, or Pentecost. Now, when the people heard the preaching of St. Peter they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Now what did St. Peter say to them? Did he tell them that they must get their good neighbors all together and unite in prayer at some anxious seat in order that they might be converted? Nothing of the kind. St. Peter had not so learned Christ, but he did say unto them, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Would you, sir, make the same reply if the same question were asked you to-day by convicted sinners. Your printed sermon, proclaims you would not, simply because you do not believe that doctrine of the Gospel, and you left the Church rather than acknowledge it in the baptismal service. Just like St. Paul, St. Peter regards the gift of the Holy Ghost and the remission of sins as the result of our baptism, and you boldly tell the world you do not believe it, and yet you affirm, on page 7, that the "Bible only" is the rule of

your faith. Have I given you the Divine word correctly? Then all I ask of you is to believe it, a duty which, I greatly fear, you are not prepared to do.

Let us now take the specific case of Saul of Tarsus, when he became convinced of his sins, and the voice answered him, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." Saul made a similar enquiry to that of the Jews on the day of Pentecost, or Whit Sunday, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"—Acts ix. 6. The Divinely appointed minister was there who had received authority to teach, and when Ananias appeared he said, in answer to Saul's enquiry, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins."—Acts xxii. 16. Now, sir, honestly, what would you have said if you had been present and heard Ananias teach that lesson to Saul? We imagine we hear you. You are a Puseyite Ananias! You believe in Popish ritualism, and evidently have no sympathy with us in what we call the Reformed Episcopal Church. Away with you, Ananias, away with you, we don't want to hear any more of that kind of preaching; and St. Paul, to the very day of his death, knew no better than to believe what he was taught, viz., that in baptism we obtain the remission of our sins and are saved; in other words, that "we are made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven."

Thus far I have noticed all your objections to the Church; and I think I have proved from the word of God that they are

frivolous and vain, and they come with as much force against the New Testament as they do against the Book of Common Prayer; for in most cases what you object to in the Prayer Book, are the very words of inspiration. In the books you kindly sent me, you object first to the constitution of the Church because it embraces the bad and the good. I have shown from Holy Scripture that this state of things was to exist by Divine appointment unto the end of the world. You next object to apostolic succession. I have given you five links in the chain of succession as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, and have proved that the Lord himself appointed three distinct orders in the holy ministry. The only thing now to be considered is, your objection to the Church's absolution.

On page 4 of Mr. Latane's letter, already referred to, the author objects to the priest declaring to the people the absolution and remission of their sins, which you say you have also expunged from your new Prayer Book. Would it not have been wiser for your Reformed Council to have begun with the New Testament, for that is the grand fountain from which the Prayer Book is supplied, and it is perfectly useless for you to attempt the stopping of the stream so long as the fountain flows; therefore so long as the New Testament is honoured in our land, the doctrine of absolution, as declared by the priest, will be held by every devout Christian. And is not this reasonable. St.

Paul says, "Let a man so account of us as ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God."—1 Cor. iv. 1. Now, a minister in a foreign court represents his sovereign that sends him, and what he does by the sovereign's authority, and in the sovereign's name, is as truly done as if the sovereign had personally and officially done it himself. The ministers of Christ are ministers of his Gospel, which offers a pardon to all those who sincerely repent, but according to your "reformed" religion you would forbid him doing this very thing; you therefore on your own shewing, do not believe in the true gospel at all, for you deny to the ministers of Christ the power which he has conferred upon them of faithfully declaring to the penitent the absolution and remission of his sins.

