

# The Theological Instructor.

No. 6. TORONTO, MARCH AND APRIL, 1874. VOL. I.

## PERSONAL OBEDIENCE, AND AN ENTIRE DEPENDENCE UPON THE MERITS OF CHRIST ALONE FOR SALVATION, NOT TO BE SEPARATED.

It is natural to fallen man, when he has once adopted any opinion from a persuasion of the truth of it, immediately to lay an unwarrantable stress upon it, and to magnify its importance, with the utmost jealousy against every thing that seems to oppose it. This sad disposition continually discovers itself in the common affairs of life; it infuses much of the bitterness of party spirit, and is the parent of that detestable bigotry, with which religious sects have hated and persecuted each other. A clear discernment of some dangerous error, which alarms the mind, makes it apt to suppose that safety is only to be had by keeping at the greatest possible distance from it. In consequence of this, a man retreats again and again without any suspicion, till he is overtaken and ensnared by some error, equally pernicious, though directly opposite to it. Thus some, that desire to excel in gentleness and good nature, do often become criminally complaisant, neglect their duty, and dishonour God, rather than disoblige a fellow-creature.

This weakness of mind produces the same effect, when religious truth is its object and pursuit. To be the maker of your own happiness; to be calculating the difference between yourself and others; and to fancy there is more

to be commended in you for your duties performed, than to be blamed for your failures and offences; and likewise to expect heaven; not as a free gift, but in acknowledgment for your service and duty; all this is a scheme which is highly gratifying to self-conceit, by keeping out of sight the depravity of human nature, the purity and extent of God's law, and all those self-abasing truths which Christ has revealed.

On the other hand, to extol without ceasing the all-sufficiency of Christ, his infinitely meritorious sufferings and obedience unto death, and then to suppose that all things pertaining to, and requisite for, the sinner's salvation, have been so finished by the Redeemer, that nothing is required from the sinner, but to acknowledge the unspeakable benefit thereof; no repentance, obedience, nor works of righteousness: this is a way favourable and indulgent to sin in the greatest degree; a masterly invention to pacify the guilty conscience, whilst it spares, and even cherishes the lusts of the flesh; a scheme made on purpose for those who have been enlightened, who have begun in the Spirit, and run well; but longing after unhallowed ease, forbidden gain, or carnal pleasure, have turned back again to their

own way. Wherever, therefore, pride or sensuality reigns in the hearts of men, they will be for separating personal obedience and a dependence upon the merits of Christ alone for salvation.

This fatal division Satan will use all his influence to procure and promote. If you are endeavouring to obtain salvation by your own works, he will be at much pains to gild and emblazon your supposed excellencies, and hold them before your eyes to produce in you self-admiration; that you may perform your works without a knowledge of yourself as a defiled sinful creature, and without humility; and that, "continuing ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish your own righteousness, you may never submit to the righteousness of God," Rom. x. 3.

And if you now begin to depend on Christ for salvation, the deceiver immediately changes his method of assault; he will join with you in beating down all merit in man, and whisper perverted truth into your ears: he will help you to vilify all human righteousness as filthy rags, and endeavour to the utmost to push you on to that dreadful error of fancying that Christ is most exalted, when personal obedience is least regarded: that by this device you may be so infatuated as to build your house (all your eternal hopes) upon the sandy foundation of a dead notional faith, till it fall upon you, and you perish under the ruins of it for ever.

To guard you in this important matter against the corruptions of your fallen nature, and the temptations of Satan, I proceed to lay before you the

mischievous effects of separating personal holiness and the merits of Christ's blood and righteousness. If you place your dependence for salvation upon your own performances, lightly esteeming the merits of Christ, then the better you suppose yourself to be, the more self-sufficient you will be. And though you acknowledge that your obedience is performed by the help of God's grace, this will not prevent you, any more than it did the Pharisee, from trusting in yourself that you are righteous, and despising others. But though your good qualities make you highly esteemed amongst men; if this be your case, God, who knoweth your heart, in utter abhorrence of that self-conceit which reigns in it, hath declared that whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased. For thus you oppose the most solemn declarations of God concerning the way of salvation. God hath laid upon Christ the iniquity of us all. He was made to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. And to prove the absolute necessity of receiving salvation in and through Christ, as the purchase of his blood, and the free gift of his grace, "I have sworn, saith he, by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear," Isa. xlv. 23. That no man is justified by the law in the sight of God is evident, for the justified shall live by faith in Christ, Gal. iii. 10. The consequence of such a denial of the truth is, in the end, eternal death; "for as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse," Gal. iii. 9.

On the other hand, most dreadful will be the effects of placing your dependence for salvation on the meritorious obedience of Christ, to the neglect of personal obedience. No sooner can you be entangled in this most awful error, then you will entertain slight thoughts of sin, defiling and damnable as it is. You will account it a part of legal bondage, instead of your bounden duty, to study the Scriptures, and examine yourself by them, to watch, and pray, and mortify continually your corrupt inclinations. Your religion will be a presumptuous insolent dependence upon Christ without repentance, and without love, as if he was a friend of sinners, though they continued in their sins. From such diabolical opinions the growth of every evil temper, and the return of old sins, will follow of course; till Christ will be made of no other use than to reconcile sin and salvation.

