

CLAIMS
OF THE
CHURCHMEN & DISSENTERS

OF
UPPER CANADA BROUGHT TO THE TEST;
IN A
CONTROVERSY BETWEEN SEVERAL MEMBERS
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND
A METHODIST PREACHER.

KINGSTON, U. C.
PRINTED AT THE HERALD OFFICE.

.....
1828.

ADVERTISEMENT.



IT will be recollected that the various articles contained in the following pages, with the exception of an extract of Dr. Strachan's Sermon, preached on the death of the late Bishop of Quebec—originally appeared in the Newspapers; and the compiler, not feeling himself at liberty to make any alterations whatever in their phraseology, lest he should incur blame, presents these articles again to the public entirely in their primitive form of expression. The subjects here discussed, have always been considered of the very last importance to the civil and religious welfare of every christian nation. Both to the *Churchman* & the *Dissenter*, the following work will be of great advantage, as it will enable both to judge of the comparative merits of their respective claims, and prepare each to give such a reason as his cause affords, of the hope that is in him.

This was the first time the claims of *Churchmen* and *Dissenters* have been brought to the test of argument in this Colony; and as they are treated of with a view to the local circumstances of the Country, the perusal of them will afford additional satisfaction and profit to the Canadian reader.

The following is an extract of Dr. Strachan's Sermon, on the death of the Lord Bishop of Quebec, which gave rise to the discussions in the succeeding pages :

“ON dividing the Province of Quebec into two distinct Governments, our late venerable Sovereign signified to Parliament his intention of making provision for a Protestant Clergy, according to the Church of England, by which the people might enjoy all the benefits of religious instruction—rightly judging that the establishment of an enlightened Clergy in the Colony would contribute more than any other measure to its happiness and prosperity. To follow up this pious and benevolent measure, and to meet the wants of the rising Church with more ease & convenience, by rendering it unnecessary for young men, desirous of entering her ministry, to proceed to England for Holy Orders, as well as to perform those Episcopal functions, which are necessary to her very existence, a Bishop was appointed, retaining the former name of the colony, that both Provinces might be included in the Diocese. For this arduous charge Dr. Mountain, then a Dignitary in the Church of England, was most judiciously selected. This gentleman had taken his degrees at the University, with great distinction, and from his elegance of taste, extensive literary acquirements, and private worth, had been rapidly preferred. The friend of the great Mr. Pitt, and of the present Bishop of Winchester so justly revered as the champion of the true faith, the brightest prospects were opened to his view, and when it appeared expedient to constitute an Ecclesiastical establishment in the Province of Quebec, he was nominated Bishop, and consecrated in 1793. This appointment, or rather the Ecclesiastical establishment of which the late Bishop was the head, is remarkable, not only in the history of this Province, but in that of the

British Empire, as being the first step ever taken by the Imperial Legislature, towards a recognition of that obvious, but still unacknowledged principle, that the Colonies of a Country have as good a right to receive moral and religious instruction from the Parent state, as her laws and Government. What are the great objects of Colonization but to provide for the redundancies of population, to afford to meritorious enterprize and industry the means and opportunity of successful exertion, to recognize and improve the unheeded and uncultivated bounties of nature, to form at intermediate points links of connection between the Mother Country and the remotest lands to which her commerce can be extended, and in addition, to direct to beneficial purposes, the talents and labours of those, whom the offended laws have banished from their native land? Now, these objects so highly beneficial to the Parent State, produce settlements in the most distant regions, notwithstanding the perils of unhealthy climates, and unexplored seas. And shall the various descriptions of Emigrants, of which they are composed, encounter all the privations and dangers, incident to the formation of such settlements, for the advantage of their native land, and be in the mean time deprived of their most precious rights and privileges? Surely if they are entitled to all the comforts of a moral and religious education, by remaining at home, much more ought such comforts to accompany, or as soon as possible follow them to the remote settlements, which they are employed in establishing.— And if any Colony can have a paramount claim over another to a privilege, which is the common right of all, it is Canada, more particularly Upper Canada, which was settled by men driven from their homes, by the enemies of their country, many of whom had sacrificed to principle, the means which would have enabled them to have procured for themselves and children, the benefits of moral and religious instruction.

When the late Bishop was appointed, about thirty-two years ago, to diffuse the light of the Gospel through this extensive portion of his Majesty's dominions, it was even

a greater spiritual, than a natural wilderness. Only five Protestant Congregations were to be found within the whole diocese ; where now, upwards of fifty are established. In so long a period, this may appear a small increase ; but great and many were the obstacles which the Church had to encounter, some of which could only be removed by time, and over others, the Bishop had no controul. In as far as depended upon his exertions, no labour was spared in promoting those measures, which he judged most likely to extend the Ecclesiastical establishment. and after many years of disappointment and delay ; he had the happiness to behold, before his departure, a fair foundation laid for the diffusion of Christianity, through the whole diocese. In this age of affected liberality and abhorrence of restraint our venerable Church has peculiar difficulties to surmount, in establishing herself in a new country like this, which those societies, that adopt no form of Church government under the pretext that forms are not sanctioned by the primitive times, never can experience. But in proportion to the difficulties, which she has to overcome at her commencement, is the permanence of her establishment, and certainty of her extension, for while the members of other denominations connected by no bond of union, no common principles of order, and no subordination, are soon scattered, or divided, our Church proceeds, with all the advantages, which union, discipline, and order can produce. Her government justly claims a divine origin, sanctioned by the authority, and practice of the apostles, which is the law of Christ. The vigilance of the Bishops, animated by zeal, and tempered with discretion, produces the greatest benefits. The inferior clergy feel the responsibility of their situation, and learn from experience that they are placed under a real and not a nominal inspection, and that they are acting under a watchful shepherd, whose voice will rouse them, if slothful, or punish them if negligent. The form of prayer, which we are bound to use, unites all the congregations of our Church in the principal part of their worship, as if they were only one congregation and assembled in the

same temple, and it presents to them with great force, simplicity and beauty, the ways, means and appointments of God, to restore our fallen nature to purity, and everlasting life. Without a liturgy, or regular form of prayer, no church can continue long; for when the spirit is gone, there is nothing left, but a scriptural liturgy, says an amiable divine, will save a Church in the worst of times, and preserve the spark of religion, when the flame is extinguished. With a pure Government, and a still purer form of prayer, there is in our Church no discordance in doctrine, precept, or discipline; we all acknowledge one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God; consequently the people, whom we address, are not bewildered with a variety of opinions; all is simple, beautiful, and clear, nor are they even left to learn from their teachers, the proper forms of worship. But when they are able to read that Liturgy, which has now remained for so many ages unaffected by the weakness, the corruption, the false opinions, or evil motives of men, it becomes the source of the liveliest devotion; their prejudices are removed, their minds enlightened, and their hearts opened to the reception of the truth. Such is the Church, whose standard our late Bishop was sent to unfurl in the face of this new world—white and spotless as her faith. Such she has been for many centuries, and such his Lordship presented her to the inhabitants of these Provinces, “in her true majestic comeliness—her primitive attire—her modest dignity—her sober pomp, such as she was seen, by those who proclaimed her in the midst of the flames, loved her through imprisonment and torture, and placed the Bible in her hands, as the charter of her constitution, and the trophy of her triumphant sufferings.”

On arriving in his Diocese, the Bishop found many things combining to blight the prospects of the rising Church. The majority of the inhabitants of Lower Canada, where his Lordship determined to reside, belonged to the Roman Catholic persuasion and looked upon as the head of a rival Ecclesiastical establishment. The Protestant dissenters, who composed a considerable number

of the remainder, envied and opposed him, because the Church over which he presided, was the religion of the state, and was therefore more immediately under its protection. To soften the asperity of the opposition of these two classes and the undisguised hatred of inferior sects, and to shew them the real excellence of the Church of England, happily placed in the true medium between extravagant and dangerous extremes; could only be the work of time. His Lordship had also the mortification to find that many of the Protestant inhabitants, imbibing the levelling opinions of the times, declaimed against the appointment of a Bishop and against all religious establishments, as inconsistent with the spirit of true religion and the peace of society. Had not Christianity been revealed, then had mankind been left to follow their own imaginations, as they did before the coming of Christ, but as the Supreme Being has been pleased to communicate his will, it is the duty of every Christian Government, to support such a religious establishment, as may best secure the benefits of this revelation to all their subjects. Now, as this divine revelation is intended to promote among all men true morality and purity of life, to become the mother of good works, our cordial in affliction, and our comfort in death, to bring us daily into the presence of God and our Saviour that we may believe in his holy name, love him with all our hearts, and by making him the object of our imitation and the foundation of our faith, resemble him on earth, and follow him to heaven; an establishment which produces these excellent effects ought to be cherished by every good Government, in its own defence, as the guardian and nourisher of the purest social, and domestic virtues. Indeed the very appointment of Parochial instructors of the people, in the duties of morality and the doctrines of revelation, is so eminently wise and beneficial, that it may not only be adduced as a collateral evidence of the Divine origin of Christianity, but of the necessity of a public establishment, to render it truly efficacious. Accordingly the most eminent friends of the Gospel have considered an Ecclesiastical establishment, so

necessary to the moral and religious improvement of the people, and so essential to give permanent effect to the most pure and sublime principles that can direct the understandings, and influence the heart, that they have declared a regular Clergy, and those authorities which appoint and superintend them, important branches of the Church of Christ. Experience has justified this declaration. The religious establishments of England and Scotland have, under the Divine blessing, been the great promoters of all that is great and good, in those happy Countries. The mass of the population are taught their duty to God and man—to attend to a law, not to be obtained in books, nor to be engraven on tablets of brass—a law which always subsists, which is every moment forcing itself into notice, and which condemns every species of wrong. Hence the British nation is the most intellectual, and moral in Europe—The world's centre of arts, commerce and civilization. Here the light of freedom burns with the brightest radiance, and the rights and liberties of man are the best understood and most abundantly enjoyed; and here a lofty sense of independence is of universal growth. From this nation, the cherisher and supporter of religious establishments, have come almost all the lights that exalt modern times. She takes the lead in those mighty efforts, which are changing the face of the world. To the able administration of her excellent laws, and the wisdom of her political institutions, all nations turn their eyes not only to admire, but to imitate. She stands aloft like the sun in the Heavens, dispensing her charities wherever distress is to be found, without regard to difference of language, climate, or complexion. Not satisfied with shewing the way, she compels by entreaties and donations, other nations to pursue her virtuous course. It is to religion that she owes her pre-eminence—it is this that throws a holy splendour round her head, makes her the hope of every land, and urges her to achieve the evangelization of mankind. Never without a religious establishment could she have soared so high above other nations—it is this that diffuses through her whole population, the

most sublime and disinterested principles, which, refining the sentiments and elevating the affections, enable them to subdue selfish passions and appetites, and to pant after the felicity of doing good. Indeed a Christian nation without a religious establishment is a contradiction, and notwithstanding the praiseworthy exertions of a few denominations in the neighbouring States, more especially the Episcopal Church, Christianity except in a few large towns is found to languish, and seldom in the country pervades the mass of the people. Let the candid opponents of Ecclesiastical establishments, if any such there be, compare the people who have no standing ministry, not merely in towns, where a spark of Christianity may exist, but through the country, with a people possessing this inestimable advantage, and they will acknowledge that no country can be called Christian, which does not give public support to Christianity, and that no other Religion but that of Jesus could have suggested an idea so grand and affecting as that of placing a public Teacher of Righteousness in every small Society throughout the world.

On his first visitation the Bishop found things very different from what he had anticipated. Nothing which he had seen could enable him to form any conception whatever of the nature of the country in which he was to constitute a Religious establishment. But being endowed with great talents, and a happy faculty for observation, he returned to Quebec with a mass of the most useful information, by which he became acquainted with the state of his vast Diocese, its wants and prospects. In coming to this Province every thing, to a person only acquainted with England, was entirely new. In Lower Canada some associations might be found, but the Western part of the Diocese, in regard to Religion and education presented a dreary waste. The people were scattered over a vast surface, and had the means been furnished of building Churches, and Schools, which ought always to go together, there was little or no chance of their being supported. Nor did this arise so much from any disinclination

on the part of the people, to have the benefits of Religion and Education, as from their inability to support Clergymen and Teachers, an inability which grew out of their peculiar situation, and the nature of the climate. In new Settlements families live of necessity far apart—they are for some years so wretchedly poor that they cannot dispense with the services of their Children, who are able to work ; and if a Church is erected the families are for a long time too remote, and the roads too bad to attend—hence the motives for building Churches are enfeebled, and many are discouraged from making any strenuous efforts to provide accommodations so necessary to civilized life. The Bishop found it difficult to overcome these discouragements—the offer of assistance might raise for a moment a lambent flame, but it soon disappeared. The people would speak of their inclination, but the scite of the Church was too distant—how could they with their families go through roads almost impassable, and over brooks without bridges. It was easy to see that the taste of many had become vitiated, and that they were disposed to exaggerate difficulties, and to calculate the benefit rather with a tendency to refuse than to assist. Settlers in a wilderness are often found greatly changed in a few years—at first they lament their distance from Churches and Schools, but by degrees such lamentations die away, as well as the generous and noble dispositions from which they emanated—and when the accommodations for public worship are provided, bad weather, bad roads, or any other trifling cause, prevents any thing like a regular attendance. Living without restraint, and without the eye of those whom they respect, a sense of decency and Religion frequently disappears. Here the disinclination to holy things presents itself in all its deformity, a distaste for divine worship, and neglect of every thing sacred, and a total estrangement from God, and although from their situation, crimes against Society are few, the heart becomes entirely dead to true piety and virtue. Were it not for the mothers, nothing engaging or amiable would remain in many of the back settlements ; but they, lamen-

ting their separation from civilized society, are still anxious to cherish and inculcate some of the principles of social life.

In the scattered settlements of this Diocese, Schools and Churches are of necessity for many years few in number, and multitudes of both sexes are growing up in great ignorance. In regard to Education, something has been done by the Provincial Legislature ; but to build Churches, and to place Clergymen is a work of greater difficulty. Even when Churches are erected, the persons who give regular attendance are so few as greatly to discourage the Minister, and his influence is frequently broken or injured by numbers of uneducated itinerant Preachers, who, leaving their steady employment, betake themselves to preaching the Gospel from idleness, or a zeal without knowledge, by which they are induced without any preparation, to teach what they do not know, and which, from their pride, they disdain to learn. Under such circumstances, the Minister placed in the first Church, or Settlement where in all probability he will have several Churches to attend, has many difficulties to encounter—his people live scattered on their farms, cut off from that daily intercourse, which softens and polishes the manners. Confined to family circles, their ideas become selfish and contracted, and they are little disposed to trouble themselves about any other thing than what contributes immediately to their own comfort. Among such a population, social intercourse is very rare, and they seldom meet unless to bargain and traffic. Consequently the social affections sleep or expire—their deportment becomes rough and forbidding—at one time, forward and impudent, at another time awkward & sheepish. From all which, the first Clergyman finds himself not only engaged to preach the gospel, but also to preach civilization. Such was the picture, which the Diocese presented to the Lord Bishop on his first visitation, and though now in many places much changed such is still the picture of some of the remote settlements, and must continue to be so till the whole country is filled with inhabitants. In no situation is the influence of the

female sex so engagingly seen as in the distant settlements—to their exertions are we to attribute all the softness that remains. The Bible, the Prayer book, the sense of a God, and his Providence, are by them preserved and introduced to the notice of their children, and often of their husbands.

In the more populous parts of the Diocese, the Bishop saw with concern the prevalence of opinions which, under the name of liberality, disregarded that uniformity of plan on which the Church of Christ was founded, and which proceeding from laxity of principle to doubt, commonly ends in profligate indifference. But notwithstanding the gloomy prospect which the Diocese presented to his Lordship's anxious mind, he perceived some grounds of hope. He assured himself that a Church which resorted to the mild patriarchal and primitive discipline, of which the Apostles were the first founders, and their Churches the brightest examples, could not fail of eminent success, and that the manner of propagating the Gospel in the first days of its glory, must be the most judicious manner of propagating it now; and that if no general change of opinion could reasonably be expected among the old, yet many would embrace her ministrations if placed within their reach. There are indeed times when the consolations of Religion are required by all Men—moments of deep affliction, of heart-breaking bereavments, when the weeping spirit bows to the voice of God, and at such moments, a discreet Clergyman may by his sympathy and kindness win many over to the Church. Much of the indifference to religion, which he found among the people was rather to be attributed to their destitute situation than to any disinclination, and there seemed to be good reason for believing that in almost every populous portion of this division of the Diocese, a judicious Clergyman might, in time, collect a respectable congregation. This conclusion His Lordship was the more readily induced to admit, on reflecting on the numerous emigrants resorting to the Canadas, many of whom were previously members of the Church, and the daily accession of those youth, who, by a wise distribution

of Tracts and Prayer Books, had been early prejudiced in favour of the establishment. In this way the progress of the Church might indeed be slow and was not to be measured by days months or even by years, but although from his experience of the difficulties to be overcome, his Lordship entertained far less sanguine hopes than before he had taken possession of his Diocese, he found no reason to despair, but felt that a gradual advancement would take place, till a paramount influence was obtained, if his own exertions were only seconded by a respectable, and increasing Clergy. On this, every thing depended—all other obstacles might be softened, removed or overcome. But how was he to procure such a clergy? This was a difficulty which the good Bishop had not perhaps foreseen in its full extent, though it was by far the greatest which he had to encounter, and the sole cause of the little progress which the Church has yet made in the Canadas. It was quite natural for the Bishop to believe before he left England, that the provision made for the support of a Protestant Clergy, included a full communication of all the benefits of the religious establishment of the Parent State, and although it might not be equal for sometime to the wants and necessities of the infant Diocese, that yet it would become so at no distant period. In this expectation, if it was even entertained, he soon found that it would be unwise to trust. The piety of the late King had gone far beyond the spirit of the Legislature, which was not prepared to second a policy so judicious and beneficial, by voting temporary aid till the Royal munificence become available.—The times were inauspicious to any application to the Imperial Parliament. Engaged in a terrible war, which required every exertion to bring it to a successful termination, no minister would have presumed to move for pecuniary assistance, to support and extend the Church in Canada; for the progress of Christian feeling, which now shines so brightly, had not then manifested itself, nor indeed, did it seem to have, at that time, any existence in the British Legislature. For in the very year of the Bishop's appointment to Quebec, it was with the utmost difficulty that

Mr. Wilberforce, that ornament of human nature, could on the renewal of the character of the East India Company, obtained the frigid assent of the House of Commons to the moderate resolution, that it was the duty of the Legislature, to promote the interest and happiness of British India, and that such measures ought therefore to be adopted, as might gradually lead to their advancement in useful knowledge, and to their moral and religious improvement. This feeble proposition was assented to with a chilling coldness, and produced no effect,—the nation expressing no feeling on the occasion, but beholding the decision with apathy and indifference.

To the Local Governments His Lordship could look for no assistance. The Legislature of Lower Canada, consisting chiefly of Roman Catholics, could hardly be expected to support a church which they were taught to consider heretical, and in Upper Canada the scanty means at the disposal of the Government, precluded all hope.

To a feeling mind, ardent in the cause of his Divine Master, this disappointment in augmenting the number of his Clergy, commensurate with the wants of his people, must have been severely felt; and the gloomy prospect before him, of remaining for many years without the means of extending in any considerable degree the benefits of religious instruction, must have been exceedingly distressing. In this destitute condition the Bishop's confidence did not give way, but he exerted himself with redoubled energy to cherish the infant Church committed to his care, and in the absence of assistance from every other quarter, strenuously urged the venerable Society for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign parts, to increase the number of their missions. His Lordship's application to this distinguished institution, which, in the true spirit of Christian humility, has done so much for the cause of religion, was not made in vain, but unhappily their means were limited, and far from being in a condition to supply the number of Clergy, which appeared to his Lordship absolutely necessary. And here an unexpected difficulty stood in the way of procuring the few that the Society had determined to

support. For when they had assented to the Bishop's prayer, in as far as they were able, Clergymen of enlightened piety could not be found willing to leave England for Canada. This country was still so little known, and the character of its climate so frightful, that it was considered worse than Siberia; and therefore, gentlemen of education and zeal, refused to forsake their homes and the endearing associations of early years, to come to so distant, and inhospitable a Colony. Eager to remove this unexpected obstacle, the Bishop listened to the suggestions of one of his Clergy, stating that young men might be educated for the Church within the Diocese, and the Society willing to second his Lordship's exertions, granted assistance to a certain number of persons during their studies. The result has been very satisfactory, for in many respects the native Clergyman has the advantages over his brother from England. He is much better acquainted with the habits and manners of the people—knowing their peculiar prejudices, he can, with more tenderness remove them, and he can address himself to their affections with greater effect. There is moreover a pleasing association of ideas, in the minds of the people, when they see one of their own children raised to the office of a Clergyman, and offering them the words of eternal life, which induce them to give more heed to his admonitions, and thus afford him greater success in his ministry. Add to all this, that a native Clergyman commonly unites all his friends and relations in favour of the Church, and though they may be at first induced to give her a hearing from interested motives, they soon discover an acquaintance, that her doctrine is the faith that was once delivered to the Saints.

