

The Theological Instructor.

No. 10.

TORONTO, SEPTEMBER, 1874.

VOL. I.

WHAT DO THEY MEAN BY RITUALISM?

In our last article on this subject we established, we trust to the entire satisfaction of our readers, that the assertion of Church authority is no innovation of modern times, and consequently cannot be reckoned as one of the peculiarities of Ritualism. It is, therefore, but proper that we should examine in whose hands this power is placed, in order that we may be guided in our practical attendance on the Apostles injunction "Obey them that have the rule over you."

Whatever may be said about the developments of ritualism in other respects, the doctrine of an Apostolic succession is, after all, the chief subject to which sectarian preachers object; and that obviously because it has a tendency to lessen their over Clerical importance. Had the Church Clergy omitted to meddle with this subject, or maintained the equality of all that pretend to the Ministerial character, their other errors would be looked upon as of a very pardonable nature. "It is elsewhere," said a sectarian preacher, "than in that Episcopal succession that we seek that which gives authority to our ministry, and validity to our Sacraments,"—(D'Aubigne on Puseyism, p. 23). This was surely most judicious-

ly as well as magnificently spoken; for, if any sectarian were to ascend but a few links in the chain of the ministry to which he belongs, he would soon come to the end of it, and would find its origin without the claim of even Presbyterian Ordination itself. He therefore gives up every idea of a succession, and betakes himself to the resort of every fanatic that has sprung up since the foundation of the church. If called and authorized by the Spirit of God, as all sectarians suppose, to take upon themselves the office of pastor without any other appointment, how in the name of all that is rational, are we to become cognizant of the fact? Has he the power of working miracles to convince us? Or have we the gift of discerning spirits? One of which, or perhaps both, would be necessary to satisfy us respecting his credentials.

In treating the origin of ecclesiastical authority, there have been three different theories adopted by those who have turned their attention to the subject. The first supposes a spiritual democracy to exist in the Church; and that the ecclesiastical officers, even the very highest, must receive their commission from the people.* To

enter upon a refutation of this theory would be only trifling with time. It has not the least shadow of support from the word of God, and sectarians all tell us they believe the Bible, and the Bible only. The second supposes such a call to the ministry from God himself as supersedes the necessity of any additional act of the public authorities of the Church. But if an individual should pretend to such a call and be asked for his credentials, how is he able to furnish them? He may refer us to certain impressions upon his own mind which he supposes to be made by the Spirit of God, but whilst these may satisfy himself, so long as he is of that opinion, are they calculated to give such satisfaction to any one else so as to induce him to submit to his authority? The fact is, God never called any man to contravene the injunctions of his own word, or to break the unity of his Church, (a crime, of which all such pretenders are most glaringly guilty,) when he did call any person to minister in his name, by a commission held immediately from himself, as the Prophets and Apostles, he invariably furnished them with those miraculous credentials without which no such pretensions can be sustained, so as to satisfy the mind of any man that has given the slightest consideration to the subject.

The third theory is that which may be justly termed Catholic, as it has been held and acted upon in all parts of the Christian

Church, and in all ages since the days of the Apostles. It is simply, that in order to receive a legitimate commission to exercise the office of an Ambassador of God, it is necessary that it should be conveyed through the ministry of the regular and established authorities which he has appointed in his Church. Now if a man is to be put into the office of the Ministry by those who were in office before him, this necessity implies a succession of some kind, and leads us up along the various links of a chain till we arrive at the commencement of the Christian Ministry, or to the immediate appointment of the Apostles themselves. But we desire to call the attention of our readers to the Episcopal succession as always held by the Catholic Church of Christ to which our adversaries object, not excepting a dignitary of the "No Church" party in Toronto. This they are all free to class as undisguised ritualism, as a popish innovation of the Oxford School. Let us examine the opinions of the Reformers upon this subject, as also those entertained by the early Church.

When the English Reformers renounced the usurped power of the papacy, and reclaimed their own native independence, the succession of their Bishops, it is well known, was carefully preserved. This is rendered peculiarly obvious, as a matter of fact, by the celebrated controversy which was subsequently carried on with the Jesuits, about the "Nag's Head Ordination." Now,

by the book of consecration of Archbishops, Bishops &c., which by the authority of the Legislature, was made an integral part of our public liturgy. It is manifest that Bishops were then reckoned as a distinct order from Presbyters or Priests, and that their succession from the Apostles was indubitably assumed; for in the preface to that book it is expressly said: "That it is evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles time there have been three orders of ministers in the Church of Christ, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," to which is subsequently added, "and therefore to the intent these orders should be continued and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England, it is requisite, that no man shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, and examined, according to the form hereafter following."