Thus you will offer the greatest affront to the Redeemer, because such a monstrous perversion of his atonement is a denial of many of his most solemn declarations. It treats him with the uttermost contempt, as not worthy of credit and regard in the whole of his teaching, but only in some particulars. It gives him the lie, because he declares of himself, that he came not to destroy the law, and assures you that he, and he alone, is wise unto salvation, who heareth his sayings, and doeth them.

Thus you will likewise bring a reproach and dishonour upon him in the world. They will judge of your principles and doctrines by the influence they have upon you. If they observe you to be proud, worldly-minded, sen-

sual, or immoral in any way, however highly you may speak of the glory of the Saviour, and of his all-sufficiency of his sacrifice, the blame and reproach will not rest upon you alone; it will reach through you to the principles you hold; and, by reason of your pernicious ways, the way of truth itself will be evil spoken of.

Thus also you will set at nought the operations of the Holy Ghost, who is given on purpose to mortify the deeds of the body, and to bring forth all the fruits of righteousness in us. Now sanctification by the Spirit is insisted upon continually in God's word no less than belief of the truth; insomuch that it is said, If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his; and, that as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. But if you think that personal obedience and sanctification can be dispensed with, you entirely set aside these Scriptures, and declare that there is no need of the Holy Spirit; for the necessity of his influence is founded on the necessity of being turned from the love and practice of sin to the love of God and the practice of holiness.

The end of this dreadful error is destruction. Sin unrepented of, and unsubdued, brings forth death, eternal death; and to suppose that a bare assent to a set of doctrines can prove any security against it, is to suppose that God does not look to the heart, but only to some particular notions; and that if men do but hold some particular opinions, he will be favourable to them, though they hold them in unrighteousness. But this is utterly unworthy of his perfections, and con-

trary to his repeated declarations. Nor is God's justifying the sinner, and the ungodly, any warrant for supposing that he has less antipathy against sin. For who is the sinner, and who is the ungodly person, whom he justifies? What, one that still drinks in iniquity like water? No. He never did, he never can, justify a person of this character: for hatred of such a one is essential to his consummate perfection. The sinner, the ungodly, whom he justifies, is one who has begun to mourn for sin, to be burdened with it, to be painfully conscious of its defiling accursed nature, and earnestly desirous of pardon, and of power to sin no more. Not indeed for works of righteousness, but freely through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, is such an one acquitted from the curse of the law. Yet, if hatred of sin is wanting in you, you are not the sinner whom God will justify, but the sinner

whom he condemns. The assertions of God to this purpose are clear and positive. The Saviour himself declares, "Not every one that saith unto me—Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven," Mat. vii. 21. And his apostle: "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord," Heb. xii. 16. There cannot be stronger proofs brought to enforce the necessity of faith in Christ, than these are to enforce the absolute necessity of personal obedience. Every wilful sinner stands as much excluded by the Scriptures from the favour of God, and the happiness of heaven, as the self-righteous and unbeliever. If, therefore, you wish for your own salvation, you must very carefully avoid each of these rocks, so fatal to souls in this dangerous gulph we are passing through.

#### THE REV. MR. DARLING AND HIS ACCUSERS.

The following communication from the pen of our esteemed friend, the Rev. W. S. Darling, which we publish with great pleasure, speaks for itself. Mr. Darling has lived too long in Toronto, and is too well known here, to require any defence at our hands. The cowardly assassin in the country, who concocted the shameful falsehoods, and the one interested party who received them from him, and prepared them for publication, are both known, and are welcome to any advantage they may derive from their little vituperation. And all we have to say on the subject is, that we are very glad

the base calumniators do not appreciate the theology of our Magazine:—

(To the Editor of the *Church Herald*.)

SIR,—I must ask the favour of being allowed through the medium of your columns to correct some very gross misstatements of a personal character which have been recently set forth by an anonymous assailant, in (what he supposes) the interests of the Church Association.

I. In a certain letter which I addressed to Chief Justice Draper I asserted that there was nothing in the "character, attainments, or position,"

of the signatories of the first occasional paper of the Association "which would give their opinions the slightest importance" (meaning, as was surely apparent,) *on the theological questions* which they had raised. I am quite unable to qualify that assertion. Their "character" in all other respects may be excellent, but theologically, they have destroyed it by their own writings. Their "attainments may be (and in one case are confessedly) high for their respective positions of Judge, Consul, and Merchant. I think few, however, who are capable of thought will accept the original logic of their present advocate who would have us believe that these special attainments of the gentlemen in question, afford a guarantee of their competency to instruct the Church at large in matters of religious controversy.

The thought of attacking their *social* position as a legitimate mode of shaking their *theological* one would have betokened a pitch of coarse stupidity to which I do not profess to have attained, and which I gladly leave to the undivided enjoyment of my assailant, who avails himself of it so freely; the idea that there was any reference to it could occur only to one who feels that he cannot touch my arguments, or question my facts, and who is led by some innate vulgarity of mind, or malignity of motive, to adopt the tactics, usual in such cases among a certain class of of "abusing not the plaintiff's attorney," but the plaintiff himself.