The number of candidates for Holy Orders increased faster by this arrangement, than the funds of the Society could employ them, and his Lordship had still the mortification to behold populous towns and villages growing up without being able to afford them any steady religious instruction. Never desponding though frequently disappointed, his Lordship began to hope that, from the great increase of population, and the growing prosperity of the

Diocese, the Clergy Reserves, if under better management, might be made to contribute some assistance. So long as the Colonial Government gave lands to strangers from any part of the Empire gratis, as well situated as those belonging to the Church, it could be hardly expected, that leases would be preferred; and accordingly till the crown lands, to be granted, had become remote from the lakes and navigable rivers, very few reserves had been taken up: but now that the remaining lands of the crown were difficult of access and the inhabitants much increased, parents began to look upon the Church lands, scattered through the best Districts of the Province, as eligible for the future settlement of their children. Nevertheless, the revenue arising from the lease of such lands must of necessity be very slow in its increase, and as they had produced nothing for thirty years, and were just beginning to excite attention, they could not be looked upon as an immediate source of support.—But his Lordship looked to futurity, and supposing that they would become sooner productive, if placed under the direction of those, who had immediate interest in their improvement, a charter was procured from his most gracious Majesty, then Prince Regent, placing the lands, appropriated for the maintenance of a Protestant Clergy, under the management of the Clergy of the Established Church, in each province respectively, as a corporate body.

At the first general meeting of this Corporation in 1820, his Lordship presided; a circumstance, which may well be considered an æra in the history of the Church of Upper Canada. With great propriety therefore did the Clergy congratulate his Lordship on this interesting occasion, and hail it as opening a prospect of the rapid increase of the regular Clergy, and of the speedy accomplishment of those other plans for the support and dissemination of the true religion, which his Lordship had so much at heart, and had done so much to obtain.

Among these plans were the regular division of the Colony into Parishes—the consecration of the Churches and burial grounds, and the legal induction of the Clergy to their livings, all of which his Lordship had nearly ranged.

Should the future historian feel inclined to find fault with the little that has been done by the first Protestant Bishop of Quebec, I request him to pause before pronouncing judgment, in order to examine the many obstacles in his Lordship's way during the whole of his Episcopacy, and how little his efforts were seconded by those who were able to command success, and indeed how little disposition the people of Great Britain manifested, till lately, towards the religious instruction of their Colonies. That extensive Settlements, composed of British subjects whose loyal has stood the most bitter trials, and whose unaffected devotedness to the constitution of the Mother Country is above all praise, should be left comparatively destitute of religious instruction, and without an efficient Ecclesiastical establishment to watch over their spiritual interests, is altogether incomprehensible. Can any thing attach Colonies to the Parent State so strongly as a community of religious feeling? How then comes it that great Britain, conspicuous among the nations for her high moral, and intellectual qualities, and deriving much of her power, wealth, and political importance from her Foreign possessions, should be so culpably deficient in what should be the first care of a Christian nation? Is it not evident that the Canadas, as well as the other Colonies, have been left in a great measure to grope their way as they could through the darkness which surrounds them, almost totally unaided by the Parent State? Does not the greater part of the population of this Diocese, notwithstanding the meritorious exertions of the late Bishop, his scattered Clergy, and many individuals, remain unimproved, and sadly destitute of religious instruction? What can 53 Clergymen do, scattered over a Country of greater extent than Great Britain? Is it to be wondered at that under such circumstances, the religious benefits of the Ecclesiastical establishment of England are little known or felt, and that Sectaries of all descriptions are increasing on every side? And when it is considered that the religious teachers of the other denominations of Christians, a very few respectable Ministers of the Church of Scotland excepted, come almost universally from the Republican

States of America, where they gather their knowledge and form their sentiments, it is quite evident, that if the Imperial Government does not immediately step forward with efficient help, the mass of the population will be nurtured and instructed in hostility to our Parent Church, nor will it be long till they imbibe opinions any thing but favourable to the political Institutions of England.

Convinced that the attachment of Colonies to the Metropolis, depends infinitely more upon moral and Religious feeling, than political arrangement, or even commercial advantage, I cannot but lament that more is not done to instil it into the minds of the people. The expense of supporting the Civil and Military Establishments of Canada, is said to cost Great Britain annually £700,000, while only £9,660 is paid for the support and extension of the Religion of the Parent State, of which the Society for propagating the Gospel in Foreign parts supplies one half. Can any one doubt for a moment of the impolicy of this arrangement—that Government should scarcely allow five thousand pounds to promote the Religious and moral sentiments & feelings, which are the real bonds of attachment, while she pays £700,000 without producing any attachment, or any disposition towards the Parent State, which did not previously exist? Is it not evident that forty thousand pounds per annum (which is scarcely the expence of a single Regiment,) spent in the support of a zealous Clergy, at a moderate salary, would do more in producing good feeling and loyal attachment to the Religious and political Constitutions of England, than the whole of the above expenditure? It is reasoning, by early instruction and example, that the unity of the Empire is to be maintained— all other methods will be found vain. The Church establishment must be made efficient, and commensurate with the wants of the people—it must no longer be thought a matter of indifference in Colonial policy, nor even of secondary consideration. It must take the lead of all others, if their preservation be of importance; and can it be doubted, that it is only through the Church and its Institutions, that a truly English char-

acter and feeling can be given to, or preserved among the population of any Foreign possession?

It is indeed mortifying to think that when our late venerable Sovereign gave the means, which will in future times become sufficient to support a religious establishment in this Country, he went so far beyond the spirit of the age in which he lived, that after a period of 35 years it has not been sufficiently appreciated, and the Christian spirit has made so little progress that no effectual assistance has yet been supplied to give body to the Church, and keep it substantially alive till the bounty of the king becomes available. Now it must be evident to all sincere followers of the Cross, that while, out of the many millions of public expenditure, it shall be considered a prodigy to devote a few hundred thousand pounds to support and disseminate religion in the Colonies, which no man has the hardihood to advocate in the British Legislature, Christianity has not produced even in the most favourable situation the effect which she ought to have done. And I will be bold to say, that still this and much more has been accomplished—till besides giving the Colonies religious instruction, the British Parliament contribute to the dissemination of the Gospel through the world, the religion of Jesus has failed in attaining a proper influence on the minds of the Members, which compose that illustrious Assembly. If we take the map of the world in our hands, and after examining it with Christian feelings, ask ourselves what nation has it most in its power to disseminate the Gospel, we shall be forcibly struck with the position of our Mother Country. Possessing dominions in every quarter of the Globe, and under every variety of climate, she has the power of carrying religious knowledge to every people, and were she to put forth her energies for this labour of love so attractive and sublime, she might be said to be evangelising, not Nations only, but the whole world. Now, if we rejoice in every attempt which she makes to communicate the arts, sciences, and letters, how much more ought it to be matter of joy to publish the blessings of the Gospel—for, how-

ever precious the arts of civilized life, & precious they must be confessed to be, how infinitely inferior are they to those sublime truths, which purify the affections of the heart, suggest the noblest contemplations to the mind, and determine the destiny of the human race ! If the inhabitants of England believe Christianity to be what it professes, a bright emanation from Heaven, the harbinger of peace and joy, love and felicity, to nations as well as individuals—if they have found from experience that it purifies and refines their sentiments, smooths the pillow of death, and opens the gates of Eternity, how shall they excuse themselves from labouring by every means in their power to promote its extension !

To form Colonies under the guidance of Christian principles, is one of the noblest and most beneficial purposes which Governments can fulfil. It is thus, that uninhabited countries are peopled—an asylum found for a redundant population—where want is exchanged for plenty—independence for slavery—and the purposes of creation accomplished in conferring happiness upon a greater number of rational beings. It is thus that deserts may be reclaimed, and the idolatrous inhabitants of distant regions, taught to exert the mighty energies of their minds, and to worship their Creator in spirit, and in truth. Now this is a field of glory more in the power of Great Britain, than in that of all the rest of the world combined. The slightest inspection of the Globe presents her vast possessions as a belt around it, and opens an unbounded theatre for the exercise of an enlightened policy as regards their government and laws, and what is of infinitely more consequence of infusing into their minds the truths of eternal life. What are the triumphs of victory to the dissemination of the Gospel? In vain shall Great Britain confer upon her Colonies the free government and liberal principles of legislation, for which she is distinguished, if she do not carry with her the revelations of God. Till she does this, she is unjust to her high station—to her splendid reputation and birth-right among the nations.—Every other crown she has earned, and worn. Every

other sort of glory has faded in her possession, but this the most glorious of all remains to be won. Let her therefore no longer leave to individuals or associations the labour of evangelizing her Colonies, or even the whole world—their means are inadequate, and acting without concert, their progress must be slow and uncertain. But let England, as she has the means and requires only the will, with the divine blessing put forth her strength. At an expense trifling indeed, compared to what she frequently spends upon unprofitable contests, she might place the moral world on a new foundation, and rise to the pinnacle of moral glory. By adopting a uniform system of religious instruction for all her Colonies in the East, as well as in the West, and following it up with energy and skill, she will establish an Empire more absolute than any, which unhallowed power can hold in subjection, and which will rest on the affections and opinions of more than two hundred millions of men. Nor would such a policy, sublime and affecting as it is, and pregnant with happiness and peace, increase her expenditure; for as the influence of christian principles extended, the charge for physical coercion would become less—murmurs would give way to blessings and praise; and one fourth of the human race being thus reclaimed, the remainder would gradually follow, and thus the whole earth become the garden of the Lord.

But we return from this sublime and fascinating subject to the venerable prelate, whose loss we deplore. He no doubt saw before his death many symptoms leading him to hope, that our Parent state would obtain that moral triumph of which we have been speaking—for that Legislature, which in 1793 considered the claims of the Colonies to religious instruction as the suggestion of visionaries and fanatics, has, since that period, sanctioned religious establishments, both in the East and West Indies; thus opening a door for the entrance of Christianity, in order to make some, though a tardy reparation for the injuries which we have inflicted upon these unhappy countries. And although the prevalence of religious prin-

ciples and feelings which has awakened thousands in every rank of life, to a solicitude, not only for their own spiritual and eternal interests, but for those of the whole family of man, had not yet extended its helping hand to the Canadas, it could not but suggest to him joyful anticipations as to the future and induce, him to believe that this holy spirit would soon be awakened in favour of his destitute Diocese, when it would be found that the painful labours and anxieties of 32 years, during which he had presided over it, though not marked by splendid advancement, had, nevertheless, paved the way for a much more rapid extension of the Christian faith, than could have otherwise been effected.

The Churches are indeed thinly scattered over this vast country, and bear a striking resemblance to the small congregations of primitive Christians in the days of the Apostles, but it is to be hoped that, through the blessing of God, the intervening spaces will soon be adorned with new congregations, till the whole population shall become united in one holy communion. And when this happy period shall arrive, how many pleasing associations will be coupled in their minds, with the recollection of the first Bishop of the Diocese, who gave life and order to that religious Establishment, which guides them to salvation ; impressing as he did in his different charges on the attention of his clergy—the duty of preaching redemption—the doctrine of the atonement—the satisfaction made for sinners by the blood of Christ—the corruption of human nature—the insufficiency of man, unassisted by divine grace—the efficacy of the prayer of faith, and the purifying, directing, sustaining, and sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit. Now that he hath departed, let us have these things in remembrance.

*A Review of a Sermon, Preached by the Hon. and Rev.
John Strachan, D. D. at York, U. C. 3d of July,
1825, on the Death of the late Lord Bishop
of Quebec.*

BY A METHODIST PREACHER.

THE diffusion of Christianity is the most important subject that can engage the attention of men. In its origin, nature, and effects, it may be justly said to be divine. While its doctrines, principles, and precepts, have been revealed from Heaven by Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and by them, disseminated through different parts of the world, they afford a powerful inducement, and an admirable pattern for imitation to their sincere followers in all ages of the world, and in every situation of life.

Who that considers, that it is the object and tendency of the religion which they propagated and established, to deliver the earth from her sorrows, to be our comfort in affliction, our joy in health, our hope in death, and our inestimable possession in eternity, but must feel an anxiety "to enlist among that disinterested band, who fight not for human ambition, or human praise, but for the honor of their Saviour and the Salvation of men."

But while we are roused to this holy warfare by the examples of those illustrious heroes of Christianity, and are encouraged with the sublime prospects which her promulgation presents, and the invaluable blessings which her achievements will bring to the fallen race, we consider it equally important, never to degrade her native dignity and worth, nor make her the author of those corruptions which she forbids and condemns.

When we see the heavenly affections which she infuses into the minds of men, represented as nothing more than an attachment to a particular constitution or establishment, and those bonds of charity by which she embraces all

mankind, described as the principle which only unites colonies to their "Parent State," to the unchristianization of all other kingdoms who bow not to this political shrine; when we see the balm of her consolations, which the beds of affliction requires to unite the distressed to their God and to prepare them to meet him in peace, perverted to the sordid purposes of extending the influence of a favourite church; but above all, when we see that which is converted into a vehicle of preferment, a political tool, exhibited as "a bright emanation from Heaven, the church of Christ, founded upon Jesus Christ, and his Apostles," we are sensible that the religion of the meek Saviour is made to bleed by a wound more fatal, than those which are inflicted by the ravings of infidelity. She is attacked by the most dangerous of all enemies, one who lurks within her borders, shelters himself under her canopy, and feeds upon her benevolence.

He who is sincerely attached to the Lord Jesus Christ and his interests, must feel himself compelled to contribute his efforts, however feeble they may be, to expose sentiments, which are so degrading to the character of Jesus and his Apostles, and so destructive to the true interests of his holy religion. And, as a dissenter, he must now think it high time to defend himself and his brethren from that calumny with which the Doctor's discourses and writings have, for so many years, been replete.

As to the Christian Religion it is possible for us to err in two respects; with regard to her nature, and the means to be used for the dissemination of her principles. Either of these mistakes, must necessarily defeat the object which she purposes. Into both of these errors, the Doctor seems to have unhappily fallen in the elaborate discourse before us.

He assumes axioms which are far from being self-evident; and lays down principles which can hardly be supported. He prescribes means, which never have been and never will be effectual, in accomplishing the victories of the Redeemer; and he throws out slander, which better comports with the character of a passionate lawyer,

pleading a hard cause, than it does with the character of a professed Christian, or Minister of the Gospel.

Whatever remarks the Doctor's discourse may require me to make, I wish it to be distinctly understood, that I mean no reflection on the doctrines, liturgy, or discipline of the church of which he has the honour to be a Minister. Be assured I mean no such thing. I firmly believe in her doctrines, I admire her liturgy, and I heartily rejoice in the success of those principles which are therein contained. And it is for the prosperity of the truths which they unfold, that I shall ever pray and contend. And with respect to church government, I heartily adopt the sentiments of the pious and learned Bishop Burnet that "that form of church government, is best which is most suitable to the customs and circumstances of the people among whom it is established. If I am at any time led to animadvert on the conduct of the clergy of the church of England, my strictures are not intended to be generally applied.— Even in Canada there are very worthy exceptions, whose names I would take particular pleasure in mentioning, were it not a step beyond the bounds of delicacy. Wherever he is, and in whatever church he is,

"I venerate the man, whose heart is warm,
Whose hands are pure, whose doctrine, and whose life,
Coincident, exhibit lucid proof
That he is honest in a sacred cause.
To such I render more than mere respect,
Whose actions say that they respect themselves.
But loose in morals, and in manners vain,
In conversation frivolous, in dress
Extreme, at once rapacious and profuse;
Frequent in park, with lady at his side,
Ambling and prattling scandal as he goes;
But rare at home, and never at his books,
Or with a pen, save when he scrawls a card;
Constant at routes, familiar with a round
Of ladyships, a stranger to the poor;
Ambitious of perferment for its gold,
And well prepared by ignorance and sloth,
By infidelity and love of world,
To make God's work a sinecure; a slave
To his own pleasures and his patron's pride;
From such Apostles, O ye mitred heads,
Preserve the church! And lay not careless hands
On skulls that cannot teach and will not learn."

But, I am far from paying that servile homage to the disputed documents of history as to acknowledge the unbroken succession of Episcopal authority from the Apostles to the present day ; nor do I think that presumption can be supported consistently with the principles of the Church of England. I feel myself quite deficient in sagacity of perception, or that wonderful power of association for which the Dr. is so eminent, as to discern the resemblance between the congregations of the church of England in Canada, and the assemblies of ancient Christians; neither am I able to learn in what part of the New Testament the Doctor finds Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, Rectors, Deacons, Prebendaries, Vicars, Readers, Clerks, &c. with which the church of England is so abundantly fortified.

Were I to judge according to outward appearance, I should feel a trembling awe ; in drawing near to this impregnable Castle of the State, so “venerable” in every department ; but feeling myself at liberty to judge righteous judgment, I approach it without dread, nor do I feel myself obligated to take my shoes from off my feet.

The Dr. when describing the present church of England, with her various offices, and superb appendages, feels confident that he is exhibiting to us a truly apostolic church. He says, (speaking of the church of England) “her government justly claims a divine origin, sanctioned by the *authority* and *practice* of the apostles, which is the law of Christ,” (p 13;) and, having spoken most pompously of her teachers, liturgy, discipline, and unity, he says, “such she was seen by those who proclaimed her in the midst of the flames, such she has remained for many centuries, and such his Lordship presented her to the inhabitants of these Provinces, pure and spotless as her faith.”

What “origin” the Dr. calls “divine” I am not able to determine; for I find but little in the commonly received scriptures which contains the divinity laid down in the above cited passages. The apostles, it seems, had not sufficient discernment to fortify the “towers of their Zion”

with the modern “defender of the Faith,” or that “watchful shepherd, whose voice will rouse the inferior clergy, if slothful and punish them, if negligent.”—And if we compare the present state and conduct of a great part of the church of England, with that of the apostolic church, and of many of her clergy, we will have but little cause to wish the continuance of this relationship, either with the “defender,” or the “shepherd.”

That the three orders of church officers in the church of England are not apostolic, is undeniable from those plain accounts which are given us in the New Testament of the ancient churches. However different our ideas may be which we are accustomed to attach to the terms Bishop and Presbyter, or Elder, it is certain that they were promiscuously used in the scriptures for names of the same officers. This is obvious from the exhortation which St. Peter gives to the Jewish christians. “The elders which are among you, I exhort, who am also an elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed, feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the *oversight* thereof (—, or governing as bishops) not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre’ sake, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but examples to the flock.” (1 Pet. v. 1, 2, 3.) Here they were commanded not only to feed the flock of God, but to govern it with Episcopal authority; and the apostle, as a church officer, calls himself nothing more than an elder.

In Acts (xx. 17, 25, 6, 7, 8,) “And from Miletus, he (St. Paul) sent to Ephesus, & called the elders (presbuteros, or presbyters) of the church. And when they had come together unto him, he said unto them, And now behold, I know that you among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more. Wherefore, I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you everseers (episcopal bishops, called in

verse 17 presbuteros elders or presbyters) to feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood."

Now at this meeting of the apostle and the elders of the church of Ephesus, Timothy was present, (Acts xx. 4, 5, &c.) who, we are often informed, was the first diocesan bishop of that church. If Timothy was the prelate, or modern diocesan bishop of that church, why did the apostle, even in the presence of Timothy, delegate the whole episcopal authority to the elders or presbyters? Could there ever be a more favourable time than this to teach elders their duty to their diocesan bishop, if there was any? He says that he had "declared unto them the *whole* counsel of God." How could this be true if he had not taught them subjection to their prelate? The apostle foresaw that ravenous wolves would come and attempt to devour the flock, and if diocesan episcopacy was the only effectual remedy against these approaching evils, as some learned divines very gravely teach, why did the apostle not appoint Timothy, who was then standing by his side, to his office, and give him the proper instructions for the discharge of his important duty? Should it be asked "what was Timothy's duty in that city? (for I readily acknowledge that he was invested with authority to ordain and rebuke presbyters.) To this I answer that he exercised the office of an evangelist. (2 Tim. iv. 5.) According to Eusebius, (Eccles. Hist. chap. 9,) the work of an evangelist was, "to lay the foundations of the faith in barbarous nations, and to constitute among them pastors, after which he passed into other countries." And this perfectly accords with 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10, 11, Phil. ii. 19.

I might here give the Dr. a little information relative to the introduction of diocesan episcopacy, But upon this I will only remark, that the hearts of every good man, even in ancient days, as well as the present, were not entirely free from the desire of influence and dominion, and therefore the whole mystery is explained in 2 Thess. ii. 7, 1 John ii. 18, 19.

I leave the scriptures for the present, for I perceive the Doctor likes politics much better. But before I follow him into this favourite field in which we are always favoured with his presence, though not for the best of purposes, I wish to make one or two enquiries more about the "divine origin" of his "venerable church." He seems to consider the episcopal authority, as it is exercised in the church of England, unbroken from the apostles.—How the Dr. will make this appear, is difficult for me to determine, unless he can prove the ordination of Queen Elizabeth, and the British Parliament, (who pronounced legal, 8 years after his formal ordination, the ordination of Mr. Parker, the first church of England prelate, whom the papal bishops unanimously refused to ordain, and who was ordained by bishops that had been deposed from their offices by Queen Mary) by the "venerable" fathers of the third and fourth centuries; or by claiming it from his holiness the Pope. But as the Dr. though possessing a wonderful power of association, will hardly presume so far upon the longevity of the ancient fathers, we think he would prefer the latter source of ecclesiastical authority, which harmonizes better with his complexion, as well as with the history of the times. But even in this happy retreat, the Doctor comes in contact with his own principles. He declares in the book of Homilies, (which are recognized in the 35th article of his creed, as containing "a godly and wholesome doctrine") that the church of Rome is a "Harlot, the most filthy of all harlots, the greatest that ever has been." How is the Dr. to derive a pure, spiritual, and apostolic authority, from the "most filthy of all harlots?" If he still maintains this intimate relationship with the "most filthy of all harlots," even when she denies his legitimacy, he is welcome to the endearing connexion. I will not attempt to disturb him in his undefiled repose.