From this book therefore, it is plain that our Reformers asserted a tripartite ministry from the time of the Apostles; that they resolved that the same should be continued in the Church of England; and in order that a man should lawfully execute any of these offices, it was necessary that he should be not only tried, and examined but "called" to the office in the manner and by the authority prescribed in that Book.

Now, surely nothing else is meant by the doctrine of Apostolic Succession than this; and we would ask is it fair, is it honest in the Church Association

to represent this doctrine of the Church of England, so clearly set forth in her prayer book, as one of the innovations of Ritualists? If our opponents wish to attack us as Churchmen, let them do so openly and in a manly spirit; but let them not dare to tell us, in order to gratify the morbid appetite of a low and vulgar and ignorant mob, similar to the one just called in Toronto, that when we believe in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession that we are papists, trying to introduce a novelty into the Church of England, when every man among them with the slightest intelligence knows that the statement is a deliberate and wicked falsehood.

"All very good," the dissenter exclaims, "so far as your prayer-book is concerned, but what do we care for the prayer-book, it is the Bible (we sects) look to for direction and information."—Very little we know!! but you have had the goodness to accuse us of introducing a novelty, and as such guilty of Ritualism, for teaching and believing what the Church of England commands us to teach and believe. It is amusing to hear the sects talk about the Bible, just as if the Church did not reverence that book which was committed to her own keeping, but which, to the present hour, was never given to the sectarians by its Great Author. The Church is still the keeper and guardian of Holy Writ.

But is it true that the Holy Scriptures are against us? It

cannot be that the inspired volume favors the sects, for not one of them were born for over a thousand years after it was given to the Church.

Let us now enquire what the Holy Scriptures teach us on this subject.

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; but the question at issue is, whether there was any order of men to succeed them in the same office, at least as regards the ordinary part of that commission. It has never been shown by the most talented of our opponents, that there is the least intimation in the New Testament of the cessation of this office; and surely it is not reasonable to suppose without proof, that our Blessed Lord should appoint governors over the Church, and that these should ordain others throughout every part of the world to which their ministry extends, as we know they did, and yet upon the death of these men, the Church should be left, contrary to its first institution, without any settled order of ecclesiastical government. This preposterous opinion is that on which dissenters and sectarians stretch their mangled and distorted bodies,

Blondel, the most learned and acute of all the opposers of Episcopacy, who succeeded Vossius in the Chair of History in Amsterdam in 1550, admits that episcopacy did exist in A.D. 135. Now it is universally

agreed that St. John lived till the last year of the first century: there remains, therefore, only an intervening period of 35 years between the death of that Apostle and the admitted existence of Episcopal government.

Our Blessed Lord promised his Apostles that they should sit upon twelve thrones judging the 12 tribes of Israel. Bishop Hall, who could not be accused of Ritualism remarks upon this passage:—"What are the 12 tribes of Israel, but the whole Church of God? For, whereof did the whole Christian Church consist, but of converted Jews? And whether did our Saviour bend all his allusions, but to them? They had their twelve princes of the tribes of their Fathers, heads of the thousands of Israel Num I. 16. They had their 70 Elders, to bear the burden of the people Num. 10, 16, 17. The Son of God affects to imitate his former polity; and, therefore, chooses his 12 Apostles, and 70 disciples, to gather and sway the Evangelical Church. The 12 Tribes then are the Church; the 12 Apostles must be their judges and governors; their sitting shows authority, their sitting on thrones eminence of power, their sitting on twelve thrones equality of rule; their sitting to judge power and exercise of jurisdiction. And what judgment could this be but ecclesiastical and spiritual; for civil rule they challenged not? And what thrones, but Apostolical, and by their derivation Episcopal."—(*Divine Right of Episcopacy*, Part II. Sec. 2.

THE TORONTO ASSASSINS.