II. Notwithstanding the assertion of this writer, there is not in the letter referred to a single word of "boasting," but a simple statement of fact, prefaced with the express statement that

I have never by word or act assumed to be "a person of consideration." That fact is, that my nearest relatives and connexions occupying honorable positions in the professions of law and medicine, and having had their place in every grade of Her Majesty's service, from subalterns up to general officers and Governors of her colonies, have, in my earliest boyhood, taught me to look with disdain upon anything likely to tarnish a man's honour. I am not aware of having ever forgotten or discredited those teachings. I resented warmly the attack upon the honesty and truthfulness of honorable men, myself among the number, which I believe to have been made in the occasional paper referred to, because I felt it to be at least as dishonourable to the principles of a clergyman as it could possibly be to that code of worldly punctillio which prevails among persons of respectability, and which from my associations I had early imbibed.

The correctness of this persons assertions may be judged by the fact that my father never placed his foot on Canadian soil, and therefore did *not* "settle in the bush;" that I was *not* brought up there as a Scotch Presbyterian, because I was brought up by a mother who was born and reared in the south of England, and never saw Scotland or Scotch Presbyterians, until long after she had reached the age of womanhood, that my proclivities therefore were naturally English and not Scotch; and that the probabilities are that my assailant is much more conversant with non-conformity than I have ever been. The vulgar personalities of this writer make one

feel that to have been born and brought up among decent people who contemn what is dishonourable, false, and malignant, though certainly not a matter for boasting, is, nevertheless, a reason for devout thankfulness.

III. The statements of my assailant with reference to my examination for orders are simply astounding for the utter wickedness of their falsehood, wherever he may have learned them. The insinuation he throws out of my having by some unknown and dishonourable means gained a knowledge of the chapters of the Greek Testament in which we were to be examined, is baseless. One of those who was "in" for Priest's orders, and who had been ordained Deacon the previous year, said casually, "the Chaplain often examines in such and such chapters, I would advise you to read them over in case they should fall to your lot." In consequence of this, I said to my friend, who like myself was a candidate for Deacon's orders, "you are better up in your Greek than I am, let us read them over together." It is impossible not to pity a man of a spirit so evil as to torture such a thing to so malignant a purpose. The whole thing had passed from my memory until I applied to the friend in question "the man now living" who recalled to me the fact which I now state. I certainly never have made the faintest pretence to that critical knowledge of Greek which this person who cannot write English, parades with a self conceit which tends to make people doubt its depth and which even if real, is a sorry substitute for the manners of a gentleman and the feelings of a Christian.

The examining Chaplain of that day,

the Rev. H. J. Grasett, has never permitted me to number myself among his friends, but he is a gentleman, and as such perfectly incapable of allowing any difference theological or otherwise, to colour any statement of fact. I am confident, therefore, that were he referred to, he would at once bear testimony to this fact, that at my ordinations, both as Deacon and as Priest, I was appointed on the one occasion to read the Gospel, and on the other the Epistle; a token which, at all events in those days, was recognized as indicating that the person so selected and (taking all subjects together) passed the most satisfactory examination. I am further forced to say that he who was ordained Deacon with me, an old and valued friend, had (for twice the length of time which was allowed to me to prepare for the examination) been a pupil of the Rev. Frederick Augustus O'Meara, LL.D., and that out of all who then presented themselves for Priest's orders, as well as Deacon's, including one who is now Bishop of St. Helena, others who wrote themselves graduates, and one an A.B. of Trinity College, Dublin, who was "plucked," I received the highest commendation that was given, for the essay which was required from all. My impression is, that the essay of my friend above mentioned, was owing to his illness, written at a subsequent time, and therefore would form an exception to this statement. However, that may be, it did not affect the result referred to.

I meet his assertion of my Presbyterianism with a definite and distinct denial; and I assert that the writer is as ignorant of my faith as he is of my

family. I hold that a man is to be honoured who honestly follows out his conscientious convictions, and therefore had I done what he asserts, it would not have been anything to be ashamed of, I should only have done what many gentlemen, members of the Church Association, and some of our most eminent Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergymen, have done; and who, for that reason, we do not regard as unworthy of our esteem and confidence. As such, however, was *not* the case with me, I cannot with truth acknowledge it to be so.

During the years I was at the High School in Edinburgh, under Dr. Boyd, a teacher at that time of some repute, and a period when one's theological views are not very definite, I never knew a Presbyterian minister; I was never but two or three times at a Presbyterian service; I never saw a Presbyterian function, such as marriage, funeral, or communion; no member of my family ever held pew or sitting, or frequented any place of Presbyterian worship; and the only Church which I habitually attended, was St. Paul's Episcopal Chapel, in York Place. Perhaps that may be sufficiently explicit for my assailant; but if he would like further particulars, I shall be happy, if he will apply privately, to *exchange* family histories with him, since he seems to take an interest in such matters, and furnish him with confidences which he can use in his next public vindication of his friends who are unhappy enough to have him for their advocate.