The Doctor however, does not lay so much stress on this part. The fire of animation does not appear to kindle till he comes to the chain on which the purse hangs.—Then he rises to the sublime. "Indeed" says the Dr.

“a Christian nation without a religious establishment is a contradiction. And notwithstanding the praise-worthy exertions of a few denominations in the neighbouring states, more especially the Episcopal church, christianity, except in a few large towns, is found to languish, and seldom in the country pervades the mass of the population : and let the opponents of ecclesiastical establishments, if any such there be, compare the people who have no standing ministry, (or religious establishment) not merely in towns where a spark of Christianity may exist, but through the country, with a people who possess this inestimable advantage, and he will acknowledge that no country can be called Christian, which does not give public support to christianity, (or an ecclesiastical establishment) and that no other religion but that of Jesus, could have suggested an idea so grand and affecting, as that of placing a public teacher of righteousness in every small society throughout the world.”

The Doctor, in other parts of his sermon, as well as in the passage above quoted, endeavours to impress upon his readers, that the “church of Christ,” and a “religious establishment” are one. And so confident is he of it, that he roundly asserts, that a religious establishment is essential to every Christian nation, and to the diffusion of Christianity. Not to notice the profound ignorance of religion and church history, the palpable contradiction to daily experience, and the pitiable bigotry that such representations display, I observe, that the church of Christ as described in the scriptures, is very distinct and different from such a religious establishment as that to which the Doctor alludes.

By a religious establishment, I understand, “a clergy, or an order of men secluded from other professions to attend upon the offices of religion ; (not politicians) a legal provision for the maintenance of the clergy ; and the confining of that provision to a *particular sect* of Christianity.” (Paley.) Such “a legal provision,” or I may say, such a union of civil and religious policy, the Doctor seems to consider essential to “a church founded by the authority

and practice of the Apostles, which is the law of Christ." But, in the scriptures, I do not find this notion attached to the "church of Christ."

St. Cyprian says that "where two or three believers are met together, there is a church." But we will turn to the law and to the testimony.

The first time that St. Paul mentions the term "church" is in his preface to the first epistle to the Corinthians.— "Paul called to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ, unto the church of God, which is at Corinth;" the import of which expression, is determined by the following words. "To them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be Saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord, both theirs and ours."—(see 2. Cor. i. 1, Gal. i. 2.) Frequently the term "church" is taken in a more extensive sense, meaning all the Saints upon earth; as we pray in the liturgy "let us pray for the whole state of Christ's church militant here on earth," which is doubtless St. Paul's meaning in Acts xx. 28, including the Catholic, or universal church, or all the Christians in the world. This is in perfect harmony with the nineteenth article of the church of England.

"The visible *church of Christ* is a congregation of faithful men, (or as the Latin translation of the 39 articles, published at the same time by authority, expresses it, "*coetus credentium*," "a congregation of believers) in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered."—From all these authorities we may infer, that "the church of Christ" is a body of men among whom "there is one body, one spirit, one hope one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God & Father of all, who is above all, and in all, and through them all."—(Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6.) We hear nothing here of religious establishments." Why? Because the Apostles and reformers thought there could be Christian nations, without the union of civil and ecclesiastical power. Gold was not valued so highly by those "uneducated itinerant" Apostles, as it is by some of their "venerable successors."

I dare say that even the Doctor himself, in his cool and rational moments, would subscribe to the above account of "the church of Christ." But getting warm in his subject, and his imagination being considerably saffroned he slipt a little beyond the bounds of cool correctness, by gracing his subject with a few rhetorical embellishments.

It being obvious that there is nothing like our present "religious establishment," in the scripture accounts of the Apostolic church; we will enquire a moment whether it is consistent with a truly Apostolic church.

To silence every objection raised against a religious establishment, the Doctor triumphantly boasts that "the religious establishments of England and Scotland have been, under the divine blessing, the great promoters of all that is great and good in those happy countries" with respect to morality and literature, liberty, charity, &c.

The truth of this statement will be considered in another place; I shall now examine the principle.

Upon this I remark, that our Saviour never intimated the union of his church with the civil polity of any country. He refused to settle legal disputes, (Luke xii. 14.) He said that his "kingdom was not of this world," (John xviii. 36;) and consequently, that the policy by which his spiritual system is managed never ought to be blended with the imperfect works of men. Nor indeed can it be united with them without suffering material injury.

With respect to the support afforded to religion by the civil government, matter of fact proves that it can answer no beneficial purpose. The church of Christ never was so prosperous and so pure, as she was in the first three centuries. She was not only without the aid of the civil government, but was most violently opposed by it. Did this extirpate her from the earth or retard her progress? The former part of the Doctor's Sermon abundantly proves that even "uneducated itinerant men, without human aid or influence, can in the strength of the Lord," "strew their way from country to country with the wrecks of Satan's kingdom." Did not the religion of the Redeemer spread her vicories with almost unconceivable ra-

pidity against the united intrigue and force, of Jews, Greeks and Romans? Why is not "the manner of propagating the gospel, in the first days of its glory, the most judicious manner of propagating it now?" Are her evidences less clear and forcible? Is her influence less upon the heart? If she, without civil support, nay, even opposed by the civil government, rose triumphant over the powers of earth and hell, and extended her influence so wide, that as Tertullian informs us, Christians were in the forum, the senate, and in every place, except the theatre, why is her influence and extension now depending upon Legislative influence? If there be any power in Christianity, it operates on the *consciences* of men; resting solely on the belief of *invisible* realities. She can derive no weight or solemnity from human sanctions.—"The Kingdom of God" says Jesus "is within you," (Luke xvii. 21.) It is divested of that external pomp and splendour which are calculated to excite the admiration of the world; why then should a union with worldly men and worldly policy be considered essential to its diffusion and establishment? Is it not plain that whoever insists upon this heterogeneous union degrades the religion of Jesus, and displays an ignorance of its gracious power? Is this not making Christianity, a pensioner upon political benevolence, rather than the "power of God unto salvation," (Rom. i. 16;) a tool of the state more than "a bright emanation from heaven?" No wonder then, that the power of religion, when clogged with the selfish contrivances of men, is always weakened. No wonder that those divines who are constantly dabbling in politics, are a disgrace to the church and a pestilence to their parishioners.

When was it that the church of Christ began to degenerate from her primative purity? When religious establishments were first contemplated.—When did popish and corrupt doctrines receive countenance and support in the church? When religious establishments commenced their existence.—When did papal domination, which has crimsoned the Christian world from age to age, commence her infernal sway? When religious establishments got

the vogue. When was the clergy corrupted by the emoluments of the church, so as to become dissolute in their lives, loose in their principles, and defective in their instructions; that the most superstitions and destructive errors became unchangeably established; that the *public creed* and *private sentiments* of her ministers widely differed; and that sadducees found their way even into the pulpit? Let the faithful records of history declare it, to the everlasting disgrace of religious establishments. The Doctor attributes the superiority of intellectual improvement in England to her religious establishment. I feel no disposition to derogate from the luminaries of the church of England that respect and praise, to which their superior talents and literary attainments give them an undisputed right. But let it also be remembered that learning and talents have shone with equal splendour among dissenters; and that the most illustrious literary characters, both in language and divinity, philosophy and the polite arts, which England can boast, rank themselves among dissenters. This shows that England might still "stand aloft like the sun in the heavens," without paying several hundred thousand pounds annually for the support of a religious establishment.

The Doctor considers a "religious establishment" the only means of supporting the clergy.

Were not the first ministers of Jesus Christ supported by the free-will offerings of Christians? The Apostles had not found out the art of forcing men to support religion. This was left to the fertile genius of some of the "venerable" successors; and by them has been displayed to admirable advantage for many centuries. Yes, to such a degree of perfection has the system of *forcing* by the authority of Legislative enactments, been brought; that A. B. being Rector of C. is allowed £1000 per annum. Vicar of D. £600. of E. £500 per annum: and F. G. L. and Dean of S. P. is allowed the very respectable income of 18 or £20,000 per annum. No wonder that Diocesan Episcopacy and religious establishments are so highly valued, when they

have made such great improvements on the imperfect system of Christianity laid down by the Apostles, whose views were so grovelling that they did not seek a superb establishment to dwell in, but could even go "from country to country strewing their way with the wrecks of Satan's Kingdom," "and having food and raiment, could therewith be content" (1 Tim. vi. 8.) without having their fingers in politics, or a voice in the Legislature. Their "venerable" successors have become more wise, and have learned to take the world more easily and not preach Christ from house to house, in season and out of season, as the "uneducated itinerant" Apostles did. Many of their "venerable" successors have become so completely master of their profession, that they can spend two or three nights in a week at the card table ; one or two in the ball room, &c. &c. &c. and there preach, by their pious example, the doctrine of Christian purity. The Apostles never had the zeal to do this, though they sometimes preached Jesus in the streets, at the tribunal, and in prison.

So highly does the Doctor value religious establishments, that he is sure our neighbours in the United States dont feel the influence of religious instruction "among the mass of their population." I am no republican ; but, I will take the liberty to observe that the United States, without the assistance of a religious establishment, can produce men, who, for piety, learning, and talents, both in the pulpit, in the closet, and in the senate, make a much more honourable display, than those who seem to despise them.—I will just state the numbers of the different religious denominations in the neighbouring States, and leave the reader to judge, how far the influence of religious instruction is felt among the "mass of the population."

"The principal religious denominations, at present in the United States, are the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, Baptists, Friends, Episcopalians, and Methodists. The two first of these unitedly have more than twenty-five hundred congregations ; the number of the Baptists congregations, exceeds two thousand; the Friends

have five hundred ; and the Episcopalians are about three hundred. The Methodists also are numerous."* [Hist. U. S. p. 383.]

I cannot but take notice of a circumstance in the Doctor's Sermon, which though, indifferent in itself, yet strongly bespeaks the narrowness of his religious feelings. Reluctantly conceding the "praiseworthy exertions of a few religious denominations in the neighbouring states," he observes, "more especially the Episcopal church," which the historian informs us contains only three hundred congregations : and those we understand, are not in general, very conspicuous either for their religious zeal or piety.

The Dr. affirms, that "without a liturgy, or regular form of prayer, no church can continue long," [p. 14.]—This carries its own refutation.

He also says that "the liturgy presents with great force, simplicity, and beauty, the ways, means, and appointments of God, to restore our fallen nature to purity, and everlasting life, that it becomes a source of the liveliest devotion ; by it the prejudices of men are removed, their minds enlightened and their hearts open to the reception of the Gospel." [p. 14.] To all this pompous panegyric on the wonderful efficacy of the liturgy, I shall oppose the testimony of one of the most pious, and learned ministers of the church of England.

"During my whole life he says" I have heard of only three instances of persons converted to God, by attending to the service of the church in places where the Gospel has not been preached, and I trust I should not exaggerate, were I to say that I have known *three thousand* in places where it has been preached, [Christ. Obs. p. 593, A. D. 1805.]

In page 13, 14, the Dr. observes that "while the members of other denominations, connected by no bond of union, by no common principles of order, and no subordination, are soon scattered or divided, *our* church proceeds

* The Methodists consist of 334,268 members and 1,280 Preachers.

with all the advantages, which union, discipline, and order can produce. The people whom we address, are not bewildered with a variety of opinions."

I scarcely know which to impeach, the Doctor's honesty, or his ignorance. Who has not heard of the "variety of opinions," and the warm disputes that have divided the members and even ministers of the church of England, at every period of her existence? If there be no "variety of opinion" among the members of the church of England, whence originated the theological disputes between Mr. Simeon and Dr. Marsh, between the Christian Observers, and the British Critics; between Dr. Hawker and Mr. Fellowes, between the Bishop of St. Davids and the Bishop of Llandaff; between the Evangelical clergy, and the high Churchmen, &c. &c.?

Is it possible for a man of truth, and honesty, to make representations of this kind?

The Doctor then proceeds to detail the many and serious difficulties which opposed the first establishment, and which still prevents the extension of the church of England in Canada. He describes in quite striking colours, the almost incredible ignorance, the mental degradation, the vitiated principles and practices, which abounded in the greatest part of the country at the time of his lordship's first visit, and which now exist in many places. But he considers those obstacles which the "venerable church" has to surmount, the greatest, which are occasioned by dissenters and sectaries. And here, as a hungry parson once did upon the poor men's beef, the Dr. makes a dead set upon the Methodists.

"Even when churches are erected," says the Dr., "the persons who gave regular attendance are so few, as greatly to discourage the minister, and his influence is frequently broken or injured by numbers of uneducated itinerant preachers, who, leaving their usual employment, betake themselves to preaching the gospel out of idleness, or a zeal without knowledge, by which they are induced without any preparation to teach what they do not know, and which from their pride they disdain to learn."

With respect to the small numbers who give regular attendance to the ministrations of the church of England, I am of the Doctor's opinion. For I believe those instances are not very rare, which almost compel the venerable clergyman of Canada, to say with Dean Swift, "my dearly beloved Roger, the Scripture moveth us, in sundry places, &c. And as a remedy for this doleful complaint, we may say with the eloquent Chalmers, "to fill the church well, we must fill the pulpit well." Until that is done, the Doctor's mournful cries of Sectarianism! Schism! Republicanism! will still be screeching in our ears; and the repose of the "Imperial Parliament" will continue to be disturbed by the desponding exclamations. "The church is in danger—money! power!"—Is there no deliverance from those tedious qualms, with which the Dr. has for so many years been pained! Yes, it is found in 2. Tim. iv. 2. Preach the word; be instant in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine."

As to the Doctor's remarks on the qualifications, motives, and conduct of the Methodist itinerant preachers they are ungenerous, unfounded and false.

The Methodist preachers do not value themselves upon the wealth, virtues, or grandeur of their ancestry; nor do they consider their former occupation an argument against their present employment or usefulness. They have learned that the "venerable" Apostles, were once fishermen; that a Milner could once throw the shuttle; and that a Newton was not ashamed to watch his mother's flock. By these examples, and a hundred more, they feel themselves sufficiently shielded from the envious reflections of a bigotted ecclesiastic. They are likewise charged with "preaching the gospel out of idleness."—Does the Dr. claim the attribute of omniscience? Does he know what is in man? How does he know they preach "the gospel out of idleness?" Let the Doctor remember that "with what judgment he judges, he shall be judged," [Matt. vii. 2.] What does the Doctor call idleness? Not the reading of one or two dry discourses

every Sabbath : not the preaching to one congregation, with an annual income of 2 or £300. No ; this is hard labour, this is indefatigable industry. Two or four hundred pounds per annum is no inducement, no motive for preaching the gospel. Those who labour in this Apostolic manner, and for this small pittance, cannot be otherwise than the “venerable successors” of the Apostles.— Who are they then, that preach the gospel out of idleness ? Those indolent covetous men who travel from 2 to 300 miles and preach from 25, to 40 times every month. Those who in addition to this visit from house to house, and teach young and old “repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ,” (Acts, xx. 21.) Those who continue this labour year after year, and are elevated with the enormous salary of 25 or £50 per annum ; these are the men who preach “the gospel out of idleness.”— O bigotry ? thou parent of persecution ; O envy ! thou fountain of slander ; O covetousness ! thou god of injustice ! would to heaven, ye were banished from the earth !

The Methodist preachers are said to be “uneducated,” and to preach the gospel without “any preparation.”— To a collegiate education they do not make pretensions. But it should not be forgotten that there are other ways and places of improvement, besides the Doctor’s Academy at — and that if this objection may be brought against the Methodist preachers in Canada, it cannot be brought against those who composed their articles & discipline ; & who formed their constitution. The founders of methodism, were not inferior to the most illustrious of their age, both in the republic of letters, and in scientific knowledge in general. But the Methodist preachers are not destitute of learning ; nor do they undervalue it. They consider it indispensibly necessary to an able minister of the gospel. They go farther. They say “to human learning, we must add divine grace ;” “that man is not properly qualified” say they “who can only translate some of the classics, read a chapter or two of the Greek gospels, rehearse the Lord’s prayer and the ten commandments in Latin, perhaps write a Latin sermon &c.—if he be destitute of that wisdom which comes down from

heaven, "he cannot discern the things of the spirit of God," (1 Cor. ii. 14.) "Old things must pass away, and all things must become new," (2 Cor. v. 17.) St. Paul's learning, though extensive, did not qualify him for the ministry. "His sins must be washed away, and he, be filled with the Holy Ghost," (Acts, ix. 17.) The son of God was revealed in his heart, before he was qualified to preach him among the heathen (Gal. i. 16.) Except a man be born not only of water, but of the *spirit* he cannot see, much less can he enter, and we add, much less is he qualified to preach the kingdom of God, (John, iii. 3, 5.) "Learning and piety" says an able divine "accompanied with a consciousness of the divine call, constitute the accomplished and able minister of Jesus Christ."

The Methodist preachers consider a knowledge of the languages, both desirable and useful, and encourage the attainment of them, and allow to those who possess this knowledge all the superior advantages which it confers. But they do not think that what is commonly called *classical learning*, is essential to the minister of the Gospel. A few words excepted, it is quite needless to refer to the original languages in theological discussions, and on all those words and phrases, where the meaning is equivocal, or where a difference of opinion exists, all has been, that can with profit, be said. So generally is the learning of antiquity, and science in general, brought within the limits of our mother tongue, that we can attain a competent knowledge of all the sciences (excepting a few technical terms) without knowing any other than the English language. This is so true in divinity, that we see very many divines, who attach a great deal of sanctity and virtue to classical learning, no sooner pass the Bishop's hands, than they bid farewell to the ancient languages, and in a few years know as little about them (a few proverbial phrases excepted) as those who never learned them. Of what advantage is it to have known the good old way, and if after we have known it, we depart from the holy commandment delivered unto us?

But the Methodist church is not indifferent to the quali-

fications of her ministers. Whoever attends to the following rules given in the Methodist discipline, will see the wickedness and falsehood of those vague assertions, that the Methodist preachers "are induced to preach what they do not know, and which from their pride they disdain to learn." With the following prior preparation every person must comply before he can become a minister of the Methodist church.

1. They are received as private members of society on trial.—2. After a half year, if they are found deserving, they are admitted as proper members.—3. When their grace and abilities are sufficiently manifest, they are appointed leaders of classes.—4. If they then discover talents for more important services, they are employed to exhort occasionally in the smaller congregations when the preachers cannot attend.—5. If approved of in this line of duty, they are allowed to preach.—6. Out of those men who are called local preachers, are selected the itinerant preachers, who are recommended by the conference of local preachers to the travelling conference; and if accepted, are appointed to a circuit.—7. Their characters and conduct are examined annually in the conference; and if they continue faithful for two years of trial, they are admitted into full connexion and ordained deacons; and if faithful two years longer, they are ordained elders or presbyters.

At these conferences, strict enquiry is made into the conduct and success of every preacher, and those who are found deficient in abilities are no longer employed as itinerants; while those whose conduct has not been agreeable to the gospel are expelled, and are thereby deprived of all the privileges, even of private members of the society.—(See *Adam's Religious World Displayed*, Vol. III. *Coke's life of Wesley*.)

Before persons are allowed to preach, after complying with the requisitions above laid down, the following questions are asked.

I. Do they know God as a pardoning God? Have they the love of God abiding in them? Do they desire

nothing but God? And are they holy in all manner of conversation?

II. Have they gifts (as well as grace) for the work? Have they [in some tolerable degree] a clear sound understanding, a right judgement in the things of God, a just conception of salvation by faith?—And has God given them any degree of utterance?—Do they speak justly, readily, and clearly?

III. Have they fruit; are any truly convinced of sin and converted to God by their preaching?

As long as these three marks concur in any one, we believe he is called of God to preach.—These we receive as a sufficient proof that he is moved by the Holy Ghost to preach. [Meth. Discipline, p. 44.]

When Methodist preachers are admitted to travel on trial in the manner already noticed, the following rule is given:—"It shall be the duty of the Bishop or of a committee, whom he shall appoint, at each annual conference, to point out a course of reading and study, proper to be pursued by candidates for the ministry; and the presiding elder, whenever such are presented to him, shall direct them to those studies, which have been thus recommended.—And before any such candidate is received into full connexion, he shall give a satisfactory evidence, respecting his knowledge of those particular subjects, which have been recommended to his consideration." [Discip. p. 32.] Accordingly; "The committee of preachers appointed to arrange a plan or course of study for the candidates for admission into full connexion with the travelling preachers of the Methodist church in Canada, recommended the following courses of study as indispensibly necessary."

Divinity.—Wesley's Sermons, Fletcher's Checks, Clark's and Benson's Commentaries.

Logic.—Watts' Logic.

Ecclesiastical History.—Mosheim's and Milner's Ecclesiastical Histories.

Grammar.—Murray's Grammar.

Geography.—Morse's Geography.

They farther recommend the following studies as useful and ornamental :—viz.

Natural Philosophy.—Wesley's Philosophy.

Ancient and Modern History.—Goldsmith's Rome, Greece, and England, Rollin's Ancient History, Prideaux, and Shuckford's Connections.

Poetry.—Milton's Paradise Lost, Young's Night Thoughts, and Cowper's Poems.

Biography.—The lives of Wesley, Fletcher, Coke, Bramwell and Francis Xavier, British Nepos, &c.

Chronology.—Clark's Tables, contained in his Commentary.

The selection of authors on some branches, might perhaps have been more judicious ; but do the above extracts show that the Methodist preachers “ are induced without any preparation to preach what they do not know, and which from their pride they disdain to learn ? ”—The Methodist preachers are required to be diligent and studious, not only before they enter into full connexion, but during the whole course of their ministry. To such their discipline [p. 60] gives the following directions.—“ Read the most useful books, and that regularly and constantly.