It is well, sir, that your Council in New York and Chicago has no authority from Christ or his Church, and the people must be taught this. It was Christ, and not even the Church, that gave authority to the priesthood or ministry to pronounce and declare to the people being penitent the absolution and remission of their sins. Will you kindly listen to the voice of your disregarded Saviour as he gives authority to his first ambassadors, when he graciously promised to be with their office unto the end of the world. Be silent then while he reproves you, and vindicates his own priesthood. Hear what the Son of God says to the first bishops of our Church, "As my Father hath sent

me, even so send I you."—John xx. 21. Can you deny the passage? Did our Lord act in his father's name? (John x. 25) so accordingly his ministers act in his name, and therefore our blessed Lord acknowledges the official acts of his ambassadors as his own acts, and as he has surely promised absolution from sin to the penitent so he has empowered his ministers to declare that absolution — precisely what the church teaches and the very thing to which you object. Nor is this all, sir, for he added, "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained"—John xx. 23. You, sir, tell us you plant yourself on the Bible. Tell me honestly do you believe one word of the passages I have quoted from the words of Christ? Our Lord leaves no room for your unbelief, for he tells us in what sense he sent his priests forth, even as his Father sent him forth, namely, to declare and pronounce to the people being penitent the absolution and remission of their sins—thus he says, "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted. It is not the priests that absolve it is Christ that absolves through them, just as he preached to the antediluvians through his ambassador or minister Noah.—1 Pet. iii. 18, 19. In St. Matthew's gospel, and to St. Peter our blessed Lord taught the very same truth "If he neglect to hear the Church let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."—Mat. xviii. 17. Now, sir, you must pardon me while I inform

you that from this passage of God's word we must entertain but one opinion in relation to your conduct in avowedly neglecting to hear the Church; for she has taken your authority from you, and still you exercise it contrary to her bidding and directions. But our Lord does not end his instructions there, for he proceeds and says, "Verily I say unto you whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."—Mat. xviii. 18. Comment upon this passage could make the fact no plainer than Christ himself puts it, that when his priests "declare and pronounce to his people being penitent the absolution and remission of their sin," this absolution thus pronounced is ratified in heaven, for he himself has spoken the words, and yet, sir, you boastingly declare that you have taken this out of your prayer book; and I must add my conviction that, if you dare, you would take the passages I have just quoted from the New Testament also. At all events whatever dispute you and your friends in schism have had with the Church of the United States, what right have you to send servants of Satan to raise up strife and contention in Canada? The Canadian Church surely has sought no quarrel with you, why therefore do you not let her alone. Have you learned this unseemly spirit from your brethren, the Fenians, who tried to avenge Ireland's wrongs upon the inhabitants of our unoffending Dominion? If you quarrel with your church

be kind enough to keep your quarrels among yourselves, and just allow our people to follow the dictates of their own conscience, and the teaching of the Holy Scriptures through their own lawfully appointed pastors. The world is lying in wickedness and I doubt not that if you were all good Christian men you would find enough work to do in convincing the infidel of the truth and power of the holy gospel; in reforming the drunkard, the swearer, the murderer, and adulterer, and the thief, rather than to weaken the Christian influence by attacking the Divinely appointed Church, which you do in our free and

Christian land, as well as in your own. Praying that God may enlighten you by his Holy Spirit to see the error of your way, and that the prayer of your mother may be granted, "that He may take from you all ignorance, hardness of heart, and contempt of his word, and so fetch you home to his flock, that you may be saved among the remnant of the true Israelites, and be made one fold under one shepherd, Jesus Christ our Lord." (*Collect for Good Friday*).

I remain, Rev. Sir,

Faithfully yours,

D. FALLOON HUTCHINSON.

Toronto, Nov. 13, 1874.

---

### CONTENTMENT.

15. *A simple, and a kind of careless behaviour is also best for those who would live in tranquillity.* They cannot be happy, who, as Seneca was wont to speak, *anxi se componere*; compose themselves, and form their behaviour with an anxious study and care. Such a constant observation of themselves in every small thing, torments and racks them. It cannot be a pleasant life, because too solitary, and though all things should succeed as they desire. But that is not to be expected; and therefore as there is no end of their cares so the vexation is perpetual, because many things will still

fall out against their will. They are surprised oftentimes, and do not appear the same as usually. This they are afraid of; and when it happens, they are to be found out from their settled, studied garb and way. On the contrary, what pleasure is there on a sincere, unaffected, and self adorned simplicity; which feigns nothing, but shews itself as it is? Some may despise it, but it is better to bear that despidal, than to be tormented with perpetual constraints, in the acting of a person which is like ourselves.

*To be concluded in our next.*