I am exceedingly sorry to have been compelled by the personalities of this writer to enter upon details of no

possible interest generally, except to the cause of truth, and which have no bearing whatever upon the questions at issue between the Church Association and those who are called High Churchmen. The only consoling thought is, that if a few more of such "friends" of that Body could be found it would soon come to an end, for no organization has vitality enough, long to survive such blows as he has dealt to it through my unfortunate person.

Nothing can be imagined more painful than this detailed reference to myself, and by forcing me to enter upon it, my assailant will have the satisfaction of knowing that he has succeeded in inflicting suffering upon me which he is wholly incapable of understanding. It is not for the general public I care, my work is drawing to its close, because my capacity for its discharge is failing, and I have been too long bruised and battered in this weary war, to place any great value on its verdict. But I compel myself to do violence to every instinct of my nature in order that my parishioners and friends whose esteem, regard, and confidence, I have long enjoyed, may not have lodged in their minds any lingering doubt that, while professing to be honest, straightforward, and sincere, I have all the time been the delusion which my assailant has pictured. I know how energetically they will repudiate such an idea, but I know also how clinging is the nature of the doubts to which such charges and insinuations give rise; and as, for many years back, the same statements have been issued from a source which is not difficult to trace, I think it better once for all to settle the matter by the

step which I have now taken, distressing as it has been.

And now, turning from my parishioners to the members of the Church Association, I beg to say that with reference to anything I do or teach to which they take exception, I am, as far as my poor ability goes, ready and willing to discuss our differences in a fair and courteous spirit, if discussion is deemed necessary; but I shall certainly resent "slander" which was, and is my complaint against the Chief Justice, speaking for the Church Association; and I shall treat with the silent disdain they merit any repetition of the assaults of one who, notwithstanding his assumption of learning, has been unable, as his production proves, to rise above the coarseness of his early

associations; no gentleman could, by any possibility, have put forth such a document; and I am not disposed to hold the members of the body whom he professes to befriend, responsible for what, I am sure, has given many of them unaffected pain. I know numbers of them who however strong may be their theological feelings, are high-minded men who can have no sympathy with such an attack; and I am not without hope that they may be induced, by their own feeling of honour and self-respect, publicly to disavow any complicity with it.

I remain, yours &c.,

W. STEWART DARLING.

Holy Trinity Parsonage,  
Toronto, March 6th, 1874.

#### THE DELAY LAST MONTH.

We feel it necessary to apologise to our subscribers for the non-appearance of the last month's number of the *INSTRUCTOR*. Being from home during the month of March, and part of February, we found it impossible to return earlier than passion week, and consequently were unable to issue the March number of our Magazine. We are now obliged to issue both it and the April number in one, but we beg to assure our readers that they shall have the full compliment for which they subscribed. We have already mailed to all those who have subscribed for the *INSTRUCTOR* during the month of February and March, and we hope in future to be able to issue our monthly regularly on the second Wednesday in every

month, and we take this opportunity returning our thanks to the numerous friends who have by their subscriptions so materially aided us in the publication of the *THEOLOGICAL INSTRUCTOR*. We hope to merit a continuance of their approbation, and are happy now to say that our little magazine is taken and read by the leading and prominent families in the Dominion, and that already our circulation has trebled our most sanguine expectations.

#### OUR ABSENCE.

We regretted exceedingly, that in consequence of our recent absence from the Dominion, we were not able to accept the many invitations which

we received from several quarters to attend special meetings, and speak to the brethren and friends assembled on the different occasions referred to. And we now beg to assure our patrons and friends that having returned home again, we are prepared to attend to their calls, and address them on the subjects specified. Our address, they will remember, is Box 1540, Toronto, Ontario. We always answer communications on the very day on which we receive them. And we have a special request to ask of all our correspondents that they will give us their names and addresses written so plainly that we cannot mistake them. We have now on hand very many important letters that we can not reply to, because we cannot decipher the writer's name nor address. We have one letter from a place called "Grass Lake," and we answered it according to the direction given, but we received our letter back again from the dead letter office for better directions, as there was no post office known by the name of Grass Lake. The result is, we are not able to reply to our correspondent.

THE PARISH GUIDE is the name of a neatly printed little monthly, published by our friend and brother, the Rev. W. R. Tillinghast, of St. Peter's

Church, Detroit. The magazine is thoroughly Catholic and Evangelical. We recommend it as one of the very best little periodicals we have ever read. The matter contained in it, both original and selected, is of a most churchly and interesting character: and to be appreciated by all churchmen, it only requires to be known. Its present price is \$1.00 a year, but we have made arrangements with the Reverend Editor and Publisher to publish the two magazines, viz., *The Theological Instructor* and the *Parish Guide* with our published works as advertised on the second page of the cover of *The Instructor*, all post paid from the offices at the low price of \$1.90 a year, in advance. Send us \$1.90 and we will by the next mail forward to any address in Canada or the United States, both magazines and works referred to. And we beg to inform our friends who have already subscribed and paid for the *Instructor* that if they send to our address 75 cents, we will send them a copy of the *Guide* for one year, post paid, from Detroit. We hope that a great many will at once avail themselves of this offer. Churchmen in Canada and the United States are one; and it will not be uninteresting to our readers to be reminded of the one Catholic and Apostolic faith as existing and taught by the Church in both countries.