Steadily spend all the morning in this employment, or, at least five hours in four and twenty. And if any have not a taste for reading, let them acquire it or return to their former employment.”

What are the public left to think of a man of God, a prop of the church, who, surrounded by the sacred vestments of his ministry, with the word of truth before his eyes, and standing as an ambassador for Christ, will, when warned by all these solemnities, and in the face of the above evidence, pour forth slander as black as it is bitter ?—It is not impossible that the Methodist ministry, with all their imperfection and ignorance, may be almost as useful to the uncultivated inhabitants of Canada, as he who

“ stands fast wedged
Between two empirics, and with swollen cheeks
Inspires the news, his trumpet keener far
Than all invective is his bold harangue,

While through that public organ of report
 He hails the clergy ; and defying shame,
 Announces to the world his own, and theirs !
 He teaches those to read whom schools dismiss'd
 And colleges untaught ; sells accent, tone,
 And emphasis, in score, and gives to pray'r
 The *adagio* and *candate* it demands.
 He grinds divinity of other days
 Down into modern use ; transforms old print
 To zigzag manuscript, and cheats the eyes
 Of gallery critics by a thousand arts.
 Are there who purchase of the Doctor's ware ?
 O name it not in Gath ! it cannot be
 That grave and learned clerks should need such aid,
 He doubtless is in sport, and does but droll,
 Assuming thus a rank unknown before,
 Grand caterer and dry nurse of the church."

The Dr. having given this death blow to the Methodist preachers, continues several pages, developing the wretched state of morals, and the want of improvement in Canada ; and the very serious impediments in the procuring of support, either from England or from the Legislature of these Provinces. Also, that the want of laborers, and the scarcity of means induced the Bishop of Quebec to apply to the "society for the propogation of the Gospel in foreign parts," to increase the number of their missions. "His Lordship's request being favourably received "says the Doctor," the next difficulty was to procure clergymen. For when they [the society] had assented to the Bishop's prayer, in as far as they were able, clergymen of enlightened piety could not be found willing to leave England for Canada ; that gentlemen of education and zeal refused to forsake their homes, and the endearing associations, of early years, to come to so distant and inhospitable a colony."

If "gentlemen of enlightened piety and zeal would not sacrifice their homes and the endearing associations of early years" to preach the word of life to the uncultivated inhabitants of this colony, who would ? Would those of less piety and less zeal do it ? If this be the character of the "gentlemen of *enlightened piety and zeal*," what notions are we left to entertain of the great mass of the English clergy ? Can these be the "sincere followers of

the cross ?” Can these be the true followers of him who declared with the most solemn asseverations, “if any man love father or mother, wife or children, houses or lands, more than me or my gospel, he cannot be my disciple ?” (Luke, xiv. 26.) Can these be the followers of him, who “counted all things but *dross* for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus ?” (Phil. iii. 8.) Of him who was “willing not only to be bound at Jerusalem, but to die for the Lord Jesus ?” (Acts, xx. 13.) Can these gentlemen of *enlightened piety* and *zeal* be the “venerable” successors of him who “went from country to country strewing his way with the wrecks of Satan’s kingdom ?”

We would fain exculpate the enlightened and pious clergymen of England from that indelible reproach that the Doctor has poured upon them ; but we fear the task would be too tedious at present. It seems however, that though his Lordship could not find gentlemen of *enlightened piety* in England, he could find some in the sister kingdom who could sacrifice not only the “endearing association of early years,” but their own church, “to come over to the help of the Lord against the mighty.” Hence though this objection might be brought against the “gentlemen of *enlightened piety* and *zeal*” in England it could not be brought against those of Scotland.

The Dr. having shot his pointless darts at the sectaries of Canada, explored her “dreary wastes” and severely reproach the luke warmness of the English clergy, commences hostilities with the Imperial Parliament, against which he brandishes his little dagger with a great deal of vehemence and ability. However, it does not yet appear that he has cut his way to the money chest ; and as we think that the Imperial Parliament are quite capable of defending themselves and taking care of their purse, we shall not step forward in their defence.

The Dr. towards his expiring moments on this heart rending subject, exclaims “what can 53 clergymen do, scattered over a country of greater extent than Great Britain ? Is it to be wondered at that under such circum-

stances, the religious benefits of the ecclesiastical establishment of England, are little known or felt, and that sectaries of all descriptions are increasing on every side? And when it is considered that the religious teachers of the other denominations, a very respectable portion of the ministers of the church of Scotland excepted, come almost universally from the Republican States of America, where they gather their knowledge and form their sentiments, it is quite evident, that if the Imperial Government does not immediately step forward with efficient help,* the mass of the population will be nurtured and instructed in hostility to our Parent church, nor will it be long till they imbibe opinions, any thing but favourable to the political institutions of England." We are sorry to see the Dr. reduced to such a dilemma of agitation and distress; but we fear that his recovery will not be immediate. He asks in the language of despair "what can 53 clergymen do scattered over a country of greater extent than Great Britain?"—For the Doctor's reflection and encouragement I would ask what did 12 Apostles do in the midst of an obstinate, a barbarous, and a persecuting world?—What did a Waldus do in the valleys of Piedmont? What did a Wickliffe do in England? What did a Luther do in Germany; nay, in the Christian world? What did a Wesley and his contemporaries do in Europe? What have the Methodists done in America?

The most of these were not endowed with miraculous gifts. Why did they not cry out in the tone of discouragement, "What can one man do in the face of an anti-christian world? Why did they not apply to some Legislature for pecuniary aid? Because they had learned that "the race was not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong," [Eccl. ix. 11.] Because they felt the force of

* Is it not astonishing to hear such language in a country where three millions of acres are set apart for the support of 53 clergymen, besides their proportion of nearly £10,000 a year given for the support of the established faith, in the Canadas by the British Parliament, and by the Society for propagating the Gospel in foreign parts?

that saying, "cursed is the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm, whose heart departeth from the Lord," [Jer. xvii. 5.] Because they knew that the victories of the cross did not owe their extension to Legislative influence or support. Because they believed the weapons of their warfare were not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds, (2. Cor. x. 4.) Because they had 'the sword of the spirit, which divideth asunder the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart,' (Eph. vi. 17, Heb. iv. 12.) Because they were convinced 'that the manner of propagating the gospel in the first days of its glory, must be the most judicious manner of propagating it now.' And 'according to their faith so it was done unto them,' (Matt. ix. 29.) Let the 'venerable' successors of the Apostles in Canada, go forward in the spirit of him whose residence was among the habitations of distress and the tabernacles of the poor; let them in reality, be the followers of them who 'declared the whole counsel of God, in season and out of season, from house to house, reproofing, rebuking, exhorting with all long-suffering and doctrine,' (Acts, xx. 27, 2 Tim. iv. 2.) And they will soon exclaim, not in the language of apology, but in the song of triumph 'what have 53 clergymen done in the British Canada Colony!' Would to God they might so do, and that every house might become a house of prayers, and every heart, a temple of the Holy Ghost!

One particular reason, which the Dr. assigns for imploring the aid of the Imperial Parliament is, that republican principles will be instilled into the minds of the people, by the 'religious teachers of the other denominations, who' he says 'come *almost universally* from the Republican States of America.'

To put the Dr. at rest on this point, and to remove this cause of complaint, I remark, that the 'religious teachers of the other denominations' do not talk or think quite so much about politics as the Doctor does. They have something else to do. They leave others to attend to temporal affairs, that they may 'give themselves to prayer,

and to the ministry of the word,' [Acts, vi. 4.] 'They find as much as they can do in hunting up the lost sheep of the house of Israel,' [Matt. xv. 24,] without having their fingers in every political question that is agitated in the colony. 'They feel the force of that command, 'give thyself wholly to them, study to show thyself a workman that needeth not to be ashamed,' [1 Tim. iv. 15. 2 Tim. ii. 15] 'They believe it to be their duty above all men to 'have their conversation in heaven,' [Phil. iii. 20.] And whatever might be their private feelings, they know that they have not come to canvass political questions, but to 'call sinners to repentance,' [Matt. ix. 13.]

But the assertion is false. They are not republicans; neither are they infected with republican principles; nor have they come 'almost universally from the Republican States of America.'

Seven eighths of the religious teachers among the dissenters, are British born subjects. And out of the whole body of the Methodist itinerant preachers, who seem to be the principal butt of the Doctor's hatred, there are only eight, who have not been *born and educated* in the British dominions. And of those eight all except two have become naturalized British subjects according to the statute of the Province. Although such representations might have some palliation had they proceeded from a subtle lawyer, or a designing politician, yet, what covering can they have to conceal their deformity, when they drop from the lips of him, who proclaims them as he does, the solemn truths of heaven?

The hue-and-cry that 'dissenters are disaffected to the Imperial Government,' has stunned the ears of almost all Europe, for more than two centuries. It was first raised to make dissenters contribute to the support of the establishment, to enlarge the revenues of the clergy, and to give more unbounded sway to ecclesiastical domination; such as enforcing the act of uniformity &c. ; And doubtless it is for the same purpose that it has been transported to America, & now continues its hideous shrieks through the 'dreary wastes' of Canada.

Have the dissenters in this country ever shown a disposition in any way hostile to the true intrests of the colony? Have they not been quiet in time of peace and bold in time of war? Answer ye Parents, who mourn the loss of patriotic sons, who yielded up the ghost in the field of battle! Speak, ye fatherless children! the dying groans of whose dissenting fathers proclaimed, that 'they could die in defence of the British constitution, and yet be unconnected with religious establishments? Bear testimony, ye disconsolate widows, whose dissenting husband's loyalty, has doomed you to perpetual melancholy! Lift up your voices, ye unfortunate invalids, whose lacerated limbs speak more than volumes, that they are slanderers and liars, who say that the religious any more than the political dissenters in Canada, are not true to 'the political institutions of England!'

I take my leave of the Doctor's Sermon at present. He may trust in Legislative influence; he may pray to 'the Imperial Parliament.'—But we will trust in the Lord our God; and to Him will we make prayer. And, under his auspices, we fondly hope, that the day is not very far distant 'when the banners of the Lamb will wave triumphantly over the blood-stained car of the Juggernaut; when the Shaster and the Koran shall be exchanged for the oracles of truth;' when the plundering Arab, the degraded Hottentot, and the inflexible Chinese; with the polished European, and the uncultivated American, will sit down under the tree of life, and all acknowledge 'one Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, and one God.'

TO THE EDITOR OF THE KINGSTON CHRONICLE.

SIR,

A number of 'the Colonial Advocate' was lately put into my hands, containing, as it was styled, 'a Review of a Sermon preached by the hon. and Reverend John Strachan, D. D. at York,' &c. and giving for its author 'A Methodist Preacher.'

The worthy Rector of York, whose character has been foully assailed in the said article, is absent from the coun-

try on business connected with the common welfare ; and the probability is, that with the high-minded integrity which distinguishes him, he would have treated, had he been here, with merited contempt a publication of the nature of this Review—which though regarded as a prodigious effort by the party that has put it forth, is remarkable only for the cool bitterness of its calumny, and cannot bear the test of judicious criticism applied to its arguments.

Had the ‘Methodist Preacher’ confined himself to a simple attack on the Rev. Divine’s personal character—however censurable and unmanly, I might have thought his stab at the reputation of an absent individual, there would not have been adequate cause for *my* thus stepping forward on the occasion. But this spiritual man—this denouncer of every thing connected with politics in religion—has unfortunately acted (even while laying them down) in violation of his own principles : and while he blames ‘the Doctor,’ and cannot endure the establishment, because they are so far connected with the state as to be conducive to the preservation of *order*, he has forgotten that there is still greater degree of guilt in being, as he has made himself, the minister of *disorder*. For the review is, evidently, a mask put on to divert attention from the real malignity of an attack made against the government, and intermediately, against the church establishment—an attack so very rancorous, and so very general, that it cannot be accounted for, unless upon some reason, which it would no be pleasant for the reviewer to reveal.

Now, I am friendly to both—I believe, most solemnly, that there is not a country on earth, which, on the whole, enjoys better laws, or a more just administration of them, than Upper Canada enjoys. I know, further, that the established church, which this reviewer has reconciled it to his conscience to vilify, is the *very best*, among the *many* blessings, which it is the peculiar good lot of the inhabitants of Upper Canada to share. And as the public is impartial, and as plain good sense is the character of the people of this colony, feeble as my pen is, I do not despair (if it shall prove necessary to maintain the point) to

make something of so good a cause, and soon, or late, to persuade every honest man who is not already persuaded, to think the same.

It is, however, with reluctance, sir, that I have taken up my pen to appear in your columns—a quiet and peaceful life suits better with my particular system of religion, than a public contest, which may irritate passion, and carry me, as well as my adversary, farther than we originally ment to go. I think the ‘Methodist Preacher,’ and myself, would have been equally well employed in private religious pursuits, without aspiring to sway the public mind. Besides this preference which I have for a retired mode of life, there were other dissuasives to my entering upon this controversy. In treating of the claims of our holy and venerable establishment, upon the filial reverence, and dutiful respect, of every inhabitant, without exception, of Upper Canada, I am aware of the disadvantages under which I begin the discussion. From the bottom of my soul, I believe in the faith of Christ, and yet I cannot *cant*—I cannot affect a solemnity which I do not feel; though fully convinced, from the example of my adversary, that a well acted hypocrisy—a bold condemnation of what I do not understand—a broaching of principles which I do not believe—would gain many of the unintelligent populace to my side: nor has it escaped my notice that he, who professes to defend, has a more difficult task to perform than his assailant; and that while this is true generally, the difficulty is seldom greater than in the particular controversy to which I am drawn. For, though nothing is more true than that church of England principles, discipline, and establishment, are in strict conformity with ‘Apostolic authority and practice,’ by what *media* of proof am I to convey a sacred impression of its truth to the generality of my readers. We, of Upper Canada, are not read deeply in Greek and Latin Fathers—we are not versed in the valuable treasures of musty and strangely written manuscripts amid contradictory testimonies—we are not skilled to weigh the value of each—nor can it be expected that a plain farmer, or respectable

artisan, will appreciate the testimony of old authors, when even the learned 'Reviewer' has mistaken Cyprian, and adopted a quotation to which his adversary has the legitimate claim; and, therefore, though the right of private judgment be admitted in its utmost latitude, we are not indeed *qualified* to exercise the capacities, with which heaven has blest us, on the matter, unless it be to resolve this, that sense and virtue, and christianity, oblige us, in this state of the matter, to comply with the religion of our fathers, till we are better informed, and can render a just reason for the change. But here again a difficulty obtrudes itself upon the defender of the orthodox faith. For the spirit of the age is that of innovation. The time was, of which our fathers and grand-fathers have told us, when men were modest in manners, and in mind—when their prejudices were in favour of antiquity—when, from this laudable and evangelical attachment to the institutions of prior ages, they were cautious in receiving even what, in the particular, was true and useful. But *that* time, not undesired, has been succeeded by another, in which every thing that is novel will command admiration—every thing that calls itself liberal will attract followers—and a wild and frantic joy is found in change—change even without cause for it. This rage for novelty, and this affection of liberal principle, is no where more violent than in this free and happy country—it may ultimately result in good—but its present operation will be to prevent a fair reception of the arguments, by which the established church is to be defended. Every man among us maintains his privilege to unshackled freedom of judgment in matters religious. Would to heaven, they would truly exercise that mental freedom, and keep themselves as unbiased by one prejudice as by another—as little swayed by the love of change, as they confessedly are by a reverence for venerable antiquity—would to heaven, they would do this, and this cause I advocate would be already won.

But the ludicrous part of my situation remains to be exposed; for it is my unhappy fate to be called to conduct a contest with a person who is merely a pompous preten-

der—a shadow of what he affects to be—a man of learning—who has no knowledge, but what he has pilfered, of the languages—a critic without canons—a person being full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. I appeal to any person who has read this would-be ‘Review,’ whether the author has not laboured to impress the mind of the reader with an idea of his learning, and various research. Dr. S. for 20 years as laborious a student as was in America, forsooth, is ignorant ! ignorant of the nature—ignorant of the history—unacquainted with the defences of christianity—and the reviewer, with infinite condescension, affects to set him right. Now, in due time, Mr. R. shall have proper acknowledgments for his pains. At present I shall content myself with affirming, that this bold and unblushing man is an ignoramus—that he pretends to knowledge which he has not—but half understands the arguments he uses—quotes authors whom he has never read—and distorts the truth of history.

But before I proceed, I call the public to witness that this controversy comes unsought. We, of the church of England, deprecate religious altercations. Much as we have been provoked, we had rather, if it might be, forbear—nor are we disposed to take up the gauntlet of defiance cast down by an unworthy antagonist, unless it shall appear absolutely necessary. Nothing but the modesty of the establishment—nothing but the eager joy, with which men of all ranks throughout this Province have received the doctrines of the church of England, whenever they have been offered—nothing but the tenderness with which she regards the prejudices of all those, who, unattached to other forms of worship, have not yet obeyed her voice of invitation—has prevented a public and full exposition long ago of her many and incontrovertible claims on the obedience or the respect of every soul within this Province. She has nothing to dread from public discussion of her claims—nor from such discussion, provided it be ample and fair, does she expect aught but complete victory.

Still, from a perusal of the review I suspect treachery.

It becomes me not indeed to disguise that my respect for Methodists, of any name or nature that I have yet encountered, is for from high. They have much, I think, to answer for, both to God and man, for the schism which they have unnecessarily introduced into the peaceful bosom of the church. In this colony I look upon the *American* Methodists as politically dangerous : and I am prepared, with facts if it were necessary, to go farther than Dr. Strachan in his sermon has gone, in my charges against them. But in analysing the ‘Review,’ I cannot persuade myself that the author thinks himself a Methodist. I have yet a better opinion of the Methodist discipline than to believe, without fuller proof than I have at present, that he is a ‘Methodist Preacher.’ For the man varies his fundamental principles in different parts of the same piece. He may, indeed, be a crafty politician—he may be a bold infidel—he may be ‘legion,’—to all these characters his claims are indisputable— but, no, he cannot be a ‘Methodist Preacher.’

For is *it possible* that a Methodist Preacher can be governed by such dreadful malignity of disposition towards a mother church? Is it possible that he should admit, broadly and fully, principles, which go to destroy christianity, as well as episcopacy? Is it possible that a holy preacher of a sect so strict, that we, poor souls! think them sanctimonious, should make his ‘coup d’essai’ in the polluted numbers of the *Colonial Advocate*? Does he really lay down the *political* principles of the whole Methodist connexion? Are the Methodists so adverse to church and state as he describes them to be? Are they *all* as uncharitable as ‘*the Methodist Preacher?*’ Then I say, that the Rev. Dr. Strachan, when he was upon the subject, has betrayed distrust, in not holding them up to full and marked reprobation. But, surely, the signature is feigned, and feigned by an enemy as well to the Methodists, as to the church.

If, however, contrary to all internal evidence in the review itself, this swaggering polemic should, in truth, be the character to which he pretends, he must be sensible,

that, before an adversary can conduct an argument with him, it is necessary that he, the said Methodist Preacher, should be a little more *precise*. *What are the principles of a 'Methodist Preacher?'* Let him state his definitely, for the expression is very vague. There are Methodists, or *were*, followers of Wesley, and others, followers of Whitfield. We have seen English Methodists, and Methodists from America, differing so widely, that this extensive Province could not harbour both at the same time; then there are Irish Methodists, who are allowed to have communion, it appears, with neither; and moreover, there are 'new lights' sprung up in Lenox and Addington, who, far from having any objection, like our reviewer, to politics, were the main instruments of returning a member to Parliament, whose object it has been, ever since he was there, to sweep off church and state—every thing generous, and every thing honorable, and every thing dear to British feeling, from the face of the earth. But the reviewer cannot even be classed with these loyal subjects; for though they reject church and state in their system, they nevertheless retain the principle of '*holiness of life*, being desirable in a believer,' which holiness of life, on a perusal of the Methodist Preacher's articles, I perceive that in two definitions, which he there gives of christianity, he has excluded from his code of doctrine.

Let us then know *with whom* this controversy (which we do not seek) is to be carried on,—let it be clearly understood *WHAT* the reviewer intends to *substitute* for the church establishment; and let his definition of this be *complete*.

The established church will then take up the gauntlet that has been cast down by this braggadocio.

A CHURCH-OF-ENGLAND MAN.

"THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAN."

"*Quin age, si quid habes; in me mora non erit ulla;
Nec quenquam fugio.*—

Boaster come on, and do the worst you can:
I fear not you, nor yet a better man."

Dr. Blair judiciously observes, that 'it is much easier

to point out the defects and faults of others, than to correct our own." The truth of this remark must be very forcibly felt by every one who reads an article in the 'Kingston Chronicle,' said to be written by 'a church of England man.'—Although the humble author is strongly attached to 'a quiet and peaceful life, which,' he says, 'suits better his particular system of religion than public contest,' yet he does not hesitate to challenge 'the Methodist Preacher' to public combat, provided he can find out who he is and what he believes; and while he sweeps the Preacher into the regions of Pluto as an enemy of the church and state, he cannot forbear to brand the pious member for Lenox and Addington with the same indelible guilt, and doom him to the same ruin. Such is the fate of the Presbyterians and Methodists by this charitable defender of the apostolic church!

The Preacher was not aware that in a church which is 'never divided by a variety of opinions,' he should be made to assume the character of a Proteus, insomuch that while he is despised by one as a shameful 'confessor of his ignorance,' he should be hooted at by another as a 'proud boaster of his learning;' and that he should be at one and the same time an 'ignoramus' and a 'crafty politician.' Such mysterious personages, it seems have commenced their existence: a paradox indeed!