It is with shame and regret that we are obliged to bring to the notice of our readers recent articles which have appeared in a Toronto paper (*The Leader*), of a most disreputable and vulgar character, against the Church of England and her clergy, and by men, too, who have the daring effrontery to call themselves Orangemen. Loyal and Christian Orangemen the ruffianly assassins cannot be, for the members of our Loyal Order have always been distinguished both by honor and courage, and, we may add, by warm attachment to the Church of England, as the great bulwark of Protestantism, and the noble Church of the Reformation. Orangemen all over the world have ever been "slow to take offence, offering none;" but, at the same time, they have never been branded with cowardice; and such cowardice, too, as to strike a supposed enemy in the dark, and, at the same time from an evident consciousness of their own guilt and shame, conceal their names from the public, as well as from himself. The Toronto assassins have done this very thing by publishing their miserable rubbish in a newspaper that could afford to lend its columns to so vile a purpose. We refer to the articles which have appeared against the Venerable the Archdeacon of Niagara, and St. George's Church. And we may observe that the man who could

be guilty of attacking any Church or person under cover of darkness is no Orangeman at all, and unworthy the honored name of Protestant.

The Orange body never did profess to be a religious Society. And how could it? Composed of every section of the Protestant family, from which could it draw its religion? For although the Institution originated in the Church of England, and by far the large majority of our Loyal Order are churchmen, yet we admit dissenters to membership who are known to be loyal to the British Crown, and who are willing to subscribe to our principles, which are summed up in Prov. ii. iv., 21; and in admitting them to the privileges of our Order, we never so much as once alluded to their religious opinions as differing from the established faith of the Church, simply, because the Society is not religious, but political, military and moral. In politics it is a defensive association, designed to resist foreign and domestic innovations on the rights of free born British subjects. And in this respect we speak from knowledge. We are not an Orangeman of yesterday, but one of the fourth generation, every drop of blood in our veins being Orange, and we are to-day, after much thought and reading, an Orangeman, and opposed, not to Romanists, but Romanism by conviction. For over a quarter of a century

we have never once failed, not, merely, to meet with our brethren in their Lodge room, but amidst friends and enemies; aye, and in the time of danger, too, to march with them in procession on the glorious old 12th to the soul-stirring music of "The Protestant Boys," while over forty good working lodges now in the Dominion were organized by ourselves, at our own expense, and yet a few persons in Toronto, most of whom have driven respectable men from the Institution, have had the presumption to class our magazine "*The Theological Instructor*," our Protestant and religious journal, with such semi-popish rags as *The Church Chimes*, a paper that we would not allow inside our doors on account of its popish tendencies. We surely do not require the superstitious and deadly heresies of Rome, while every truth held in the Roman Church is equally held in the Church of England. Our Church, therefore, being divine in her origin is a perfect Church in herself, and does not require the interference of any foreign Church to make her more complete than she is.

We have no fault to find with any good man in Toronto, but we have found it necessary to reprove a great many for vice and immorality, and we are sorry to say that these are The Protestantism of too many of our people. At all events it is not unreasonable that before a man presses his views of religion

upon us, he should be the subject of the common decencies of religion himself. But how is it with our Church opponents in Toronto? Alas! it is too true that many of them love their glasses more than they do the Saviour and his spouse, the Church, and very few of them, even those who have the most to say on religious subjects, ever darken a church door; while others spend the Lord's day in concocting schemes to advance the interests of the Church Association, and, without any exception, not one can repeat his duty to God and man, which every child should learn from the Church Catechism. We have the particulars at hand, and we hope we will not be forced in our own defence to give them to the public: further comment, however, is unnecessary. These are the men, that distinguished members of the Church Association have addressed for their influence to crush the Clergy. They need not deny it, for we have read with our own eyes Mr. B——s letter, addressd to a grand officer. Surely Chief-Justice Draper, the Church Association, and their Puritan friends have cause to congratulate themselves in having such renowned characters to return them thanks for services rendered, against those who are labouring night and day for the welfare of their fellowmen. The Orangemen of Toronto, as a body, are orderly and well behaved, if let alone by such men as the framers of the reso-

lutions referred to, whose stereotype expressions very easily detect the author. The Orangemen of the dominion are by no means responsible for the doings and sayings of these men.