THE DAILY HOUSE, of Ingersoll, kept by the obliging proprietor, Mr. T. B. Berriman, is well worthy of public patronage, and we advise our friends and readers who may visit Ingersoll to give it a call.

#### THE APOSTATES.

We clip the following from the *Parish Guide*, in reference to the founders of the new sect which has just appeared. We regret the steps

which Bishop Cummins and his friends have taken in this matter. Still the wrath of men may be made to praise God! If not honest, as they

evidently were not, why compels many Judases to eat the bread of the Church in dishonesty. Of course this is our own private opinion, and we believe that a safety valve was greatly needed some where. Bishop Cummins was brought up a dissenter, and it appears like our foreign friend in Toronto, who is still, what he was in his own country, a Presbyterian, and not a Churchman, that the Bishop never repented of his sectarian errors, but entered the Church on account of its undoubted respectability, and therefore it is not to be wondered that he returned back to the beggarly elements of his sect again. Let this be as it may, the following will speak the feelings of very many Churchmen in the United States of America who are more concerned with this apostasy than we are:—

THE R (D) EFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.—The following is the ecclesiastical record of the persons who

organized that delectable sect yeleft "The Reformed Episcopal Church."

1. George David Cummins; suspended by the Most Rev. the Metropolitan, on his apostacy.

2. Chas. E. Cheney; degraded or deposed by Bishop Waithouse, Aug., 1872.

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

4. Rowland H. Bourne; degraded by Bishop Potter, July 1st, 1870.

5. Mason Gallagher; degraded by Bishop Potter, Sept. 26th, 1871.

6. Charles Tucker; deposed by Bishop Littlejohn, May 2nd, 1870.

8. W. D. Feltwell; 9. B. B. Leacock; date of degradation unknown.

It is hardly necessary to remark, that a stream seldom rises *higher* than its fountain, or that a man cannot give a *good title-deed* of property which is not his own; nor can a criminal under sentence hold office.

#### COMMON SENSE AND CONFESSION.

*From the Detroit Parish Guide.*

So much nonsense is talked just now about Confession, even by Church dignitaries, who ought to know better, that I shall be glad to put it briefly in a common sense way:

We are at times "afflicted and distressed in mind and body, or estate." Now, when the trouble affects the body, we naturally go to the doctor; when it affects the estate, we go to the lawyer; and in either case we retire into his private consulting room, and tell our tale to himself alone; in fact, we make an "Auricular Confession," which he is bound not to

reveal. Similarly, if we have any trouble that affects the mind, whether it be a sin of omission or commission that disturbs the conscience, we go to the Priest, as the Church bids us, and to him we "open our grief or grava-men," i.e., reveal to his private ear the burden that presses upon our soul. So that through the Divine authority which was committed to him at his ordination, we may "receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of our conscience and avoiding (getting rid) of all scru-

ple and doubtfulness" about coming to the Holy Communion.

This is the plain common sense of the whole matter. No one is compelled to go to the doctor, the lawyer, or the priest. Every one is at full liberty to go or stay away, as he may think most conducive to the good of his mind, body, or estate. But there is not the same freedom on the other side. For the doctor, the lawyer, and the priest are compelled to do the best they can for such afflicted and distressed persons as go to them for relief; since this is one special purpose for which they take their several diplomas, and receive authority to practice.

Again, as all doctors and lawyers do not study every part of their profession with equal care, but usually devote themselves to some particular branch of it, in which they may attain peculiar excellence, so it is with the clergy. And one special object of the famous "483 Memorial" was, to ask the Bishops—not indeed, as many ignorantly affirm, to "introduce Confession into the Church;" for

there it is and has been in the English Prayer Book, undisturbed since the year 1549, but—to appoint "select confessors" in the same way that they appoint "select preachers;" i.e., to pick out in every diocese a certain number of clergymen, possessing the requisite qualifications of age, experience, learning and discrimination, who should be publicly recognized as men devoting themselves to this very thing, so that sin-laden souls might be certain where to look for help and comfort, and might thus be encouraged to come with confidence, not only for absolution from the "grief," of sins past, but also for such wise spiritual counsel as shall aid them to fight manfully against sin for the future.

The popular talk about Confession is simply the rubbish of ignorance and popular prejudice, and would be unworthy of serious notice, but for the fact that Satan assiduously fosters it to hinder individuals from coming to the Physician for the special remedy which He intrusted to the Apostles, and their successors.—(see Acts iii. 12; St. John xx. 21.)

---

#### MORE PRAYER!

The Church bell rings very often. Often on Sunday and several times during the week. Will any say, "too often; What! prayers again! It seems to me the Rector asks too much." That depends entirely upon the measure of earnestness, in the parish and its people.

If prayer is to them a task, and God's worship wearisome, they may think prayers come too often.—But Christian people, according to a certain Book

they profess to take as their guide *love* prayer, and find delight in God's worship.