The Church of England man considers that the Reviewer has black intentions upon the government. This is the *old watch word*. To this I reply, that however many and great objections I may have to a religious establishment, I have no objections to the *civil government*. I am a British born subject; and by my paternal loyalty and personal feeling, am unwaveringly attached to the British Constitution. Hence the Church of England man may learn that his antagonist, whom he considers to be an enemy of 'God and man,' is by birth, education and attachment a *truly British subject*.

The review is said to be the "prodigious effort of a party."

On this I observe, that only two preachers besides the

Reviewer knew that any thing of the kind was in cotemplation, till it appeared in print: and the reviewer wrote it in less than eight days, during which time he rode nearly an hundred miles, and preached seven sermons, This is the “prodigious effort of a party.”—The Reviewer is said foully to assail the Doctor's character, and to attack the Church of England. Who made the attack, the Reviewer or the Doctor? Should an obscure dissenter defend himself and his friends from the uncalled for and unjust aspersions of a D. D.; should he countenance those exorbitant claims which deprive him and his bretheren of the little religious freedom they now enjoy; and should he, in shielding off the malignant shafts of his adversary, return them with double force, is not all this included in self defence? The Dr. has made the attack which the mild Church of England man says ought to be redoubled, and if I, in defending my ramparts, have made a breach in his, the Church of England man is at liberty to repair them. If the Church of England man is anxious to support the attacks and claims which the Dr. has made in the second part of his sermon against the arguments adduced in the Review and those which may be offered, I am ready to meet him on the most honourable and scriptural grounds. But I am somewhat surprised to see him determined to support a cause in which he anticipates great disadvantages, because he cannot act the ‘hypocrite.’ I did not know *before* that plain truth required the aid of ‘hypocrisy’ to defend it.

He is anxious to know what my principles are. To this I answer, that I do not build my faith upon that of my ‘fathers or grand fathers;’ but upon Jesus Christ and the authority and practice of his Apostles. My principles are contained in the Articles and Homilies of the church of England; in James 1, 27, is my definition of the Christian religion; and I will substitute the 19th article of the church of England in place of a ‘religious establishment.’

To be more particular: if the Church of England man be solicitous to display his superior talents and know-

ledge over the 'infidel,' the 'legion,' (which truly christian epithets he is pleased to apply to the Methodist Preacher,) he shall have the opportunity of doing so, by maintaining the following positions :

I. That 'nothing is more true than that the church of England DISCIPLINE AND ESTABLISHMENT are in strict conformity with apostolic authority and practice.'—On this point the Church of England man need not trouble himself or his readers with the 'treasures of musty and strangely written manuscripts amid contradictory testimonies.' For if the *church of England discipline and establishment be in strict conformity with the authority and practices of the Apostles*, this strict conformity will be easily found in thsir history, which is contained in the NEW TESTAMENT ; and this is the only evidence that will be received.

II. That the Dissenters in this Province are the characters whom the Dr. represents them to be ; or that they are not true to the British Constitution.

If the Church of England man will maintain these two points, I will concede to him not only the justice of his claims, but will publicly acknowledge him as my benefactor. And if I am not able to maintain my cause by fair argument, I hope I shall never disgrace it by pitifully descending to conceal my weakness and torture my readers with the sulphurous fumes of vulgar abuse ; the shallow artifice of weak and wicked men in all ages of the world. The Church of England man need not again occupy two or three columns of the Chronicle in enquiring what the principles of a Methodist Preacher are ; and by lowering his tones a little, he may possibly save himself the reproach of learning what the insignificant Theban taught the abusive and insolent Lacedaemonians, 'to lengthen his monosyllables.'

While the Methodist Preacher refers the whole cause to the test of those scriptures which 'are given by inspiration of God, and which are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness,' he leaves the investigation of the subject to show, whether

he shines in borrowed garments, or whether he appears in his own proper cloathing.

THE REVIEWER.

June 3d, 1826.

—o—
FOR THE CHRONICLE.

Remarks on a late publication in the ‘Colonial Advocate,’ styled a ‘Review of a Sermon preached by the hon. and Rev. Dr. Strachan, on the death of the late Lord Bishop of Quebec, &c. &c. &c.’

BY A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

MR. EDITOR,

The publication, in a late Colonial Advocate—alas! that so sacred a subject should be introduced into those prostituted columns—of the composition above alluded to, and the pains taken by the publisher of that paper to render its circulation as wide as possible, with every stimulant to a ready and biased perusal which his laudatory notices can give it, will, perhaps, justify me in obtruding the following observations, by way of qualifying or correcting any undue or dangerous influence which that mass of partial representation, and malevolent animadversion, may possibly excite,

I am concerned to sally forth—so inexperienced a litigant—into the wide and dangerous field of controversy; but taking leave to make some reply to that worthy disciple of Zoilus, I shall, with the permission of the same ‘eloquent critic,’ and with the condescending liberty of his favouring ‘Advocate,’ retire again into the happy obscurity from which I am so reluctantly drawn.

I beg, in the first place, to express my regret that the aforesaid ‘Reviewer’ will not, in denying his ‘homage to the disputed documents of history,’ turn his attention to those *undisputed* portions of ecclesiastical record, which would, perhaps, especially when impartially reviewed in connection with the language which breathes throughout St. Paul’s first epistle to Timothy, lead to an acknowledgment of the ‘unbroken succession of episcopal authority from the apostles to the present day.’ I am unwilling

to imitate the vulgarity of personal invective, or the acrimony of individual vituperation ; but perhaps so loose and unqualified an assertion as that I have quoted will amply warrant a retort of the accusation he was pleased to make against a worthy and highly gifted divine that a ‘ profound ignorance of religion and church history, and a pitiable bigotry,’ must have directed the observation.

Bæotum in crasso jurares aere natum.

I am far from being disposed to censure any *conscientious* dissent from early established constitutions, had enquiry, and deliberation, accident and circumstances, conspired to effect that decision ; but we cannot withhold our condemnation of that *wilful* and *unnecessary* departure from the appointments of Christ's Apostles, and first Ministers, which is plainly implied in the acknowledgment from our critic of a ‘ firm belief in the doctrines, an admiration of the liturgy, and a hearty congratulation for the success of the principles,’ which the church of England maintains. We may respect a *necessary* deviation from primitive forms ; but we cannot lend any countenance or encouragement to that criminal indifference to apostolical constitutions, and to that slight of the positive ordinances of scripture, which some of our dissenting brethren rank amongst things of no consideration. Is it a matter of no consideration that the ‘ seamless coat of Christ’ should be rent asunder and torn into fragments—that the ‘ church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood,’ should be lacerated and dismembered by those endless divisions, which must result from a callous inattention to one, apostle, general, and undivided, constitution of it—that, by multiplied diversities of opinion, and the whimsical and indiscreet erection of countless systems and forms, we should bid an eternal farewell to the hope of seeing that happy period restored, when the ‘ multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul ?’ We are, and cannot but be aware of the influence of self-opinion combined, as it too often is, with ignorance, and a besotted attachment to early formed prejudices ; yet, neither example nor habit can justify an adherence to error ;

and the usages of our forefathers can never hallow what is wrong. It is surely incumbent on us, as well in outward ordinances, as in matters of doctrine, to adhere as strictly as possible to the injunctions of Christ, and to the institutions of his apostles; and we must not, from any suggestions of private feeling, or any motives of self-interest, desert the foundations which the scriptures have laid in rearing the external fabric of the church.

A public newspaper is certainly no proper medium for the display of Biblical criticism, and theological research; and, therefore, I shall be brief in the assertion of our conscientious belief, and firm persuasion:—that Episcopacy is the medium through which the office of Christian Ministers is appointed to be kept up—that, taking the word of God as our guide, and the undisputed practice of the church for 15 centuries as our remembrancer, we hold *Bishops* alone as constituted and perpetuated by apostolic appointment, to be empowered to confer those sacred functions upon others—that this chain of the communication of those spiritual offices, notwithstanding all deviation and dissent, has yet been preserved in unbroken continuity—and that the Ministers of our national church establishment are enabled to trace back, through the long lapse of 18 centuries, their regular succession from those holy men who were appointed by Christ himself to teach, and to empower others to preach the saving truths, and to administer the outward symbols and ordinances of his holy religion.

Unwilling to claim from our ‘eloquent’ Reviewer any implicit belief or ‘servile homage to the *disputed* documents of history’—I will ask him whether he disputes or denies that the following were the sentiments of St. Clement, who flourished about the 96th year of the Christian æra, and whether there be nothing in those expressions to favour the belief I have already professed: ‘It well behoves us,’ says that father in pressing upon his converts the duties of ecclesiastical obedience, ‘to take care that we do all things in order, whatsoever our Lord has commanded us to do, and particularly that we perform our

offerings and services to God, at their appointed seasons, and by the *persons that minister unto them*. For the chief priest has his proper services, and to the priests their proper place is appointed, and to the Levites belong their proper ministrations, and the layman is confined within the bounds of what is commanded to laymen? If we are not to infer from this that the offices of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, in the Christian church, were analogous to those of High Priest, Priest, and Levite, in the Mosaic dispensation, where would have been the sense or propriety of those allusions of St. Clement? And are we to infer nothing for the nature and distinction of the orders which our church maintains from the testimony of Ignatius, when he exhorts the Magnesians to ‘do all things in unity, under the *Bishop* presiding in the place of God, and the *Presbyters* in the place of the Apostolical Senate, and the *Deacons* to whom is committed the ministry and service of Jesus Christ?’

With regard to the confusion of the two words Bishop and Presbyter, or, to borrow the language of our Reviewer, that the ‘terms Bishop, Presbyter, or Elder, were promiscuously used in scripture for the names of the same offices.’ The above cited testimonies [to which a thousand others could be added] should lead to the conviction—a conviction, I must be bold to say, which would be not a little aided by a competent knowledge of the original tongue of the New Testament, which he affects so much to despise—that although every Bishop be a Presbyter, every Presbyter is not a Bishop. For, ‘to turn to the law and to the testimony, we find that Paul and Barnabas *ordained them elders* in every city;’ but we never hear of elders invested with the power of ordaining others—and when it was said to Timothy, ‘rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father,’ we must assuredly infer a pre-eminence in the office of Timothy above that of an elder.

I will only further remark on this branch of the subject, that the corruptness of the Romish church destroys not the validity of their *orders*, especially as these are

deduced from a sound and legitimate original—and that no prince nor power can *take away*, although they may *forbid the exercise* of that sacred commission—and consequently, that the prelates who were deposed by Queen Mary, could never be deprived of the authority—an authority, we may say, derived from Christ himself, through the medium of his Apostles, and their successors—to ‘teach,’ and to ‘preach,’ and to ‘lay hands’ on others. As well might it be asserted that the rite of baptism administered by a corrupt Priesthood, whose commission, nevertheless, was legal and valid, is not effectual to the admission of them we receive it to a participation in the blessed privileges of which that sacrament is a sign, a seal, and a means.

In regard to ‘religious establishments,’ I beg to observe that our critic’s inference from the state of christianity in the time of our Saviour, cannot apply to succeeding ages. At that time, he must know, Judea was a conquered Province, subject to the Roman bondage—but it does not follow, because all collision with political authorities was then wisely avoided by the propagators of christianity, that this would have been the case when the religion of Christ became the predominant one of a state or empire. The religion which God gave to the Jews was intimately blended with their civil polity; and who will presume to call in question the wisdom of that connexion? Nor will the same argument be wanting, in a christian country, for the expediency of closely associating its religion with its government—for the least observant, and even the ‘profoundly ignorant’ will admit that a civil constitution, built upon religious principles, is likely to be more perfect and permanent, than one which disclaims all such connexion; whilst none acquainted with the Jewish law will deny, that the arm of the civil power may often interfere for the preservation of religious duties with wholesome effect.

So far from admitting the justice of our Reviewer’s insinuations, I readily and entirely coincide with the learned and excellent divine, whom he so unceremoniously vilifies, that religion is not likely to exist in a community,

with equal extent and influence, when it does not possess the character and authority of an establishment. Without adverting to actual experience, I shall briefly assert it as a thing natural and to be expected—that mankind, if left to individual and voluntary contributions for the support of a ministry, will never possess a standing or permanent Priesthood—that the effects of the occasional and desultory instruction they may receive would be to render them the sport of ‘every wind of doctrine’—the dupe of every fanatic, who could excite a momentary ferment in their passions. The temporary disciples of every enthusiast who could gratify their natural curiosity to ‘tell or hear some new thing.’ Then would we behold many enlisting themselves for a time under the parochial charge of some self-appointed and enthusiastic teacher, directed in their choice by whim or caprice, and only retained in their adherence by private convenience, or the award of popular favour. But when that charm had passed away, and the breath of popular applause began to veer—when, perhaps, private pique, or personal resentment had converted those attractions into the blackest deformity—then would we find a ready secession from that preacher and that community, accompanied with the most violent breathings of disappointment and hatred. But, alas! is so momentous a thing as religion to be made the sport, of mankind’s fickle passions? Is the ‘unity of the spirit and bond of peace’ to be dissevered and broken by every change of man’s unstable dispositions? Is the church of Christ to be built upon the uncertain foundation of mankind’s froward will? Is the welfare of the immortal soul to be dependent on the inconstancy of perverse affections?—No: for the sake of unity, peace and concord, we will cling with closer affection than ever to an established faith—an established form of ecclesiastical government—and an established order of Ministers. There—under such a constitution of things, we shall seldom be presented with those deplorable instances of religious dissension and distracting passion—there we shall generally witness that settlement of principle and sobriety of deport-

ment which so happily accords with the design and tendency of christianity.

But, will it be said that no such baneful effects resulted from the preaching of those holy men who wandered about from city to city, and in the face of persecution and death? I answer that *they* were men endued with an extraordinary inspiration of the Holy Ghost, which, with the power of working miracles, gave them such an influence over mankind as none, not the most eloquent, not the most excellent can now hope for, or aspire to—and besides, *they* ever manifested a calmness of temperament and a freedom from enthusiastic warmth widely different from that which we must attribute so much of the mischief produced by their itinerant and self-constituted successors. But upon the cessation of miracles, something more, I contend, was necessary for the preservation of religious truth and practice than the casual instructions of itinerant and unlettered preachers whose tenets perhaps were as various as their numbers. Without a *standing order* of men to promulgate unceasingly the truths of religion—to repeat and continually to enforce the conditions of the Evangelical covenant—to bid mankind, by every dissuasive and encouragement, to ‘turn away from the wickedness which they have committed and to do that which is lawful and right’—then would all *forms* as well as all the *power* of religion quickly disappear. The effect of some sudden, occasional and passionate appeal, urged and aided by ferocity of look and vehemence of gesticulation, might strike with fearful impression upon many to whom it was addressed—it might suddenly call up their vagrant passions and concentrate them into the single feeling of admiration or affright—still would it want the legitimate and permanent influence of those addresses which harmonize with the best sympathies of humanity, and awake, as it were, a *spontaneous* endeavour to ‘do the will of God from the heart.’

I must pass over many angry and unjust remarks both on the subject of our author’s critique and on the established church in general, as totally irrelevant to the

motives which prompted my present efforts, and as not likely to produce any beneficial effect. I will but pause an instant on some invidious and absurd comparisons betwixt the preachers of his own sect and those of the church at which he so violently ‘shoots his pointless darts.’ He asks if 2 or £300 per annum be no inducement, no motive for preaching the gospel—and contrasts with that wondrous stimulant of religious zeal the humble pittance which they themselves receive for what he pronounces a sevenfold labour. I need scarcely ask the candid and the impartial whether such a remuneration is likely to prove the leading inducement with many who have undertaken this sacred office—whether they who have turned an eye of indifference upon all the allurements of worldly ambition—who have foregone the high and dazzling prospects of wealth and reputation and power—who have abandoned the bright hopes of distinction and comfort which might have crowned their progress in other pursuits—I ask whether such can be charged with a love of lucre or emolument as their motive for embracing and zealously persevering in the profession of a minister of Christ? Are they whose labours are rewarded with that humble stipend, less praiseworthy than those who have abandoned the loom, the plough or the hatchet, for an occupation which demands less of that manual labour and bodily fatigue to which perhaps their birth and education would otherwise have doomed them? But—

Optat ephippia bos piger; optat arare caballus.

Will they who are accused of uttering dry discourses, and directly charged with an incapacity of ‘filling the pulpit,’ suffer by comparison with those who enter upon the difficult task of expounding the word of God without any acquirements of education or helps of genius? Will they who have trodden the enchanted paths of science—who can call up and combine the varieties of nature—who can search out and bring fourth the treasured stores of philosophy to fortify and adorn the excellencies of religion—will *they* suffer by comparison with those who admit amongst their systematic studies in theology so strange a classifica-

tion as that of ‘Murray’s Grammar’ and Morse’s Geography?’ Why not annex to that dazzling catalogue the perhaps necessary appendages of the ‘New England Primer,’ ‘Entick’s Dictionary,’ and the ‘Ready Reckoner’?

But perhaps the very accomplishments of many of the established clergy expose them to those invidious remarks—and lead to the bitter and false insinuation of their partiality for ‘ball and rout and cards and dice.’ Search—and with me, you will perhaps deny the fact—you will retract the hasty accusation—you will cease to say that their higher pursuits are interfered with by any undue or anxious attention to those relaxations and diversions.—Nor would I rank it amongst things flagrantly wicked or loudly condemnable, if they *did* occasionally resort to the assemblages of the refined and intellectual—to whose society their early habits may have attached them—to whose converse their attainments and pursuits would naturally direct them. I esteem it no crime in them to adhere with some affection to the ‘endearing associations of early days’—which blend and entwine themselves with the kindest feelings of our nature ; and I deem it, at least, a pardonable error, if they cherish some fondness for the elegancies of polished society—if they cultivate, with a moderate care, those nameless delicacies and graces which may throw a charm over the mantle of piety, and add a lustre to the brightness of religion. The accomplishments of learning and the graces of address may add an attraction to the force of truth, which it would not possess in its nakedness—and it may be neither vain nor unprofitable to embellish the loveliness of religion and recommend the beauties of holiness by all the exterior aids of literature and language.

Remember it is human nature on which this influence is to be tried ; and human nature, from its very constitution, will ever be impressed and captivated and won by the aids and ornaments which I have enumerated. What is addressed to the understanding must meet and move with some vibrating chord of the heart—and what is ad-

dressed to the heart must be admitted and embraced by the understanding, else there will be no lively or permanent impression—no such excitation of feeling as will leade to a correspondance of practice. There is an indescribable, though acknowledged union betwixt the perceptions of sense, the sensibilities of the heart, and the faculties of the mind—and they who would make the most efficacious appeals to human nature, must strive to reach these secret fountains of action, these latent springs of conduct. I will, therefore, ask whether or not that intimate knowledge of human nature, that capability of calling up and classing the various means of striking upon and moving this complicated machinery of man, is not more likely to be possessed and mastered by those who have devoted many years of study to their peculiar acquisition, than by such as have started forth without education or talent to assume the high and responsible office, to the successful fulfilment of which these helps are not needful ;

Qui studet optatam cursu contingere metam
Multa tulit fecit que puer; sudavit et alsit.

I know what, in these cases, is their final resort and last resource : they presumptuously lay claim to a *heavenly* aid and guidance, which is only promised as a *furtherance* to our own good endeavours—not as an arbitrary prevention of our wills—not as an extraordinary illumination of our faculties—not as an irresistible movement of our feelings. In the age of miracles it was so—but the age of miracles is over—and we cannot now without asserting its restoration, pretend to any thing more of that heavenly and directing influence than what furthers and purifies our own good intentions, and aids and affectuates our own pious efforts.

Piety and goodness we shall ever respect, whatever be the situation or religious tenets of their professor. Lowliness of condition cannot dim the intrinsic lustre of holiness ; and humility of garb can never affect the excellence of an inherent virtue. Even in the religious denotation of which our Reviewer professes himself a leader,

we have seen much to commend—we have met with instances of exalted worth, and unaffected piety—but we have also witnessed too much to condemn. If they would inspire us with a sincere respect for their body generally, they must reform many prominent evils, and correct many striking blemishes. They must, if they would remove the prejudices, and command the esteem of the wiser part of mankind, repress the shameful effects of fanaticism so deplorably visible amongst them. They must check, and put an end to those ebullitions of enthusiasm so abhorrent to rational feeling, which are too often exhibited in their public assemblies. They must cease to fan the fires of that delirious fervour which often glows with such wildness amongst the assembled members of their sect—they must apply a healing band to that sickness of passion manifested in mad gesticulations, and incoherent expressions—a blind impetuosity of feeling and untempered extravagance of action, abhorrent to the sentiments and feelings of the rational part of mankind—contradictory to that holy spirit, amongst the fruits of which are specially named ‘soberness, gentleness, meekness, temperance’—and unhappily similar to the religious madness of Pagan worship—

— Subtito non vultus, non color unus
Non comptæ mansere comæ: sed pectus anhelum
Et rabie fera corda tument.

If they would acquire our hearty esteem, and gain our unfeigned confidence, they must abolish their infamous *camp meetings*—those theatrical representations of religious quixotism—those lamentable spectacles of religious degradation.

— ut mihi sæpe
Bilem, sæpe jocum vestri movere tumultus !

There the grossest terms of earthly passion are addressed to the high and holy objects of spiritual affection—there moral depravity is momentarily obscured by the prostituted mantle of religion. Yes ! the learned, the wise, the delicate, the good, will turn with horror and disgust from the thought of religious association with them, who dili-

gently nurture such feelings, and publicly encourage such practices. And I must add that they who are ignorant enough to commend them sincerely, and who are wicked enough to countenance them designedly, are unqualified by education, and unfit by principle, to assume the high and responsible office which they exercise.