One thing we are sure of, that the Orangemen throughout the land know us too well, for one moment to doubt our Protestantism. Our brethren must let the Church of England alone, if they desire to answer the purposes for which they were evidently intended. The Church has surely as good a right to her own faith as the dissenters have to their opinions. And Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian Orangemen ought to know that they are not the proper persons to teach Churchmen what they are to believe: and although we may love them ever so much as good Orange brethren, yet we could not allow them to dictate to us on religion, especially when we know they do not understand the subject in dispute at all. We hope all Church Orangemen will take the hint and stand by their Clergy "that have the rule over them," and whom they are commanded to obey. We say to you, "Love the brotherhood," embracing in that term dissenters as well as yourselves; but, at the same time, allow no intrusion upon your rights and liberties as Churchmen.

But to return to "*The Theological Instructor*." We would ask what have we ever published in it to shake the faith of any man in our Protestantism?

Have we not given the authority of God's Word for every line we published in that magazine, from the first number to the present? Let our readers examine the pages of the magazine attentively, and if he require further light upon any given subject we will be most happy to give it, *provided his name accompanies* the request. We are prepared to give him a clear and plain "*Thus saith the Lord*," for every theological point we advocated in this our evangelical journal. We want to know nothing of tractarianism or any other ism similar to the resolutions by which our brethren were imposed upon. God's Word, and God's Word only, is the rule of our faith and practice. All the favour we have to ask of our brethren is, to hear us before they condemn us.

But they say we have written strongly against the Church Association: and so we have. Because we know that they have misrepresented our brethren, and violated the ninth commandment of the blessed decalogue. This was unprotestant, and, we therefore exposed their wicked sophistry to the world. They may have thought themselves justified in their statements, although we have doubts upon that subject; but we know that we are justified in God's sight for all we have said in opposition to their accusations.

Had the Associationists not slandered the Church and her Clergy. Had they written the truth against them, none would

have been more willing to expose the wrong than ourselves. If there are clergymen in this city or elsewhere who adheres to the rubrical injunctions of the prayer-book, no person has any right to call them ritualists on that account. And if complainers would have the goodness to come to the point at once, and tell us what ritualism really is, and by what authority they can recognise it or detect it, we will at once tell them whether we believe in it or not. But until they do inform themselves upon the subject they complain of, they must excuse us if we attach but very little importance to their opinions on theological questions, and we trust we will

hear no more from the self-constituted "Inquisitors." If our readers wish to know our views concerning popery they can read our reply to the Rev. Father Damen. In that reply they will hardly find any popery or ritualism, and we hereby beg to inform all men everywhere, that our Orange colors are nailed to the mast, and our word is "*No Surrender*," but at the same time our duty to Christ and his Church is far above all party considerations, and no man must ask us to lose sight of our calling. By God's assistance we mean, as we have hitherto done, to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

THE TWO APOSTATES.

The sixteenth Sunday after Trinity was dishonored in Toronto by the presence of two profane intruders from the neighbouring Republic; and judging from what we heard from eye-witnesses, their speeches, lectures, and harrangues, were as stupid as the men themselves were presumptuous and wicked. One of the apostates was degraded by Bishop Potter on the 26th of September, 1871, nearly three years before the Methodist Preacher Mr. Cummins, formed his troop of Apostates into what they call "The Reformed Episcopal Church;" the other has been a deacon for a great many

years, and for reasons known to himself and his bishop, he naturally hesitated to seek the priesthood. We understand that he says he was so much loved by the Church in the U. S. that his bishop has kindly given him 8 months in which to sow his wild oats, and to do the works of the devil, and that, after the expiration of that time, he can return again to the diaconate. From his own account it would appear that he has been coming Beecher over them in his own country, and in the latest American style he would like to try the same game in Canada; for we can say this

much for him, he is not at all hostile to the ladies. And we have the best of reasons for believing him to be a papist in disguise: at all events we hope to be prepared to give some particulars in a short time. We simply at present warn our brethren of approaching danger, although we hardly think the apostates will make much out of the roughs of Toronto. In his Sunday harrangue, one of the quacks declared that our prayer book must be popish, because the word priest was found in it, and he very learnedly informed his hearers that our priests, now a-days, were all deacons or ministers; but he can neither exercise the office of one, nor the other order: he being deposed from both, and degraded too, by his bishop some three years ago. The two apostates no doubt will cause the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme. One of them made ridicule of the most sacred act of Christian worship, the holy Eucharist; and in the presence of young people who would be the most likely to be injured by the profane man's babblings. This was the ex-deacon. A few nights ago a dozen or so of the Toronto roughs met to do these profane men honor, and two or three resolutions being moved and seconded by the quacks themselves (for no body else could do it for them) were readily devoured by their distinguished associates: after which the roughs retired to their usual retreat to discuss the subject over that—

Whose *hidden* virtues makes men
stumble,
And knocks them down to keep them
humble,
Where low they lie to fate resigned,
A meek example for mankind.