If this be true, surely we cannot find that Prayer days come too often.

But there is a mistake somewhere; Is it in the Book, or in the people? If the Book be right, some of our people are indeed, very cold, poor Christians. Which shall the priest follow? He is bound to say that constant prayer is

the law of God's word, and the law of His Church. Shall the Church yield to the world's coldness, or shall her appointments, her bell, her open doors, still utter their witness against grow-

ing worldliness, and bid you remember GOD?

The Church calls for *more* prayer: the World asks for *less*. Which shall prevail?—*Rev. Dr. Paret.*

#### THE CATHEDRAL ORGANIST.

'Tis forty years ago since first  
I climbed these dusty, winding stairs  
To play the Dean in; how I spurned  
Beneath my feet all meaner cares,  
When first I leant, my cheek on fire,  
And looked down blushing at the choir

Handel and Hayden, and Mozart—  
I thought they watched me as I played:  
While Palestria's stern sweet face  
Seemed in the twilight to upbraid:  
Pale fingers moved upon the keys—  
The ghost-hands of past centuries.

Behind my oaken battlement  
Above the door I used to lean,  
And watch in puffing crimson hood,  
Come stately sailing in, the Dean;  
On this the organ breathing low,  
Began to murmur soft and slow.

I used to shut my eyes and hear  
The solemn prophecy and psalm  
Rise up like incense; and I loved  
Before the prayer the lull and calm.

Till, like a stream that bursts its banks,  
Broke forth brave Purcell's "O give  
thanks."

I knew those thirteen hundred pipes  
And thirty stops, as blind men do  
The voices of the friends they love,  
The bird's song, and the thunder too;  
And the fierce diapason's roar,  
Like storms upon a rocky shore.

And now to day I yield me up.  
The dusky seat, my old loved throne,  
Unto another; and no more  
Shall come here in the dusk alone,  
Or in the early matin hour,  
To hear my old friend's voice of power.

And yet, methinks that centuries hence  
Lying beneath the chancel floor,  
In that dark nook I shall delight  
To hear the anthem swell once more,  
And to myself shall sweetly smile  
When music floods the vaulted aisle.

#### THE HERODIANS AND OTHERS.

Josephus, who has often spoken of the Jews, takes no notice of the Herodians. They are mentioned four times in the Gospels, viz. Mark iii. 6; viii. 15; xii. 13; Matt. xxii. 16. Jerome, in his commentary on the last-mentioned text, tells us, that some of the Latins in his time thought the Herodians were persons who believed Herod the Great to be the Messiah. But he very justly laughs at that fancy, because there is not the least trace of such a notion, either in sacred or pro-

fane history. His own opinion was, that the Herodians were either the soldiers of Herod, or else such as the Pharisees, in ridicule, named Herodians, on account of their paying tribute to the Romans, contrary (as they fancied) to the law of God. Leusden, Fabritius, Basnage, and others, adopting the first opinion proposed by Jerome, suppose that the persons called Herodians in the Gospels were courtiers, officers, and soldiers of Herod the tetrach, and that the name Hero-

dian no more denoted a sect of religion than the names Cæsarean or Pompeian. Carpozovius is of opinion, that they were servants,<sup>4</sup> domestics, and friends of Herod; and the leaven of Herod, which our Lord cautioned his disciples to beware of, Mark viii. 15; was not so much any particular system of religious opinions, as a contempt of all religion. But though this opinion is founded on the Syriac version, which renders the name *Herodian* by the phrase *the servants of Herod*, it does not seem to agree with the character given of the Herodians in the Gospels. From Matt. xvi. 12, it appears that the caution to beware of the leaven of Herod, was not a caution against the practices, but against the doctrines of the Herodians. The leaven of Herod indeed, in this sense, will apply to the collectors of the taxes for the Romans, who no doubt inculcated the lawfulness of paying tribute to Cæsar, which is the other opinion proposed by Jerome. Nevertheless, as our Lord himself taught the lawfulness of those taxes, we cannot imagine this was the tenet he cautioned His disciples against, under the notion of the leaven of Herod. The passage in Matt. parallel to Mark viii. 15, will, if I am not mistaken, lead us to a better account of the Herodians. For what Mark there terms *the leaven of Herod*, is called by Matthew, chap. xvi. 6, *The leaven of the Sadducees*. Hence we learn who the Herodians were, about whom so many disputes have arisen. It seems Herod the Great endeavoured to overturn the principles of the ancient and true religion, that he might establish a system more agreeable to his tyranny. This was the doctrine of the Sadducees, which he zealously espoused, because setting men free from the dread of a future state, it left them at liberty to pursue what they took to be their interest, by any method they pleased. *Herodian*, therefore, was but another name for such sort of Sadducees, as maintained the expediency of submitting to the innovations introduced by Herod and the Romans. For it may be easily thought

that those who favoured Herod, and the powers who supported him, were generally of this sect. At the same time, all the Sadducees were not Herodians, some of them being friends to the liberties of their country, and by consequence shewing little of that complaisance towards the reigning powers, for which their brethren were so remarkable. And this accounts for the distinction between the Herodians and Sadducees, found Matt. xxii. 16, 20. Of the nature and number of the innovations introduced by Herod, and with what temper they were received by the Jews, the reader will be able to judge who looks to Josephus. Ant. c. 11, *fine*