But, Mr. Editor, it is now time to retire from your columns, and apologise for so great a trespass on your indulgence. The exalted character whom our sciolist in religion and in literature has dared to traduce, I shall leave on his own high station of impregnable strength—where guarded by conscious integrity, and fortified by acknowledged worth, he may, amid the petty assaults of daring calumny, and the impotent missiles of silly invective, triumphantly say with the philosophic poet,

Mordear opprobriis falsis, mutem que colores ?

For my own humble self, I would fain retreat for ever from the field of polemics, and slumber on in my ‘undefiled repose’—yet I will avow that I have had some training in the gymnasium of science, and do not fear the rage or skill of my critical and ‘eloquent’ adversary.

May 22, 1826.

FOR THE UPPER CANADA HERALD.

Reply to the Member of the Church of England, &c.

Nothing can be more painful to a pious mind, than to see the ‘seamless coat of Christ rent assunder, and the church of God, which he has purchased with his own blood, lacerated and dismembered by endless divisions.’ The happy days once were, when the ‘multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul,’ but, alas ! that auspicious season of christian union and purity is past and gone. The ‘light to lighten the Gentiles,’ which shone with such splendour over nearly half a hemisphere for more than three centuries, and which united those of every land, tongue, and nation, in one common cause, lost his original harmony and glory when his rays became blended with the unwholesome atmosphere of human,

imperfect and civil establishments. The glorious days of Constantine gave the fatal stroke to christian bands, rent the seamless coat of Christ, and almost orb'd the Sun of Righteousness. From that time to the present, which is the almost uninterrupted reign of religious establishments, difference of opinion has begotten various sects, jars and contentions have divided the christian world. Christian bloodshed has made infidelity triumph, and we are scarcely left to tell the mournful tale.—Even where the same common doctrines are received, the appendages with which they are surrounded, and the restrictions laid upon them by the secular arm, prevent us from bowing at the same altar, or worshipping in the same church. This is the time to exercise christian forbearance, the time to do good even to our enemies. For we all have our imperfections and blemishes : and these should teach us to cherish that charity and tenderness towards others, which we in our turn require of them. And as we do not arrogate infallibility to *ourselves*, it is possible that in some parts of that church of which I have the honour to be a member, there may be improprieties which ought to be reformed. For, in the nature of things, that order and refinement, either in religion or education, cannot possibly be expected from those who never enjoyed the means of early religious or literary instruction, which may be found in those places which are blessed with such advantages. Men at first are children in grace, as well as in science. There is the ‘blade,’ the ‘ear,’ and the ‘full corn in the ear.’ When we are children, we talk as children ; but when we become men, we put away childish things. Let my learned antagonist visit those parts of the colony where Methodist societies are established, and other means of instruction enjoyed, and he will find religion and attainments which render them capable of acting an honourable part, not at ‘ball and rout and cards and dice,’ but in the society of the ‘refined and intellectual.’ And at those camp meetings, to which he manifests irreconcilable hostility, and concerning which he displays such a pitiable ignorance, and which he graciously styles ‘theatrical representations of

religious quixotism, lamentable spectacles of religious degradation,' which at one time makes him jeer and at another rage, he will find *suitable persons* appointed to prevent improprieties of *every description*, the worship of God conducted in a rational, scriptural manner, and the plain and unaffected truths of religion, addressed to the heart and consciences of men. He will not hear the Methodist preachers, in any of their ministrations, teach, that they 'deem, at least, a pardonable error for a *clergyman* to cherish some fondness for the elegancies of polished society,' that is, for 'ball and rout and cards and dice,' when God has commanded his ministers to feed his lambs, to visit the sick, to comfort the afflicted, to relieve the fatherless and the widow, to reprove, rebuke, exhort in season and out of season, to be holy in all manner of conversation, to avoid foolish talking and jesting which are not convenient, not to be men pleasers, but examples to the flock. How does it sound in our ears to hear an advocate for primitive institutions teach that the refinements above mentioned, 'embellish the loveliness of religion,' and that those aids and ornaments are necessary to impress its power upon the heart? The cross of Jesus has not charms sufficiently powerful. It requires the additional embellishments and intellectual refinement of 'ball,' &c &c.! Who are the greatest enthusiasts, those who assert that '*Christ* is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth,' or those who prescribe the additional external aids or elegancies of polished society, such as 'ball and rout,' &c. to perpetuate the sacred impression of religious truth upon the soul?—I am far from undervaluing education, or speaking lightly of refinement. I believe these to be the greatest earthly blessings that we can possess. An education, especially a religious education, is worth more than a patrimony of thousands. But are these the energies by which the latent faculties of the mind are opened to the charms of religion? I am of Dr. Chalmers's opinion, that as the sleeping philosopher is not awakened by a demonstration of philosophy, but by the same voice that would arouse the sleeping peasant, so in

spiritual things. It is the cry, "Awake O sinner, (says that able divine) lifted up with power enough to arouse him out of his spiritual lethargies. It is the shaking of the soul out of those heavy slumbers, under which it is weighed down to deep and strong insensibility about the awful urgencies of guilt, and danger, and death, by which it is encompassed." But this my learned opponent denounces "fanaticism" and "enthusiasm." He says that "they (the Methodist preachers) presumptuously lay claim to a *heavenly* aid and guidance, which is only promised as a *furtherance to our own good endeavours*—not as an extraordinary illumination of our faculties—and that the age of miracles is past." What my antagonist means by "good endeavours" is difficult for me to determine. For according to some of his preceding sentiments, "good endeavours would seem to mean the cherishing a taste for the "elegancies of polished society," such as "ball" &c. &c. If this be his meaning, I think *it is* presumption to "lay claim to a heavenly aid and guidance" But if by "good endeavours" he means our efforts to seek God and do his will, then I widely differ from him. A miracle is nothing *more* than a "sensible deviation from the known laws of nature." And I ask, is the change of the heart from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, any thing *less* than a "sensible deviation from the known laws of nature?" How does the following language of the liturgy comport with the above passages? My opponent plainly speaks in the office of consecrating Priests of "being moved by the Holy Ghost;" in the collect before the holy communion, he prays for the "inspiration of the Holy Spirit"—and in the order for confirmation, that he may be "filled with the Holy Ghost." Can he sincerely subscribe to his articles, and offer up these petitions, and yet call them *presumption*? Again—How can he reconcile the following language of the Homily, which he declares to contain a "wholesome

and godly doctrine," with the declaration that it is *presumption* to lay claim to a *heavenly* aid and guidance, which is only promised as a *furtherance to our own good* endeavours? "For it is the Holy Ghost (says the Homily) and no other thing, that doth *quicken* the minds of men, stirring up *good* and *godly* motions in their hearts, which are agreeable to the will and commandment of God, such as otherwise of their own crooked and *perverse nature* they should *never have*." Here the Holy Ghost is declared not merely to further our own good endeavours, but to be the *moving cause* of every *good* thought and action. The Homily goes much further than the 'enthusiastic' Methodists. It says, "where the Holy Ghost doth teach there is no delay at all in learning." There is an anecdote related, that 'one silly soul, of no learning, did what many Bishops of great knowledge and learning could never bring to pass, to confute a learned and sceptical philosopher, so that he could not choose but acknowledge that the power of God was in his words.' Is not this 'wholesome and godly doctrine?' Perhaps the 'silly soul had never seen either Murray's Grammar or Morse's Geography; although for want of knowing the former, the Hon. and Rev. Dr. Strachan betrayed his ignorance one afternoon in a public lecture room, in analyzing a single sentence; and by not being acquainted with the latter, a young gentleman who has lately entered into holy orders in the Church of England, very gravely asked one day, what country Rome was in?—I suppose they were so busy in 'treading the enchanted paths of science—calling up and combining the varieties of nature—searching out and bringing forth the treasured stores of philosophy,' that they could not descend to things so mean. Or perhaps they were just pondering upon 'all the allurements of worldly ambition, on which they had turned an eye of indifference—the high and dazzling prospects of wealth, reputation, and power, which they had

foregone—the bright hopes of distinction and comfort which might have crowned their progress in other pursuits, which they had abandoned, “such as that of a family school-master, the shop, &c. &c. Or possibly, they might have been sympathising with many of their brethren, who were supported by the benevolence of their friends till they could get a place among the apostolic priesthood. And if they had not succeeded in getting a situation there, it is probable they would have found an employment almost as honourable as the “*bos piger vel caballus*.”—But as these are facts of notoriety, I shall with pleasure drop them, and turn to that part of the subject which first prompted my feeble efforts, namely, to dispute the *exclusive claims* of the Establishment, and prove by different kinds of argument that the Dissenters have an equal right to exercise the functions of the ministry with their brethren who sit on their “high station of impregnable strength.” I agree with my learned opponent, that a public newspaper is not a proper medium for theological discussion; nor had I any intention of publishing the Review through that medium, nor did I know that it would be, till the types were nearly set. But I am now happy that it has come before the public at large, that they may judge of the justice of those claims, for which the Dissenters in this Colony have asked, but asked in vain for many years.

My antagonist very frankly avows his opinion, that “*bishops alone* are constituted and perpetuated by Apostolic appointment to be empowered to confer those sacred functions upon others.” If this opinion be correct, all the protestant churches of Scotland, France, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, Poland, Hungary, and Denmark, are destitute of any legitimate right to fill the functions of the Ministry. They are all intruders into God’s vineyard—they have gone forth when he has not commanded nor empowered them to go.—For their ordination was derived from Luther Calvin,

Melancthon, Bucer, &c. who were nothing but presbyters. And in some of those countries, where they have what they call Bishops or Superintendants, they are, like the Methodist Bishops, only *primi inter pares*.—But to return to the law and the testimony. My antagonist says that a knowledge of the original tongue of the New Testament, would not a little aid the conviction, that though a Bishop be a Presbyter, every presbyter, or elder, is not a Bishop. I can inform him, that so far from despising the original tongue of the New Testament as he falsely insinuated, that I am acquainted with it; but my conviction is by no means aided with regard to the dissimilarity of the offices of bishop, and elder, or presbyter. For the term elder (*presbiteros*) in the New Testament is a general name, comprehending under it all such as have any ecclesiastical functions, as apostles, pastors, teachers, or other church officers;—And the name overseer or bishop (*episcopos*) is applied by the LXX to officers of the army—the sanctuary—ordinary workmen, &c. as well as to officers of the church. In contradiction to what my opponent said that presbyters were not bishops, the same persons that St. Paul calls in Acts xx. 17, elders, he calls in verse 28, bishops. And are we to infer more than two orders from the following scripture? “Paul &c. to all the Saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the *bishops* and *deacons*.” If there were a third order of church officers, would not the Apostle have addressed them as well as the other two? As I showed the office of Timothy in the review it is not necessary for me to touch on it again in this place.

My antagonist next refers to the fathers. I answer, the fathers are no authority for us. They were not inspired nor appointed to make up any deficiencies of the New Testament, which is the only legitimate standard of christian faith and practice. But let us see for a moment what victory he has achieved by referring to

the fathers. He first directs us to Clement of Rome, and by a strange combination of passages, a part of which relate to the Mosaic priesthood, he infers an analogy between the Jewish church officers, and those of the christian church.—An inferred analogy is a very singular basis on which to found *apostolic* institutions and practices. The high priest in the Jewish church, was a type of Jesus Christ the great high priest who offered sacrifice once for all, and not of the bishop of the Church of England. And when the great antitype came, of course the shadow was done away. This is in perfect harmony with St Clement.

In the next chapter to that from which my opponent drew his inferred analogy, St. Clement writes as follows. “The apostles thus preaching through countries and cities, they appointed the first fruits of their conversions to be *bishops* and *ministers* over such as should afterwards believe, having first proved them by the spirit. Nor was this any *new thing*, seeing that long before it was written concerning *bishops* and *deacons* : for thus saith the Scriptures in certain places, (Isa. lx. 17.) ‘I will appoint their *overseers* in righteousness and their *ministers* in truth.’ In chap. liii. he says, ‘let the flock of Christ be in peace with the *elders* which are set over it.’ And in chapter lvi. he says ‘submit yourselves unto your ministers.’—I ask my learned antagonist what sanity there is in St. Clement’s writings if there were more than two orders of church officers? It is probable that the contentions this apostolic father was trying to quell, were a strife for modern Episcopacy, which explains the lordly language of Ignatius who flourished a few years afterwards. ‘It is a shame,’ says St. Clement, ‘my beloved, that the most firm and ancient church of the Corinthians should by one or two persons (I suppose one or the other, or both, wanted to be bishop) be led into a sedition against its ministers.’

We are next saluted with Ignatius, so precious in the eyes of Episcopalians. Not to notice that a part of his writings is rejected by some of the most learned divines,

as spurious, I observe that he wrote after all the Apostles were dead, and pastors began to get in high repute. The whole theme of Ignatius is, submission to the bishop, and he does this in terms so high, that the most zealous episcopalians confess them scarcely defensible. The following is his language. 'He that honours the bishop shall be honored of God. He who does any thing without the bishop ministers to the devil. The more silent* a man finds the bishop, the more let him reverence him. We should regard the bishop as we would *God himself*.' Will my opponent defend this language?

'If' (says Cambell) 'like the Nazeanzen monk, celebrated by Gregory, the bishop should in praise of God, devote his tongue to an inviolable taciturnity, he would be completely venerable.' How wide the difference between the inflated language of Ignatius and that of the apostles! See II. Cor. i. 24, x. 1, I. Pet. v. 1, 2, 3.

But even Ignatius calls the bishop nothing more than the governing minister of a single congregation. He directs the Magnesians to come together to the *same place* with the *bishop* for the common purpose of worship, &c. And in another place he requests the church at Philadelphia to choose a deacon who should meet the general assembly at Antioch in Syria. My opponent ought not to have exclaimed *eureka* in seeing the prototype of his venerable church till he came to the days of Constantine. Why did he not produce Polycarp who was a disciple of St. John? I will supply the defect. 'Being subject' (says Polycarp to the Phillippians) 'to the presbyters as unto God and Christ.' Would he have expressed himself thus if there was a bishop over these? My opponent's 'remembrancer' is 'fifteen centuries' old; but our 'remembrancer' ascends the stream of antiquity three centuries further. How applicable is the language with

* The pious Bishop Latimer did not agree with Ignatius concerning silent prelates. The following are his words. "If one were admitted to view hell, and beholding it thoroughly, the devil should say: On yonder side are punished unpreaching prelates; I think a man should see as far as a kenning, and perceive nothing but unpreaching prelates; he might look as far as Calais, I warrant you." Ser. Vol. I. p. 155.

which he has furnished me. "It is surely incumbent on us as well in *outward ordinance*, as in matters of doctrine, to adhere as strictly as possible to the injunctions of Christ, and to the institutions of his apostles; and we should not from any suggestions of *private feeling*, or any motives of *interest*, desert the foundations which the SCRIPTURES HAVE LAID, in rearing the external fabric of the church."

I shall pass over the dark ages of the church until the second dawn of divine light. According to my opponent's doctrine (but not according to his creed) apostolic succession remained unbroken. He says, "The corruptness of the Romish church destroyed not the validity of her *orders*, especially as these were derived from a sound and legitimate original—from Christ himself, through the medium of his apostles and their successors—to teach, and to preach, and to lay hands upon others." He also says that a prince has power to "*forbid the exercise* of that sacred commission, though he cannot take it away." Is it possible, is it rational to suppose that *man* has a right to forbid the exercise of an authority derived from *Jesus Christ*? The *Almighty God* says, "go, and preach, and teach, and lay hands upon others;" but his *Majesty* says, "you shall not teach, nor preach, nor lay hands upon others!!" Is not this making the church a creature of the state? Is not this assuming the authority of heaven, and entering the lists against Omnipotence? But how can he claim his ordination from the church of Rome consistent with his own Homilies? He says, "If they (the Popes) be wicked and nought, then it is impossible that the tree of whom they proceed should be good. Such were all the popes and prelates of Rome, for the most part for nine hundred years and odd, and therefore they are worthily accounted among the false prophets, and false christs, who deceived the world a long while. The Lord God of heaven and earth deliver us from their tyranny and pride, and work

in all men's hearts by the power of the Holy Ghost, to the beating down of sin, death, the Pope, and the Devil, and the kingdom of Antichrist." If my learned friend's prayer were answered, where would his apostolic ordination be? The above quotation he declares to be "wholesome and godly doctrine;" and yet claims his ordination from that antichrist whom he prays the Lord God to beat down. Can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit? My Beotian stupidity prevents me from discovering the line of unbroken succession from the apostles to the present time, in the face of all these contradictions, and I therefore leave my opponent to reconcile them.

I shall now turn to that part of the subject which is more immediately connected with the success of christianity at the present time, and which will probably be more interesting to the public.

FOR THE BROCKVILLE RECORDER.

MR. EDITOR,

I beg leave, through the medium of your paper, to offer some remarks on a Review of Dr. Strachan's sermon, by a "*Methodist Preacher*," which has lately appeared in the Colonial Advocate.

The professions made by this Reviewer, of concern for "the true interests of Christ's Holy Religion," of "attachment to the Lord Jesus Christ," of a hearty affection for every zealous and faithful minister "wherever he is, and in whatever church he is," are sufficiently imposing; no less so is the positive disavowal which he makes of intending any reflection on the Church of England,* or detraction from the superior

* "I wish it to be distinctly understood, that I mean no reflection on the doctrines, liturgy or discipline of the Church of which he (Dr. Strachan,) has the honor to be a minister. Be assured I mean no such thing; I firmly believe in her doctrine, I admire her liturgy, and I heartily rejoice in the success of those principles which are therein contained."—*Methodist Preacher's Review*.

talents and literary attainments of her Clergy.* His pretensions also on behalf of his own sect, to the merit of laborious and disinterested zeal ; are calculated to prepossess in his favour every man who has not been instructed by experience to hold his judgment in suspense over an alluring title, or an ingenious preface.

In the review before us, it is much to be lamented that these professions and some others, which candour would fain have attributed to a warmth of christian feeling, have been employed to give colouring and plausibility to a most inconsistent and uncharitable attack on our ecclesiastical polity, to deprecate its establishment in this colony, and to influence the minds of people against any proposal of this kind as fraught with danger to their spiritual and political interests.

It would be too much to follow this discursive writer through all his specious misrepresentations ; in making which, he flits from one point to another like an ignis fatuus, recommencing the discussion of a subject at the moment he professes to have quitted it : in the middle of some topic, which he has pounced upon, suddenly turning back to gather up a thought which had before escaped him, or starting aside from his argument to cast invective and reproach on a clergyman whose absence precludes his rejoinder. To persons habituated to study and reflection, or conversant with the subjects of which the Reviewer professes to treat, no danger can be apprehended from this performance ; but to that valuable part of the community whose time is principally occupied with the active employments of life, and who might be apt to suppose that these railings against our venerable church establishment were truths unwillingly exported from an ingenious mind, desirous at the same time of placing her

* "I feel no disposition to derogate from the luminaries of the Church of England that respect and praise to which their talents and literary attainments give them an undisturbed right."—*Methodist Preacher's Review*.

in the fairest point of view which truth and religion will admit—to such the effect must be extremely pernicious; and it is for the sake of pious and well disposed persons of this description, and to prevent their being led away into error under the guise of simplicity, that the following remarks on the Methodist Preacher's review are offered.

“Meaning no reflection” as he “wishes it to be distinctly understood on the *doctrines*, liturgy, or *discipline*, of our church,” the Reviewer immediately commences an attack on the apostolical succession of our Bishops, which he is “far from paying that servile honour to the disputed documents of history *as to acknowledge!*” But the scepticism professed by the Methodist Preacher in whatever degree it may be cherished, is no argument against the truth of the evidence capable of being advanced to establish the validity of our Episcopate, and its descent by uninterrupted succession from apostolical authority, which upon admission of the general rules of historic testimony cannot reasonably be questioned. It is very plain that thus only, can a lawful Episcopate be derived; for as a Layman cannot ordain a deacon, nor deacons a presbyter, so neither can presbyters ordain or consecrate a bishop,—since an apostle affirms as the opposite to any such rule, “without all contradiction, the less is blessed of the better.”—Heb. vii. 7. So convinced of this are the Methodists themselves, (or I should rather say were those among them, who first arrogated the Episcopal office, on the appointment of Rev. J. Wesley, himself a presbyter of the Church of England)—that it is authentically said Drs. Coke and Asbury offered to relinquish their pretensions to that holy dignity and to acknowledge the invalidity of their existing titles, if on these terms they could have obtained legitimate consecration from the American bishops, whose succession is derived through the medium of the church of England. The refractoriness of some “Methodist

Preachers" prevented them from becoming in this way possessed of that which is essential to the constitution of a church according to that Father whom the Reviewer has quoted so disengeniously,—St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, who strenuously maintained the pre-eminence of Episcopal authority, asserting that "there is one bishop for the time in a christian church; one for the time who judgeth in the place of Christ."

From the interchangeable use of the terms, *Episcopos*, bishop or overseer; *Presbuteros*, presbyter or elder, and *Diakonos*, deacon or minister, in the New Testament, (which is readily admitted, for these terms were not at first exclusively applied to the distinct offices which they most appropriately designated) the Reviewer argues that there was then no distinction of power and authority between presbyters and bishops, but it is admitted on all hands that the office of deacon was distinct from that of presbyters, and most evidently from that of the apostles, as indeed is sufficiently plain from the occasion of its institution. Yet we find St. Paul thus addressing himself to the *Corinthians*: "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers, (*Diakonoi*) by whom ye believed?" but were Paul and Apollos no more than Deacons? or can we argue from thence that there was no distinction of office because this term was sometimes generally applied, like those of presbyter or bishop?