It was amusing to hear the intruders talk about WILLIAM, of immortal memory; vainly imagining that the Orangemen were all a pack of roughs, and like the founders of the new sect, outcasts from society. Our people that feel disposed to patronize such vulgar and ignorant quacks, must surely have but little respect for themselves, and still less for the cause of Christian morality and virtue.

The following eight bright lights organized the new sect. Let their names be had in remembrance.

1. GEORGE DAVID CUMMINS, formerly, a Methodist Preacher, suspended by the Most Reverend the Metropolitan of the United States on his apostacy, and for violating his oath.

2. CHARLES E. CHENEY, degraded or deposed by Bishop Whitehouse, August, 1872.

3. Marshall B. Smith, degraded or deposed by Bishop Odenheimer, April 19, 1864.

4. ROWLAND H. BROWNE, degraded or deposed by Bishop Potter, July 1, 1870.

5. MASON GALLAGER, degraded by Bishop Potter, September 26, 1871.

6. CHARLES TUCKER, deposed by Bishop Littlejohn, May 2, 1870.

7. W. D. FELTWELL, } date of
8. B. B. LEACOCK, } degra-
dation unknown.

FASTING COMMUNION.

To the Editor of the Theological Instructor.

SIR,—I subjoin a translation of the famous passage of S. Aug. bearing on the above subject. It is found in S. Aug. ad Inquisitiones Januarii, Ep. liv. (pp. 126, 127. Benedictine Edition in the Library of the University of Toronto.)

If you will allow me, I will leave the passage without comment at present, and send you some remarks on the subject generally and the value and meaning of this letter of S. Augustine, in particular, in time for your next issue. Let me observe, however, that the authority to which we appeal on this matter, is the custom of the Churches of God; an authority claiming the deferential attention of all good Church of England men.

Januarius had asked what observances were proper for Maundy-Thursday, or in his own words "what ought to be done on the fifth day of the last week of Lent, whether the oblation ought to be made in the morning, and again after supper, on account of the words "likewise after supper," or whether we ought to fast, and make the oblation after supper only, or even to fast and take supper after the oblation as we are used to do."

The Saint refers to the diversity of practice as to this *particular day*, and proceeds as below. We may notice the incidental manner in which the general subject of fasting communion is introduced,

and the completeness of his testimony as to the practice of the whole Church of that and all former ages:—

"It is perfectly clear that when the disciples first received the Body and Blood of the Lord, they did not receive them fasting.

"But surely the Universal Church is not, on that account, to be censured because it is always received by people fasting. For it pleased the Holy Spirit that in honor of so great a Sacrament, the Lord's Body should enter the Christian's mouth before all other food; for therefore that custom is kept up through the whole world. Nor because the Lord gave it after food, ought the brethren to come together for the purpose of receiving that Sacrament after breakfast or dinner, or, as they used to do, whom the Apostles blames and corrects, to mingle those things with their meals. And the reason of this is, that the Saviour, that He might the more emphatically commend the grandeur of this mystery, wished to fix this more deeply in the hearts and memory of His disciples, as being the last thing when He was on the point of separating from them to go to His Passion. And so He did not lay down the order in which It should be afterwards received that He might keep the duty of doing so for the Apostles through whom He was going to arrange the churches. For if He had com-

manded that it should be always received after other food I believe that no one would have altered that custom. But when the Apostle says in speaking of that Sacrament, "wherefore bretheren when ye come together to eat wait for one another. If any man hungers let him eat at home that ye come not together to condemnation," immediately he adds "and the rest will I set in order when I come."