It is highly probable, therefore, that the Herodians were a sub-division or branch of the Sadducees. For to use the words of Dr. Lardner: "From the time that prophecy ceased among the Jews, new sects were continually arising. There were two disciples of Antigonus Sochæus, that were the authors of two new sects: Sadoc of the sect of Sadducees; Baithos, or Bathus, author likewise of a new sect which had its name from him, and which is mentioned in the Gemara, though not in Josephus. There was likewise, at this time, a division in the sect of the Pharisees; some following Hillel, and others Shammai. The followers of Judas of Galilee, were at first but a small portion of the Pharisees; in time they almost swallowed up all the other parties. Josephus, who so often says that the sects of the Jews are three, once or twice calls Judas of Galilee, the leader, or head of a fourth sect. The reason of his not distinguishing these from the rest was, I imagine, because they differed from the Pharisees, only in some few particulars. So that one and the same writer, who has professedly reckoned up the Jewish sects, according to different ways of considering them, makes sometimes more and sometimes fewer. Much more may two different writers, though they write professedly of this matter, which the Evangelists have done.

## THE POWER OF MUSIC.

BY THE REV. MR. WESLEY.

1. By the power of music, I mean its power to affect the hearers; to raise various passions in the human mind. Of this we have surprising accounts in ancient history. We are told the ancient Greek musicians in particular, were able to excite whatever passions they pleased; to inspire love or hate, joy or sorrow, hope or fear, courage, fury, or despair; yea, to raise these one after another, and to vary the passion, just according to the variation of the music.

2. But how is this to be accounted for? No such effects attend the modern music; although it is confest on all hands, that our instruments excel theirs beyond all degrees of comparison. What was their Lyre, their instrument of seven or ten strings, compared to our violin? What were any of their pipes, to our hautboy or German flute? What, all of them put together, all that were in use two or three thousand years ago, to our organ? How is it then, that with this inconceivable advantage, the modern music has less power than the ancient?

3. Some have given a very short answer to this, cutting the knot which they could not untie. They have doubted, or affected to doubt the fact; perhaps have even denied it. But no sensible man will do this, unless he be utterly blinded by prejudice. For it would be denying the faith of all history; seeing no fact is better authenticated. None is delivered down to us by more unquestionable testimony; such as fully satisfies in all other cases. We have, therefore, no more reason to doubt of the power of Timotheus's music, than that of Alexander's arms; and we may deny his taking Persepolis, as well as his burning it through that sudden rage, which was excited in him by that musician. And the various effects which were successively wrought in his mind, (so beautifully described by Dryden, in his Ode on St. Cecilia's-day), are astonishing in-

stances of the power of a single harp, to transport, as it were, the mind out of itself.

4. Nay, we read of an instance, even in modern history, of the power of music not inferior to this. A musician being brought to the king of Denmark, and asked, whether he could excite any passion, answered in the affirmative, and was commanded to make the trial upon the king himself. Presently the monarch was all in tears; and upon the musician's changing his mood, he was quickly roused into such a fury, that snatching a sword from one his assistant's hands, (for they had purposely removed his own), he immediately killed him, and would have killed all in the room, had he not been forcibly withheld.

5. This alone removes all the incredibility of what is related concerning the ancient music. But why is it that modern music in general, has no such effect on the hearers? The grand reason seems to be no other than this: the whole nature and design of music is altered. The ancient composers studied *melody* alone; the due arrangement of single notes: and it was by melody alone, that they wrought such wonderful effects. And as this music was directly calculated to move the passions, so they *design'd* it for this very end. But the modern composers study *harmony*, which in the present sense of the word is quite another thing, namely, a contrast of various notes, opposite to, and yet blended with each other, wherein they,

"Now high, now low, pursue the res'nant fugue."

Dr. Gregory says, this *harmony* has been known in the world little more than two hundred years. Be that as it may, ever since it was introduced, ever since *counterpoint* has been invented, as it has altered the grand design of music, so it has well-nigh destroyed its effects.

6. Some, indeed, have imagined, and attempted to prove, that the ancients were acquainted with this. It seems, there needs but one single argument, to demonstrate the contrary. We have many capital pieces of ancient music, that are now in the hands of the curious. Dr. Pepusch, who was well versed in the music of antiquity, (perhaps the best of any man in Europe,) shewed me several large Greek folios which contained many of their musical compositions. Now, is there, or is there not any *counterpoint* in these? The learned know there is no such thing. There is not the least trace of it to be found: it is all *melody* and no *harmony*.

7. And as the *nature* of music is thus changed, so is likewise the *design* of it. Our composers do not aim at moving the passions, but at quite another thing; at varying and contrasting the notes a thousand different ways. What has *counterpoint* to do with the passions; It is applied to quite a different faculty of the mind; not to our joy, or hope, or fear; but merely to the ear, to the imagination, or internal sense. And the pleasure it gives, is not upon this principle; not by raising any passion whatever. It no more effects the passions than the judgment, both the one and the other lie quite out of its province.