The fact is, that an office distinct from, and having authority over the presbytery and derived immediately from the Apostles, is recognized by the New Testament in the instances of Timothy and Titus: and that it continued in the church unquestioned, for about 1500 years, is sufficiently attested by history.

Another object at which the cavils of the Methodist Preacher are directed, is the connexion of the Church of England with the State—a circumstance purely adventitious, and by no means necessary to her existence, as is frequently and industriously misrepresent-

ed. By virtue of this connection, her proceedings have the desirable sanction of the highest civil authorities. The King as the representative of these, (or rather in our admirable constitution as the source of them) exercising a controul over her temporal affairs to the exclusion of the papal see, is declared to be the head of the church; but in no sense is this title assumed or pleaded for, at variance with that spiritual supremacy which belongs to Christ alone, and in which He only is acknowledged as Head and Lord; on this point the 37th article is very explicit. Our church has continued to exist when deprived of this temporal head, and we trust will continue to do so should Divine providence ever permit the like principles again to get the ascendancy. With respect to the revenues of the higher orders of her clergy, they are egregiously overstated by the Methodist Preacher, and are in general much less than what the persons who fill her various ranks might probably attain by their talents and exertions in any other pursuit, so that a *very few* instances excepted, the church offers the most positive reverse of any temptation to covetousness or ambition.

The piety of our forefathers has indeed made a provision for the clergy in England, by a charge upon the produce of the land, which whatever may be pretended, ought not in the present day to be felt as a burthen by any one. Were the farmer released from the payment of tythes, his rent would be proportionably increased, and he would find new ground of complaint in the exactness with which it would then be requisite to pay a charge in the shape of rent, which in that of tythes he now often finds the means of partially evading. But this is a question with which the inhabitants of Canada have nothing to do whatever; no intention exists of imposing on them a burthen even of that description which the Romanists in the Lower province discharge without murmuring. It is the disinterested character of the parent State—parental not only in au-

thority which she assumes, but in the mild and affectionate spirit in which she exercises it, to relieve her children in this part of the empire almost entirely from the charge of religious instruction, affording such stipends to the clergy as are in general sufficient to raise them above the need of eleemosynary contribution, while yet, those who are grateful for their ministrations, cannot feel it needless to contribute still further to their comfort ;—a residence for the Missionary being in general all that is absolutely required. As an ultimate provision for the clergy, one seventh of the lands granted by the crown are held in reservation, but the advantages of this grant (at present very small) have hitherto been appropriated to relieve the inhabitants by assisting them in building the residences needful for their clergy. The efforts of Dissenters of various sects to get a share of this reversionary advantage, and to obtain the countenance of civil authority for their proceedings, shews in what light they really view the connection between church and state, and renders it pretty evident that the distance at which the grapes are suspended above reach, is the only cause of their appearing green and sour. Kingly Government as it had its origin in the respect paid to heads of families in patriarchal times, so its greatest praise is to perpetuate the spirit of the relationship in which it commenced. It is not unfrequently that British Sovereigns have been styled the fathers of their people, an epithet which may with peculiar emphasis be appropriated to his present Majesty, whose paternal care for the religious instruction of the important family which he governs, and the Colonies in particular has been eminently and most judiciously displayed. Nor is the will of the Sovereign alone which sanctions the expediency of an established system of religious instruction, the need of such a provision is asserted by the best writers on political economy, and the principle has for ages been recognized by the British Con-

stitution. Religion, if inculcated at all however, must be inculcated according to some form, which it is the office of parental authority to choose. What form so proper then as that which has stood the test of ages, has proved itself the bulwark of Protestantism, and has nurtured some of the highest ornaments of the church and of the world?

These are the principles on which a religious establishment is to be desired for Canada, and not for the sake of power or gold, as is wickedly insinuated by the Methodist Preacher. The thought of introducing a system precisely similar in all its ramifications to that which successive or combined events have been the means of establishing in England, is not entertained. All the support which the State expects to derive from it can arise only from the advancement of religion and morals, from men becoming better acquainted with their duty, and more disposed to practice it, and not certainly that those precepts should be neglected and forgotten, by which they are instructed to "render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's," to give "honour to whom honour is due," to "fear God and honour the King."

Whether or not it is any evil that a christian and protestant Government should make provision for the religious instruction of a people, leaving them entirely free from the least restraint or coercion, to the probable influence of its sublime moral precepts—whether, I say, any injury is done, or any insult committed by the unexpensive offer of this boon, let common sense judge. Nothing is more displeasing to the great enemy of mankind, than pious philanthropy on such a scale as this. When a state countenances religion in an orthodox and established form, and at the same time opposes and persecutes it in none, he has great reason to tremble for the ultimate preservation of his own ascendancy, and will claim as he did of old, "all the kingdoms of the earth and the glory of them" as belonging to him alone, falsely asserting

that to whomsoever he will he gives them, and deprecating above all things their alliance with true religion. But we know who has instructed us to treat these pretensions with disregard, and to rejoice in the prophetic declaration, which assures us that the kingdom of this world are the designed Empire of our Lord and of his Christ.

Religion where it is duly cherished has an influence the most penetrating ; and that man does not deserve the name of a christian who, whatever station he may fill, denies its influence in his character and relationships. Hence, as a master, as a father, as a senator, or as a prince, a christian cannot but desire that the benign influence of the religion which he professes should, by means of a correct acquaintance with its doctrines, and the continual enforcement of its precepts, be communicated to all, over whom his influence extends, and it argues a rankling spirit of enmity to religion, the most bitter, when, however plausible the pretence, any dislike is manifested to its receiving the sanction of authorities such as these.

They who have succeeded in evangelizing barbarous nations, never did so by underrating, much less by refusing assistance of this kind, it was only anti-christian rulers setting in direct opposition to christianity, whom they ventured to set at defiance, ever desirous at the same time to win them over to the faith of Christ, and to the obedience of that faith.

To these cursory observations on the validity of our Episcopal succession, and the importance of a religious establishment in a christian land, many other remarks might be subjoined on the less prominent features of this review. It may suffice, however, to notice that the charge of intermeddling with legislative affairs comes with a peculiarly bad grace from a ' Methodist Preacher,' when more than one person claiming this distinction are Members of the House of Assembly, and it is known that great efforts are used to

strengthen the influence of their sect in this branch of the legislature. It must also be observed, that the pathetic harrangue of the Methodist Preacher at the close of his Review proceeds upon a supposition, which I may venture to state is entirely mistaken, viz. that it could be the intention of Dr. Strachan to repudiate the loyalty of every man who is not openly attached to our creed. The Reviewer is here, therefore, beating a man of straw, manufactured by his own imagination. Let us hope that every teacher of his sect will remember the positive disavowal which is made by their champion of insinuating republican doctrines even indirectly along with the professed instructions of religion.

It is not my desire to provoke controversy and it will therefore be very unwillingly if I should be obliged to continue this discussion. Other duties demand unceasing attention, and these must be my apology for having omitted to notice so much which admits of easy refutation.

I am, Mr. Editor, Your Obedt. Servt.

A CLERGYMAN.

Brockville, 2d June, 1826.

FOR THE UPPER CANADA HERALD.

Mr. Editor—I intended to have solicited your indulgence for the insertion of the following article a week sooner; but being unexpectedly required to take a journey of nearly three hundred miles, I have been compelled to defer it till the present. I now humbly request its insertion in your valuable paper.—Since I wrote my last essay, I have received another reply through the Brockville Recorder, written by a clergyman.—As there is such admirable harmony in the faith of my numerous adversaries respecting Establishments, I cannot deny myself the pleasure of edifying the public by bringing them forward in one view. I shall therefore, confine my present remarks to the subject of the former article, viz. to the ordination and succession of *bishops*.

My Reverend Friend, whose apparent candour and

good sense is worthy of the highest praise, severely reprobates me for making plausible pretensions, "to give colouring and plausibility to a most inconsistent and uncharitable attack on the Church of England polity and establishment." I shall not pretend to charge him with misrepresentation; but he certainly misunderstood my language. I say now, as I said then, that I mean no *reflection* on the doctrines, liturgy, or discipline of the Church of England. But does this imply that I am bound to them by the authority of a *divine law*; and make them supercede the necessity of the holy scriptures, as the Doctor did in the fanciful display of his magic powers? Or could any one possibly suppose that I would not *object* to the discipline of the Church of England, or rather to the sentiments of the Doctor and some of his followers so far as they are *exclusive*? It was on the unscriptural and abusive sentiments of the Doctor that I made my strictures, and I am bold to say that a part of his sermon is a miserable compound of misrepresentation and slander. So true is it that not one of my opposers has attempted to defend it; but they have quite changed the scene of controversy. I am hailed on all sides for publishing the Review during the Doctor's absence. To this I shall only say that the Doctor's Sermon did not appear till the week before he left the colony for England. (Public opinion says he took an abundant supply of his sermons with him, together with the addresses to his Excellency, to show the Lords and Commons of England what wretched creatures the "factionous demagogues," and republican dissenters of this Province are.) The scriptures require speed in giving the alarm. (Ex. xxxiii, 6, 10.) Why did not Tom Paine call some of his opponents to order who had the hardihood to write against him, not only when he was absent, but even when he was dead?!

My learned friend gives us the old tale respecting the superiority of bishops to presbyters; and as proof of

it, he graciously presents us with *his dictum*. How overwhelming such argument! I really wish that some of my opponents would give us something from Timothy and Titus, to whom they so often refer, by which we might be convinced that those eminent servants of God, were indeed bishops in the modern acceptance of the term.—The only testimony, to prove that Paul ordained Timothy, is inferred from II. Tim. 1, 6. The apostle says nothing here about ordination. Peter and John laid hands, in the same manner, on the disciples of Samaria, and they received the Holy Ghost. (Acts, viii, 14, 17.) So did Paul to the disciples of Ephesus, and *they* received the Holy Ghost. (Acts, xix, 6.) Were all these christians, by this ordinance, translated to the *Episcopal* See? Why were *they* not bishops as much as Timothy?—Let some of my opponents explain the following passage. “Neglect not the gift that is in thee which was given thee by prophesy with the laying on of the hands of the *presbytery*.” (1. Tim. iv, 14.) If Timothy was ordained by the presbytery, how came he vested with a higher *degree* of ecclesiastical authority than those from whom he received it? “For without controversy,” says my Reverend antagonist, “the less is blessed of the better.” Timothy was ordained either by St. Paul, or by the Presbytery. If by the presbytery, how did he become *diocesan bishop*? If he was ordained by St. Paul, why was he again ordained by the presbytery? But even St. Paul’s ordination could not be legal according to the canons of my opponent’s church. For it is there affirmed, that though a bishop and presbyter may consecrate a *presbyter*, yet it requires *three Bishops* to confer *Episcopal* authority. Then according to this doctrine, Timothy would be nothing more than a *presbyter* or *evangelist*. And this presbyterian link spoils the whole chain of the Church of England apostolic Episcopacy.—Let my opponents show us their scriptural diocesan episcopacy, and let them give us the scriptural pro-

totypes of their archbishops, archdeacons, deans, procurators, surrogates, prebends, chancellors, &c. &c.

I shall now give the opinions of some of the most learned and most successful defenders of the Church of England on this point, and see how they accord with the wise sayings of some of the "bold and unblushing" pretenders in this colony. "The apostles left no command," says the Rev. Thos. Gisborne, "which rendered *episcopacy* universally indispensable in future times, if other forms should evidently promise, through local opinions and circumstances, greater benefit to religion." Gisborne's Survey, p. 497. Bishop Pretyman, in his Elements of Christian Theology, speaks more fully to the point. "As it has not pleased our Almighty Father," says he, "to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of *ecclesiastical* polity, as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness. The scriptures do not prescribe any particular form of church government." Vol. II. p. 396. The following is the testimony of the learned Dr. Paley, Moral Phil. p. 443. "It cannot be proved," he affirms, "that any form of church government was laid down in the Christian, as it had been in the Jewish Scriptures, with a view of fixing a constitution for succeeding ages; and which constitution consequently, the disciples of christianity would *every where* and at *all times*, by the very law of their religion, be obliged to adopt. Certainly no command for this purpose was delivered by Christ himself; and if it be shown that the apostles ordained bishops and presbyters among their first converts, it must be remembered that deacons also and deaconesses were appointed by them, with functions very dissimilar from any which obtain in the Church at present." To the testimony of these three witnesses, I might add the names of Burnet, Stillingfleet, Usher, &c. &c. did my limits permit. Now Mr. Edit-

or, it is for adhering to the plain letter of scripture, and adopting the opinions of these able divines on this subject, that I am signalized by the genteel epithets of a "a worthy disciple of Zoilus, a stupid Beotian, an ignoramus, an infidel, legion," &c. &c. How keenly might I retort. But according to Milton, the *great* Beelzebub raised a tremendous storm of dust, hail, wind, &c. when he was driven by Michael and his fellow angels, and therefore we are not surprised that similar means should be used on like occasions. How contemptible is such conduct! It ought to be despised by every man, and blushed at by every Christian.—But to return:—From whence then do our opponents get their pretended apostolical episcopacy? They get it from the "treasures of musty and strangely written manuscripts amid contradictory testimonies." Are these better proof than the *Holy Scriptures*? Are these of higher authority than the word of God?—Allowing that diocesan episcopacy universally obtained after the death of the apostles, (which I am far from doing) does this prove that it was apostolic, or that we must obsequiously adopt the opinions of the ancient Fathers in one respect, and not in another? The ancient Fathers entertained many notions, that I presume, neither my opponents nor myself feel disposed to receive. If their notions of Ecclesiastical polity were infallible, why not receive their political opinions? Why do we not reject the British constitution, and establish the Roman? Why do we not receive as a divine law the metaphysical jargon of Aristotle because it was popular at that time?

I might here give an interesting account of the first use of episcopal claims and domination from Bishop Stillingfleet, but I shall decline doing it *at present*.

My Reverend opponent confidently asserts, that his "Episcopate, and its descent by uninterrupted succession from apostolic authority, which upon the admission of the general rules of historic testimony, cannot reasona-

only be questioned." "It is very plain," he says, "that thus only can a lawful Episcopate be derived."

This doctrine, (if it be worthy of that name) excludes dissenters of every description from any right to exercise the functions of the Ministry. All that ever have been, or are baptized by them, are yet unbaptized; they are [according to the Church of England,] unworthy of a christian burial, and those that have thus died, are, consequently, damned!!—This is the liberal and christian feeling of the learned divines of the nineteenth century, in whom are hid all the "treasured stores of philosophy" &c. &c. From such liberality, good Lord deliver us! I hope my Rev. Friend will define *his* rules of "historic testimony," and give us that "unquestionable testimony" which proves the unbroken succession of his Episcopate. The apostle says "*prove all things.*" If my learned opponent will prove this, he will exhibit a phenomenon which has never yet appeared in the historical world.

Stillingfleet differs from my opponents on this point.—He says that "the Romish succession is as muddy as the Tyber itself. For here," he adds, "Tertullian, Ruffinus, and several others, place Clement next to St. Peter. Ireneus and Eusebius set Anacletus before him; Epiphanius and Optatus, both Anacletus and Cletus, Augustinus and Damascus with others make Anacletus, Cletus, and Linus, all to precede Clement." This is the labyrinth of uncertainty and contradiction, in which we are involved at the very fountain head of apostolic succession.—What must be our uncertainty as we advance: To prove an unbroken succession, my opponents must prove the legal ordination of each individual bishop according to the canons of the Church, and that this authority is uncorrupted. All this must rest on "testimony that can not easily be questioned." For if they fail of full proof in one single instance, all (according to their own logic) is gone. We are unchristianized at once.—The canons of the Church annul the ordination of a Bishop, who is

guilty of *simony*. This is confirmed by scripture.--(Acts, VIII, 18, 21.) Dr. Jorton informs us that "in the eleventh century, simony was universally practised, particularly in Italy." And another author, speaking on the same subject, says that "it was easier to convert a Jew than a Bishop." Was the Holy Ghost communicated through Bishops by whom simony was *universally* practised? Pope John XII. was expelled from the see of Rome, by a council held at Rome in the year 963, for "simony, sacrilege, adultery, and for drinking a health of wine to the devil." In a short time he was restored; soon after his restoration, being caught in an improper situation with another man's wife, his holiness was dispatched by the enraged husband, who dashed out his brains. Two eminent Romish historians, Baronius and Binius, make this John [in opposition to Leo] the true Pope.—Now this infidel, simonist, drunkard, adulterer, murderer; this worshipper of idols and devils, is Christ's Vicar, is filled with the Holy Ghost, damns who he pleases, and is the only medium of apostolic authority!!! All this must be believed to make episcopal succession unbroken.—To touch a moment on the Church of England; she is schismatical in separating from the Church of Rome, or she is not. If the Church of Rome be a true Church, it must be schism to secede from her. The schismatics, of course, must loose her spirit and authority. If the Romish Church be an Anti-Christian Church, [as the Homily declares] how could she possess the authority derived from Christ? Either supposition turns the stream of unbroken succession from my opponent's Church.—These are only a few hints on the "unquestionable testimony of unbroken succession." If necessary, I will dive deeper into this muddy 'stream' in some future essay. Let my opponents remove these jams first.

How ridiculous are such pretensions!—How shameful and unchristian are the *exclusive* claims of the establishment! If dissenters have no right to administer the

ordinances, England both in church and state, was recently governed by *heathens*. Archbishop Secker was ordained by a dissenting minister, who never received episcopal ordination. This Archbishop baptized His Majesty and most of the Royal Family. [Ecl. Rev. Vol. 6. p. 368.] Now according to my opponent's logic, Secker's ministrations were imposture, and ecclesiastical and political England was governed by infidels. A Christian nation with infidel heads!!

"Suppose," said an English Divine, "that such a system of exclusive claims and legislative support were acted upon by any other craft than priest craft, what would be the consequence? Suppose, for instance, the tailors; these nimble-fingered gentlemen form themselves into a corporate body, and no one is allowed to make a pair of new breeches, or stop a hole in a pair of old ones, who has not served an apprenticeship to the trade, and been duly initiated into the order by a master tailor, with the ceremony of putting a thimble upon his finger, and a goose in his hand. Every parish is provided with one of these *state tailors*, and *obliged* to support him in a genteel style, to keep up the *credit* and *respectability* of the order. Who is so blind as not to see, that upon this plan, we should be in danger of appearing in the streets in a birth-day suit? There is no competition.—The livelihood of the man does not depend on the *quality* or *quantity* of his work, or upon the good opinion of his employers. According to this scheme we might have a corporation of *gentlemen tailors*, but we should have a nation in a state of *nndity*, or *clothed in rags*."—This system might be defended by the same sort of logic, which is employed by the clergy to support their pretensions. It is said that a bishop must be a better judge of a minister's qualifications than Jack the ploughman; so a master tailor must be better able to appreciate the merits of his own profession, than a person who does not know a thimble from a nut shell. (But I suppose almost any person

knows whether his clothes are well made or not.) A *regular bred* clergyman must be more fit to minister in holy things, than he who, without any such previous preparation, assumes the sacred office; and a person who has served a regular apprenticeship to the art of stitching, must be better qualified to make our clothes than one who has been brought up to other employments.—Civil society cannot exist without religion, and therefore the state ought to support an order of ministers to teach it; and men cannot live in these northern climes without clothes, and therefore the state ought to support a corporation of tailors to make them.

When trade is open, the *ignorant* and *idle* will starve, but the *wise* and *diligent* will prosper. It is the same in religion; Let the ministry be free to all, and the christian world will soon be delivered from hunting, shooting, gaming, swearing parsons; for nobody will employ them, or contribute to their maintenance, and the consciousness of this, will deter such characters from engaging in such an employment.—Learning and virtue will be necessary to command crowded congregations and liberal support; and hence the candidates for the ministry, instead of paying court to patrons, will apply to their books and to their God to qualify themselves for usefulness in the church.

The history of the church in all ages affords a practical illustration of the truth of these observations. Look at those counties where the established religion is the only one that is tolerated.—Look at Spain and Portugal. What are the abilities and morals of the clergy? Is it possible to behold a more deformed picture of ignorance and vice combined? The reason why things are not so bad in this country, is the toleration of dissenters.—Mr. Editor, having been so long favoured with your indulgence, I draw the present article to a close. I shall in my future remarks briefly reply to my numerous opponents on the subject of establishments, on which I have already “flit” occasionally as it suited my convenience.

I am, Sir, Your Humble and Obligated Servant,

THE REVIEWER.

June 29, 1826.

FOR THE UPPER CANADA HERALD.

Mr. Editor,—

Any report that will command credence must be attended by those makers of authenticity whereby it can be distinguished from falsehood. The thing must be possible in itself—attested by evidence; and the evidence must possess sufficient harmony and force to overbalance all suppositions to the contrary. However, in matters of *fact* it is possible for your testimony to vary in *some* degree, without overthrowing the truth of the whole. The witnesses may not command equal or adequate means of information—they may derive their intelligence from different sources—or, be not equally capable of judging; and hence, while they agree in the principal and more important parts of their evidence, they may differ with respect to circumstances of less moment. But in the distinguishing principles of morality and religion there is no room for diversity of sentiment.

The principles of justice and other essentials of morality, which have been laid down by philosophic heathens, are similar in nature though defective in their degree, with those which are revealed, and more fully and clearly explained in the Holy Scriptures. Our accountability to a Superior Being is a principle recognized in the heathen mythology, as well as in the sacred Scriptures; and no principle is acknowledged which would derogate from the moral freedom of man, or the supreme authority of Jehovah. This truth gains additional force by the aid of revelation. For although in matters civil, an *individual* offence may involve a nation in war; yet in spiritual matters, *every* man stands or falls to *his own* master.