"Whence, we are given to understand (since it would be too much to introduce in the epistle the whole of that order of proceeding which the Universal Church keeps up throughout the world) that what is not varied" (i.e. in S. Augustine's time) "by any diversity of customs was ordained by him.

"But a certain likely reason pleased a good many, that on one certain day in the year, on which, the Lord gave the Supper itself, as if to make the commemoration more marked the Body and Blood of the Lord might be offered and

received after food. * But I think it is more properly done at that hour that even a man who has fasted after the refection which takes place at the ninth hour may come to the oblation. Wherefore we do not compel anyone to breakfast before that Supper of the Lord" (i.e. on Maunday-Thursday) "nor do we dare forbid any one.

"This† plan, however, I think was only instituted because many and nearly all in a great many places are used to taking the baths on that day. And because a good number also keep the fast, the oblation is made in the morning on account of those who breakfast because they cannot bear the fast and the bath at the same time; but at eventide on account of those who do fast."

I remain

yours very truly

CATHOLICUS.

* *Honestius autem arbitror eâ horâ fieri ut qui etiam jejunaverit post refectionem quæ horâ nonâ fit ad oblationem possit occurrere.*

† This seems to refer to the first way set down by Januarius.

CONTENTMENT.

The following Discourse on Contentment, was written by the learned, pious, and orthodox BISHOP PATRICK. Reason and religion, light and heat, are so happily blended throughout the whole of this Sermon, as to render it equally interesting to the unlearned Christian, who reads little more than his Bible,

and the pious man of genius and learning who is a general reader.

"Be content with such things as ye have."
Heb. xiii. 5.

Something to trouble and molest us we must always expect, and not imagine that we can find *ενα βιον αλυπον*, some one sort of

life, void of all grievances and vexations. We do but lose our time and labour if we go in the search of any such state; whether we fancy it to be in the country private life, or in the unmarried, or even in that of great princes and kings; For, as Plutarch (whose words these are) hath observed out of Menander, *ἐπισυγγενες τι λύπη και βίη*, there is a certain kind of kindred between life and trouble. You cannot divide it from the delicate life; the honourable hath its company; and it grows old with men of meaner condition.

But God hath not left us without a remedy: that is our comfort. And it chiefly lies in divine faith, and a heavenly hope which springs from thence; and in a great love and gratitude to God, and an hearty affection for all mankind.

But besides those general rules which have been mentioned, there are certain particular advices, that are not unworthy the consideration of those who would live quietly in this world, and will tend very much to make their passage through it more easy, less offensive to others, and consequently less troublesome to themselves. I will briefly propound them to you at this time; and conclude them with a direction or two which are of the largest use.

1. The first is, *To have something still to do.* For though idleness seem easy, and to have nothing to trouble it, it lays upon us a great burthen of unquiet thoughts, and breeds a number

of vexatious desires. If our condition therefore leads us neither to public nor private business, let us employ our time in honest studies. That is Seneca's rule, I remember, to a man who affects not public employment, or cannot have it, nor finds much to do in domestic affairs; *In studia conferas, quod subduxeris officiis*; bestow that on study which thou takest away from business. By this means a man shall be, *Nec sibi gravis, nec aliis supervacuus*, neither burthensome to himself, nor impertinent to others. He will invite many to his friendship; the best persons will love his company. For even an obscure virtue cannot always lie hid; it gives some signs of itself, which will make it honoured and courted.

And here it will not be amiss to subjoin, that the very same rule is to be observed which was given before concerning the desire of riches; not to affect too much of them. "Give me neither poverty nor riches, but feed me with food convenient for me," is the prayer of Agur, Prov. xxx. 8, which the gentile wisdom conspires with in these words, "The best measure of money is that which neither falls so low as poverty, nor is very far removed from it." And by the same measure we should govern ourselves, say they, in our studies. Many books are a trouble. Like a variety of meats they burthen the stomach or breed diseases, but do not give much nourishment. Or like a man that is always in travel from place to

place; he hath many inns, but no friends, and few acquaintance. A multitude of books distracts men's minds, and therefore when thou canst not read all that thou hast, it is enough to have all that thou readest. It is a sign of a squeamish stomach to be tasting every thing. Read those that are approved. And if thou wouldst turn aside from one to another, return to the first again, by which thou hast profited. And be sure, saith he, to provide thyself of something every day which will serve as a remedy against poverty, against the fear of death, against the rest of the plagues of human life. And when thou runnest over many things, *Unum excerpe, quod illo die concoquas*, pick out some one thing to digest and concoct that day. But I intend not to insist long upon these advices, there being many of them, and therefore let us pass to the next, which is this:—