8. Need we any other, and can we have any stronger proof of this, than those modern overtures, voluntaries, or concertos, which consist altogether of artificial sounds, without any words at all? What has any of the passions to do with these? What has judgment, reason, common sense? Just nothing at all. All things are utterly excluded by delicate unmeaning sound.

9. In this respect, the modern music has no connection with common sense any more than with the passions. In another, it is glaringly, undeniably contrary to common sense; namely, in allowing, yea, appointing different words, to be sung by different persons at the same time! What can be more shocking to a man of understanding than this! Pray, which of those sen-

tences am I to attend to? I can attend only to one sentence at once; and I hear three or four at one and the same instant! And to complete the matter, this astonishing jargon has found a place even in the worship of God! It runs through (O pity! O shame!) the greatest part, even of our Church music! It is found even in the finest of our anthems, and in the most solemn parts of our public worship! Let any impartial, any unprejudiced person say, whether there can be a more direct mockery of God?

10. But to return. Is it strange that modern music does not answer the end it is designed for? And which it is in no wise calculated for? It is not possible it should. Had Timotheus "pursued the resonant fugue," his music would have been quite harmless. It would have affected Alexander no more than Bucephalus: the finest city then in the world had not been destroyed, but, *Persopolis staret, Cyrique arx alta maneres*.

11. It is true, the modern music has been sometimes observed, to have as powerful an effect as the ancient; so that frequently, single persons, and sometimes numerous assemblies have been seen in a flood of tears. But when was this? Generally, if not always, when a fine solo was sung: when "The sound has been an echo to the sense;" when the music has been extremely simple and inartificial, the composer having attended to *melody* not *harmony*. Then, and then only, the natural power of music to move the passions has appeared. This music was calculated for that end, and effectually answered it.

12. Upon this ground it is that so many persons are so much effected by Scotch or Irish airs. They are composed, not according to art but nature; they are simple in the highest degree. There is no *harmony* according to the present sense of the word therein, but there is much *melody*. And this is not only heard, but felt by all those who retain their native taste; whose taste is not biased, (I might say, corrupted) by attending to *counterpoint* and com-

plicated music. It is this, it is *counterpoint*, it is *harmony* (so called), which destroys the power of our music. And if ever this should be banished from our composition, if ever we should return to the simplicity and melody of the ancients, then the effects of our

music will be as surprising as any that were wrought by theirs; yea, perhaps they will be as much greater, as modern instruments are more excellent than those of the ancients.

*Inverness, June 9th, 1779.*

ADVANCE IN RITUAL—Is not confined to the English Church, but is seen in every Protestant denomination. This is notably illustrated by the form of service drawn up we believe by Mr. Newman Hall [well known in Toronto and the United States.—Ed. T. I.] for the laying the memorial stone of the new building which replaces old Surrey Chapel, but which is to be called Christ Church. It begins with the *Sanctus*, followed by the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the Prayer Book versicles and responses at Matins and Evensong, six collects from the Prayer Book, the Outh; some Psalms (Authorized Version Fan, not Prayer Book) set to a chant sicocomposite first Lesson taken from

the account of David's and Solomon's offerings for the Temple; a cutting from Dr. Neale's version of the hymn *Angulare Fundamentum*, a second Lesson compounded from Isaiah, and several New Testament passages; the hymn "The Church's one Foundation," some prayers and oblations; and then the hymn of Dr. Neale for the foundation of a church "O Lord of Hosts, whose Glory fills." Then comes the actual laying of the stone, with appropriate prayers of dedication, also based on Anglican uses; the sermon or address; and some concluding prayers, all interspersed with minute and abundant rubrics.—*English Paper.*

#### AGENTS WANTED.

We are now prepared to receive orders for the *four* works which are out of press, viz., our *Sermon on Baptismal Regeneration*, and infant baptism, giving plain proofs from the Holy Scriptures for both. Our *Reply to the Rev. Father Damen*, proving the Church of Rome to be a secession from the Church of England. Our reply to Dr. Cramp, on the *Meaning of Baptism*, and proving sprinkling to be the mode practised by the Apostles of our Lord, and our reply to the religious quackery of Mr. Spurgeon, of England, and others. The above works, with a copy of *The Instructor*, for one year, we send post paid to any address for the small sum of \$1.25. And to the above we add the Rev. Mr. Tillinghast's *Parish Guide*, a monthly also, six publications in all, post paid from the office, for \$1.90. We are now prepared to employ competent and

responsible agents in every county of the Dominion of Canada, to canvass Church families and others for the above works. We trust that the circulation of these works among the people will be attended with the Divine blessing. We pay agents 25 per cent. for collecting, so that our readers will readily perceive that our object is not so much to make money out of the affair as to benefit the souls of the people. We trust our readers will "mark, learn, and inwardly digest," all we may be able to say to them in these unpretending publications. All letters addressed to us must be prepaid, and if requiring an answer a three cent postage stamp should be enclosed to ensure a prompt reply. We make this request because our correspondence has simply become enormous. We are at present paying at the rate of \$500 a year postage.