2. *Let us never attempt any thing in our enterprize, but what is of good report and praiseworthy.* This I find recorded in the life of a famous person, that he was wont constantly to comfort himself in this, *God nihil tentasset, non laudabile*, that he never assayed any thing but what was laudable. In this, if a man miscarry, yet it is some comfort to have endeavoured to obtain it. And he may again renew his endeavours, according as the same person was wont to say; "Let us resume our work, and not despair." Fishermen do not break their nets because they

sometimes cast them in vain, and catch nothing.

3. The third is, to *do nothing of consequence without deliberation and good advice.* I do not mean only of our own, but of our friends also. For if anything fall out ill, they will help to bear a part of it.

4. The next is, to *repent of nothing that we have done advisedly*: for we could not tell then how to do it better. These two are joined together by the wise son of Syrach, from whom I borrowed them, *Ecclus xxxii. 19*, "Do nothing without advice; and when though hast once done it, repent not."

5. Another rule is, to *be of a stable and fixed resolution*; and not to be still changing of our purpose. No man's life can be quiet and orderly who hath not a settled judgment and intention. And especially to run after a new thing, before we have finished the former, is the way never to be at rest. But as we should not be uncertain in our designs and desires, always fickle and given to change, so,

9. *We ought not to fear those changes which will come unavoidably.* Let us accustom our thoughts and reconcile our affections to them, by considering that everything in this world is effected by changes. It is Antoninus's observation, *Τι δα. Φιλιππον* &c. What, I beseech you, is more friendly and familiar to universal nature, than changes? Thou canst not go into a bath unless the wood be changed

whereby it is heated. Nor canst thou be nourished, without change and alteration of thy food. No profitable thing can be produced but by the change of something or other. Methinks, then, that thou shouldst discern that changes in thyself are no less necessary and good too, in order to some useful and excellent end. But since there will be changes in our condition, it makes the next advice necessary, which is.

7. To order things so, as *not to be taken unprovided*. For which end we must think beforehand of all that may come, even of the worst. That which we look for will be less troublesome to us. It was the wise observation of Carneades, that the greatest griefs of our life come from hence, that the tempest arose unexpected. It is just as if a great many guests should come in upon us when we are wholly unprovided, and there is neither meat, nor fire, nor servants, nor anything else in the house. Then it is that we run up and down, and keep up a stir, and make a noise, and all in a great confusion. Whereas, if we had known of it before, all things would have been done in quiet, and we should have given them entertainment with ease and pleasure.

The old story was, that if the wolf saw a man before *he* saw him, the man was struck dumb; but the same happened to the wolf if he was first espied. The tale may thus be interpreted; that if dangers surprise us before

we are aware of them, they are wont to bereave us of our succours, otherwise we can defend ourselves well enough, or receive them without harm. Sudden frights commonly astonish us, and take away our voice, and extremely trouble us; but that which we are prepared for, can make no such terrible assault nor frightful noise, but silently falls upon us. If we foresee what may come it will not give us such a shock as it will if we have no thoughts of it. Foresight will put us upon the use of all those means which I have formerly discoursed of, and therefore we are not to suffer ourselves to be without it. Take advice of the son of Syrach, *Ecclus. xviii. 25, 26*, "When thou hast enough, remember the time of hunger; and when thou art rich, think upon poverty and need. From the morning unto the evening time is changed, and all things are soon done before the Lord." This you will find he condemns in another chapter as a great folly *Ecclus. xi. 25*, "That in the day of prosperity, there is a forgetfulness of affliction, and in the day of affliction there is no remembrance of prosperity." If we will be wise and happy we ought to balance one of these with the other, that is, "In the day of good things to remember evil, and in the evil day to remember good." But enough of that.

8. It will add also much to our tranquillity if we take care to *contend with no man unnecessarily*, no not with those of whom we are

like to get the victory. It is better a great deal, to sleep in the quiet of peace than to be awakened from our repose by all the trumpets of conquest, and the loudest shouts of acclamation and praise. Suppose a man will say that which you know not to be true, let it pass, rather than dispute it with him, if he be a captious, proud, and quarrelsome person.

9. Another is, *not to scoff at any body*. For few can endure to hear themselves abused; or pass it by without an endeavour of severe revenge. The mention of this is sufficient, and the reason of it apparent.

10. It is no less prudent as well as pious, to *speak ill of no man*, except when it is necessary to do some good to others. This is one of the Psalmist's counsels for a contented life, "What man is he that desires life, and loveth many days, that he may see good? Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips that they speak no guile," Psal. xxxiv. 12, 13. This is so true that it is safest not so much as to open our ears to others that speak evil of their neighbours. If we do not entertain their speeches, they recoil and wound the speaker; if we receive them they wound and trouble us. And indeed the tongue is wont to procure us so much mischief, that,

11. Wise men (let me add in the next place) have advised us, if we would live happily, to accustom ourselves to *speak sparingly*, at least among strangers; especially concerning great persons it is best not to speak at all.

This is a rule which Arrianus gave in his time when there was danger from such men. Words, though innocently meant, yet may be ill-interpreted. And it is better (as Cardan was wont to say) to pretermitt an hundred things worthy perhaps to be heard, than to say one that should not have been spoken. Again,

12. It is of great service to accustom ourselves *to be cheerful* and to find all the means we can to preserve ourselves in that temper. For we shall the more easily pass by a great many occasions of trouble without much notice, and feel the rest less heavy and more supportable. Sadness never did any body good nor lightened any man's calamity; but it is a new misery in itself. It is apt also to look on things otherwise than they are; for it sees them in the twilight, and not in the clear sunshine of our spirits. Seneca I think was in the right when he said, that of the two, one had better imitate Democritus than Heraclitus. For he that laughs at things, looks upon them but as slight and vain. And so they will be the more equally enjoyed or equally borne. There is more of humanity in it also to smile at things, than to frown and lament. He that laughs deserves better of mankind, because he leaves some good hope; whereas the other bewails that which he despairs of amending. But the best of all is to receive all accidents quietly with a smooth and placid temper, neither with much laughter nor with lamentations.

13. If we would live happily we must likewise take care that we be *no busy bodies*. For such people are very unacceptable to others and uneasy to themselves. They have a great deal to do, when in truth they do nothing but trouble themselves and the neighbourhood. This is Antonious's rule, "Do not trouble thyself about other men's matters, unless it be for the common benefit." For example, saith he, do not still be fancying what such a person is doing, and why he doth this or that, and what he designs and contrives with such like things. This is but to wander from one's self, and to forsake the custody of his own soul. Therefore avoid these superfluous thoughts, which belong not unto thee. For upon this depends as Seneca hath observed, that *terribilimum vitium*, most foul and odious vice of listening after, and inquisitiveness into, the secrets of others; desiring to know much, even those things which are neither safely told nor safely heard. A man that would live in peace, should be so far from this busy prying humour, that he should not let his secret thoughts run this way; but rather accustom himself (as the aforesaid great emperor and philosopher speaks) always to employ his mind, that if any other person be so curious as to demand of him what he was thinking of, he may not be afraid to tell him. By this means, saith he, it will appear that all things in thee are simple and good-natured, sociable, and void of

envy, emulation, suspicion, impurity, or any such like thing, which should put thee to the blush. Such a man ought to be ranked among the best and the happiest; being *ιερευς τις*, a priest and minister of God, who uses, with due respect, that divine image, which is within him.

14. And to make our lives still the less burthensome, we must *not be too stiff and rigid in the form and manner of our life*; nor too peremptorily resolved in things that are not absolutely good or evil. We shall but disorder ourselves the more by keeping too strictly to our own orders in indifferent things. We must be easy and yielding if we would be happy; and not stick too pertinaciously, no not to our own determinations and appointments. We must comply with occasions, provided lightness do not move us to it; for that is as great an enemy to peace as the other. All pertinaciousness and obstinate adherence to our own set forms of life, is *anxious* and miserable; because accidents will always contend with us, and struggle against us, and still be wresting something from us. And levity is as grievous, if not more; because it hath no certain bounds, nor can contain and rest itself in any thing. Both are very contrary to tranquillity, to be able to alter nothing, and to endure nothing.

To be concluded in our next.