What then must be our surprise and astonishment to hear the most reverend and learned teachers, of the most famous and venerable church, of the most wise and polished nation, in the most refined and enlightened age, contradict each other and their God on the most important points of christian theology, viz. man's individual relationship to his Maker, and the establishment of Christ's church among men. And hence, while we hear one ask-

ing with indignation and amazement, "Is the church of Christ to be built on mankind's unstable *will*?" Another roundly affirms, "Every man among us maintains his privilege to unshackled freedom of judgment in matters religious." One, in the lofty exhibition of his theological research, confidently assures us, that "a christian nation without a religious establishment, is a contradiction."—Another, with equal gravity, declares that "a religious establishment is a circumstance purely *adventitious*, and by no means necessary to the existence of the church," and at the same time hotly quarrels with the Reviewer, because he (the Reviewer) disputed the truth of the Doctor's assertion.—The Brockville clergyman sincerely tells us that the authority of the King, as head of the church, is in no sense at variance with that spiritual supremacy which belongs to *Christ alone* ;"—the Kingston gentleman, with equal assurance, affirms that the "*King or Queen may forbid the exercise of that sacred commission derived from Christ.*" Happy Canada! the unfathomable research of thy sage philosophers brighten the constellations of literature—the dazzling splendour of thy biblical light illuminates the darkest shades of thy uncultivated wilds—and the united voice of thy commanding oracles harmonizes the grating sound of discord—coalesces the diversity of sentiment—opens the contracted mind of the ignorant—and points out a path so clear, plain and straight that even a novice cannot err therein! Mr. Editor, lost in the vision of amazement, I attempt almost in vain to return to the subject under consideration. Whence this contradiction of sentiment—this variance of opinion? Surely not in the word of God—nor in the principles of morality, nor in the doctrines of the church of England. Does it not prove one of two things? My antagonists are either unacquainted with the constitution of their own church, or they have assumed a wrong position. I apprehend both. For 1st, the right of private judgment is essential to an accountable being. For we are accountable to God for our actions as *individuals*—2d Cor. v. 10 ; 1st Kings, viii, 32 ; Isa. iii. 10, 11 ; Col.

ii. 24, 25 ; Ez. xviii, 20.—2d, That a religious establishment is essential to a christian nation, or that any other provision is necessary for the support of the clergy, than that provided by apostolic institutions, is contradicted by experience.

For more than three centuries, the church continued to prosper, not only without any provision by civil enactments, but when she was strongly opposed by civil powers. Witness the prosperity of religion and literature in those countries where religious establishments are not countenanced. Also the vast and increasing numbers, learning, ability, and usefulness of dissenters of various kinds, in almost every part of the British Empire.

3d. That a religious establishment is essential to a christian nation is also denied by Dr. Paley, who says, “a religious establishment is no part of christianity.” So say Gisborne, Whitegift, Pretymen, and Stillingfleet.

But the testimony of my opponents, carries its own confutation, if we consider it in the light of a *matter of fact*.

Dr. Strachan declares that a christian nation ‘without a religious establishment is a *contradiction*.’ The Brockville clergyman denies it. The Kingston gentleman forbids the freedom of man’s unstable will in religious matters. His learned predecessor announces that ‘every man among us maintains his privilege to *unshaken freedom of judgment in matters religious*.’ Two contradictory propositions cannot be true at the same time.—Such are the harmonious sentiments of these church members, who our Dr. assures us ‘are never divided by a variety of opinions.’

However, that their arguments may appear in their true light, and have their full force on the reader’s mind, I will reduce them to the simple syllogistic form.

I. [1] ‘A christian nation without a religious establishment is a *contradiction*.’

[2] ‘The establishment is a circumstance purely *adventitious*, and is by *no means necessary* to the existence of the church.’

(3) *Therefore*—England ought to pay more than 1,108,000 pounds per annum to support a religious establishment.

II. (1) “The church of Christ shall not be built on mankind’s unstable *will*.”

(2) “Every man among us maintains his privilege to unshackled freedom of judgment in matters religious.”

(3) *Therefore*—the King and Parliament ought to make laws to prevent us from changing our religious opinions.

III. (1) “The King is declared Head of the Church in no sense at variance with that spiritual supremacy which belongs to *Christ alone*.”

(2) “The King or Queen *may forbid the exercise of that sacred commission derived from Christ*.”

(3) *Therefore*—the King or Queen ought to be the Head of the Church, seeing that He or She has, and yet has not a right to interfere in spiritual matters.

Are these the guardians of the flock of Christ in this Colony?

Infelixio ! semper oves pecus !

I shall leave my learned friends to settle these difficulties among themselves: and will consider their arguments in the most favourable light, as going no farther than Doctor Paley, who says, that, “a religious establishment is no part of christianity; (consequently no part of a christian church) it is only the means of inculcating it.”

My Brockville friend makes a pitiful voyage across the Atlantic, in order to rescue England from the sword of the ravenous invader. I did not think of forming an alliance with the tithemongers of the “Velvet Cushion,” nor shall I now. But did I feel disposed to enter into an investigation of the tithing system—were I to describe the feelings, circumstances, and oppression of two thirds of England, and four fifths of Ireland,

—I could a tale unfold, whose lightest word
 Would harrow up thy soul ; freeze thy warm blood :
 Make thy two eyes, like stars, start from their spheres ;
 Thy knotted and combined locks to part,
 And each particular hair to stand on end
 Like quills upon the fretful porcupine.

Shakespeare.

The Kingston gentleman assigns as a reason why the apostles avoided all collision with the civil government, "that Judah was a conquered province, subject to the Roman bondage." Were all the Provinces of the Roman Empire tributary, and subject to a foreign power? And was *that* the reason why the apostles cautiously avoided all interference with their *political* government? How dare England deviate from the example of the apostles? How dare she set up an ecclesiastical hierarchy in opposition to the Roman Pontiff, under whom she was in "bondage"?

Our attention is next called to the example of the Jewish Polity. This is the great foundation stone on which the advocates for establishments build ; and on this point I shall therefore be more particular.

The constitution of the Jewish Polity, and that of England are very different. *Religion* was the great *end* of the Jewish government ; and her civil authority was established for this express purpose. But the British constitution was established for the purposes of *civil* policy ; and religion is established as a convenience thereto, and not as the *great end* of her government, as my opponent (begging the question) attempted to insinuate. It has ever been a maxim among the most crafty politicians, that every state should have some established religion, by whose coercive influence the bounds of national feeling might be the more strongly cemented. Thus the Egyptians worshipped their dogs and monkeys, &c.--the Greeks their "thousand deities"—the Persians, the same---and the Babylonian King set up his Image, and in conjunction with his Parliament, commanded all men to fall down and worship it. These various

religions were all established by **LAW**. And under a pretended zeal for one of these established religions, Macedonian ambition, which aimed at nothing less than the conquest of all Greece, concealed those dark designs which required the tongue of a Demosthenes to expose. Although later politicians have been more judicious in selecting that "religion which is not of this world" in preference to heathen superstition; yet it is made to accomplish the same purposes, viz : to impose restrictions on the moral freedom of men—to unite them to the government by a legalized religion—to identify Christ's kingdom with an earthly kingdom—and to treat all as foreigners who will not bow down to the Image that Nebuchadnezzar the King hath set up.

Another point of distinction between the constitution of England and the Jewish government is, that in all important transactions, the Jewish Legislators enquired of God by the Urim and Thumim, and the Almighty directed them in all considerable ecclesiastical, civil, and military affairs by the *immediate* revelations of his will. Are the affairs of Great Britain, or any other kingdom, governed by immediate revelations from heaven? I can hardly believe that my opponents are so "enthusiastic" as to maintain this. Why then is it that "religion which stands not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God," to be subjected in its rights, ceremonies, and institutions, to the imperfect, fallible, and unauthorised inventions of men? Why is that "Kingdom which is not of this world," subjected to the Kingdoms of this world?

Again; the Jewish government was a **THEOCRACY**. The Almighty condescended to become their King and Head, and promised to accompany them during all their travels as a pillar of cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night. The Jewish government thus became a complete *Theocracy*, both in their civil and ecclesiastical establishments. So that afterwards, "whether they had

Moses or Aaron," says Dr. Boudinot, Judges or Kings for their immediate rulers, they were but inferior magistrates in the government, appointed *by* and under *him* as their supreme Head and Sovereign."

This continued till the coming of Shiloh, who, according to prophetic declaration, took upon himself the government of the Catholic church of both Jews and Gentiles.—Were our Supreme Governor as wise and infallible as the Jewish, [viz. Jehovah] and our legislators influenced by immediate revelation from him, then we would rejoice in submitting all our *spiritual* as well as temporal concerns to the uncontroled sway of so wise a Head, and so pure a Legislature.—But said Jesus, "my kingdom is not of this world." While, therefore we render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, we must also render unto God the things which are God's; and in so doing, we are in *spiritual* things, "to call no man Master on earth; for one is our Master, even Christ."

I shall now turn my attention for a moment to the constitution of the Church of England.—Were a person, who had never any other history except the New Testament, to enter a room where he should see seated, archbishops, archdeacons, deans, proctors, surrogates, prebends, chancellors, readers, clerks, &c. robed in state, wearing the mitre, the stole, the cope, the rochet, the pall, the dalmatica, the tunic, & the other apparatus of our famous hierarchy; would he recognize, in these splendid fopperies, any thing to remind him of those humble pastors, who taught & governed the flock of Christ in the purest of all christian periods and assemblies? He might, indeed, in such a scene, form some notion of the magnificence of pagan temples and idolatrous altars; but he would see very little to bring to his recollection the church of Christ at Ephesus or Corinth. Whence originated all this pomp and equipage? To this, Judah was a stranger; but Italy can tell.

If we were to search for the constitution of Christ's church, where would we find it? In the Bible. "The Bible only," says Chillingworth, "is the religion of the Protestants." But we find the constitution of another church, in the Canons, the Common Prayer Book, and in the codes of English Law. The church of Christ is a spiritual structure, built upon the Prophets and Apostles, JESUS CHRIST being the chief corner Stone. The church of England is a political building, founded upon the Lords and Commons, his MAJESTY being the chief corner stone.

In the church of Christ there are no such officers as archbishops, archdeacons, deans, &c. but these hold very important places in the church of England.

Excommunication in the church of Christ deprived the expelled person of only the spiritual privileges of the church; but excommunication [if there be any such thing] in the church of England is followed by severe *civil* penalties.

In the church of England, [laymen,] chancellors, surrogates, &c. exercise the most solemn acts of spiritual jurisdiction, as censuring, expulsion, &c. in defiance of the clergy, and should any clergyman refuse compliance with their decision, he is subject to expulsion *ab officio et beneficio*.

An expelled member, in the church of Christ, cannot be restored to the enjoyment of church privileges by *money*. [1 Tim. v. 21; Acts vii. 20, 21.] In the church of England, a sum of money will restore the offender to the bosom of the church.

Vos,
Dicite, pontifices in sacris quid facit aurum.

The church of Christ was never indebted to the powers or wealth of the world for her existence; but was established and extended in direct opposition to them. The church of England is supported by power, defended by acts of Parliament, and enriched by large emo-

luments. The old warrior's example is followed even in spiritual contests.

—Diffidit hostium
Portas vir Macedo, et subsuit aemulos
Reges muneribus.

The church of Christ and the church of England are two distinct bodies, under two distinct Heads. Christ is Sovereign Governor of his own Church. Matt. xxiii. 8; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Matt. xxviii. 18. In the church of England, "The King is vested with *all power* to exercise *all manner* of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, have *no manner* of jurisdiction ecclesiastic, but by and under the King's Majesty."

Jesus Christ forbids a woman to usurp authority over the man. 1 Tim. ii. 12. But in the church of England a *woman is Head* of the church. Whiston's works on the Trinity were pronounced "heretical and dangerous" by the two Houses of convocation. Her Majesty, [Queen Anne] differing in *opinion* from her bishops and clergy, refused to sanction their decision; and Whiston was released from their censure. The *opinion* of a *single woman*, wonderful to tell! revokes the decrees of all the ecclesiastical dignitaries within the British realm. Heaven's authority, and masculine knowledge, wisdom and firmness, bow to the irresistible sway of female episcopacy. How true, in this instance, is the historian's remark on another occasion, "*Quippe ut in viro muliebrem timorem, ita in muliere virilem audaciam cerneret.*"

The Holy Sacrament was instituted by Christ for sacred and spiritual purposes; as a bond of union among christians, and "in remembrance that Christ died for our sins." In the church of England, it is given to wicked persons—and to profane scoffers, as a qualification for office under the Crown.

"Hast thou by statute moved from its design
The Saviour's feast, his own blest blood and wine,

And made the symbols of atoning grace
 An office-key, a pick-lock to a place,
 That *infidels* may prove their title good
 By an oath dipp'd in sacramental blood ?
 A blot that will be still a blot, in spite
 Of all that grave apologists may write ;
 And though a Bishop toil to cleanse the stain,
 He wipes and scours the silver cup in vain."

I have ever looked upon the Liturgy as a beautiful, and in many respects an affecting piece of composition ; but with respect to the soundness of its contents, the following are the opinions of persons, whose judgment on this point I leave my opponents to question. The great Lord Chatham said, in a celebrated speech, "we have a Popish liturgy"—Archbishop Tillotson said, concerning the Athenasian creed, "I wish we were well rid of it ;"—and the learned Bishop Hoadly used to say, "our liturgical forms ought to be revised and amended only for *our own* sakes, though there were no dissenters in the land." I hope my learned opponents will no longer brand those as schimatics and heretics, who are unwilling to comply with forms and creeds which are thus represented by the most illustrious members of their own church.

I have been severely reprimanded for hinting at the laxity of christian feeling and zeal, manifest in the lives of some of the clergy. Perhaps silence would better become me on this point. However, my remarks being represented as unjust and slanderous, I shall let some of *their own* authors speak. Bishop Burnet speaks on this subject with that concern and earnestness, for which he was so distinguished. "I say it with regret," says that excellent and pious man, "I have observed the clergy in all places through which I have passed, Papists, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Dissenters ; but of whom, all *our* clergy are the *most* remiss in their labours in private, and the *least* severe in their lives.—Unless a better spirit possess the clergy, arguments, and what is more, laws and authority, will not prove strong enough to pre-

serve the church.'—Own Times, vol. iv. p. 411, 440.—
 Dr. Hartly, in his observations on man, represents the taste, ambition, and conduct of the clergy, in colours still more affecting. And the Lord Treasurer Burleigh, at a still later period, in writing to Archbishop Whitegift relative to the translation of the Bishop of Rochester to Chichester, and to other ecclesiastical matters, expresses himself in these affecting words : ' Your Grace must pardon me, I see such worldliness in many that were otherwise before they came to the cathedral churches, that I fear the places change the *men* ; but herein I condemn not all ; but *few* there be that do better being Bishops, than being preachers they did.' But what is still more astonishing is, to hear the late Rev. Samuel Wix, in his elaborate work to prove the church of England and of Rome were the same in all essential points, exhorting his brethren ' to throw their own church into the arms of the Pope, as the only means of escape which presents itself from Calvinism and Methodism, and as the best and last preservative from being 'righteous overmuch.'—*Quac tanta fuit Romam tibi causa videndi ?*

—LIBERTAS:—

Verum haec tantum alias inter *caput* extulit *urbes*,
 Quantum lenta solent inter *viburna* cupressi.

And what are we to say, Mr. Editor, of those clergymen who neglect their pastoral charge to engage in other employments—who leave the house of God to serve tables ? Shall we be silent while Heaven weeps, and the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood, bleeds at every pore ?

' Ye clergy, while your orbit is your place,
 Lights of the world and stars of human race,
 But if eccentric ye forsake your sphere,
 Prodigies ominous, and viewed with fear ;
 The comet's baneful influence is a dream,
 Your's, *real* and *pernicious* in the extreme.
 The sacred function in your hands is made,
 Sad sacrilege ! no function, but a trade.'

But I am happy to say that the church of England, whose doctrines, institutions, and benevolence, are thus abused by many, has not a few of her Tillotsons, Burnets,

and Porteus', in every age, who, by their lives and doctrines show to the world that they are

“Devout, sincere,
From mean self-interest and ambition clear,
Their hope in heav'n, servility they scorn,
Prompt to persuade, expostulate and warn,
Their wisdom pure, and giv'n them from above,
Their usefulness ensured by zeal and love,
As meek as the man Moses, and withal
As bold as in Agrippa's presence, Paul.”

But why all this expostulation by the most faithful shepherds of the flock, if there be no abuses to reform? Why this earnest desire to reform and amend the Liturgy, if it be so pure? If, from this intimate union of church and state, no evils flow, why this slavish subjection to the civil power, by which the most sacred institution of Jesus is perverted to mercenary purposes? Why cannot all the bishops and clergy within the Realm alter a *single iota* of the church of England Liturgy, Discipline, or Establishment, against which many of them most piously exclaim, if the authority of the King and Parliament be ‘in no sense at variance with that spiritual supremacy which belongs to *Christ alone*’? Why are persons supported by Parishes which they have scarcely ever, or never seen? Why are clergymen, who never preach, endowed with Livings amounting to many thousands of pounds per annum, while the faithful and laborious curate, who bears the burden and heat of the day, has not enough for a comfortable subsistence, is that St. Paul’s doctrine, ‘If any man will not work, neither shall he eat’? Why are the messengers of peace, who are sent forth to preach glad tidings of great joy—to teach heaven’s truths and them alone, diverted from the holy calling, and seated in a *political* legislature to *make* the laws of *earth*?—Why are men vested with civil authority to judge another man’s servant, and to pronounce every one an—who does not observe the same months and days with themselves? Why is a great part of the nation doomed to disabilities, because they worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences? Would these things have ever been felt, known, or heard in the British Em-

pire, had not the union of church and state engendered them? Would we have ever come to this, if that sound principle had, in its evangelical extent, been left inviolate, 'choose ye this day whom ye will serve'? With the illustrious English poet, who was a zealous adherent to the church of England, I think I may freely say,

'Inventions added in a fatal hour,
Human appendages of pomp and power,
Whatever shines in outward grandeur great,
I give it up—a creature of the State.
Wide of the church, as hell from heaven is wide,
The blaze of riches and the glare of pride,
The vain desire to be entitled Lord,
The worldly kingdom and the princely sword.
But should the bold usurping spirit dare,
Still higher climb and sit in Moses' chair,
Power o'er my faith and conscience to maintain,
Shall I submit and suffer it to reign?
Call it the Church, and darkness put for light,
Falsehood with truth confound, and wrong with right?
No: I dispute the evil's haughty claim,
The spirit of the world be still its name,
Whatever call'd by man, 'tis purely evil,
'Tis Babel, Antichrist, and Pope and Devil.'

Mr. Editor, I will not leave the disease without at least attempting to prescribe a remedy. I will recommend that which has healed thousands, and I trust will heal thousands more. And on this part of the subject I would in the first place remark, that every man must be originally free in regard to religion. It is his own, his eternal interest which is at stake. If he go wrong he is the sufferer, if right, he derives all the benefit; and therefore, in this, he is not to be controuled further than he may see fit to put himself under the authority of others, or than God may see fit to give others authority over him. Being then free from every restriction and embarrassment, let him be taught the *whole* truth as it is in Christ Jesus—especially, let him be pointed to Calvary, and on the cross he will find both Balm and a Physician.

'Else he that hung there suffered all his pain,
Bled, groan'd, and agoniz'd, and died in vain.'

Let those who teach, and those who hear and obey the truth, become 'one body,' as is described in scriptures,

and in the nineteenth article of the church of England.

The ‘ambassadors of Christ’ should be renewed after the image of God—filled with the Holy Ghost—true to their King—faithful to their God—ensamples to the flock—meek in their dispositions—clothed with humility—not lovers of filthy lucre, but lovers of God—acquainted with the doctrines which they teach—versed in the holy scriptures—frequent at their devotions—blameless in their lives and conversation—zealous in doing good. In short, they should enrich their own souls with ‘whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report.’ They should

‘Seek to delight that they may mend mankind,
And while they captivate, inform the mind.
Their language simple as their manners meek,
No shining ornaments have they to seek,
Nor labour they, nor time nor talents waste,
In sorting flowers to suit a fickle taste;
But while they speak the wisdom of the skies,
Which art can only darken and disguise,
The abundant harvest, recompense divine,
Repays their labour—the gleanings only mine.’

Such a Ministry, Mr. Editor, is the proper vehicle of communication between earth and heaven, between God and man. Let such a body of men, exercising their ‘sacred commission,’ free from the clogs of worldly policy, throw themselves upon the world—resting their hopes of success upon the power of the truths which they teach—supported by the ‘freewill offerings’ of mankind, (2 Cor. ix. 7.) whether they come from King, Nobles, or Plebians, will such a ministry want any good thing? Will not Je-sus be with them always, even unto the end of the world? And will not that Holy Spirit, which God hath promised to every one that asketh him, (not to communicate miraculous powers,) but, to enlighten the mind—to renew the nature, and to sanctify the soul; influence the subjects of his power to bring forth the fruits of righteousness—minister to the necessities of the saints—support the ministry of the word—and to be give to hospitality? But say certain

gentlemen, to be supported by 'eleemosynary contributions' is degrading. In the first place, I deny that to be charity which is a right (1 Cor. ix.) And in the next place I ask, 'is the servant above the Lord?' 'It is enough for the servant that he be as his master, and the disciple as his Lord.' 'Go,' said the Saviour, 'into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that receiveth you, receiveth me, and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me. He that giveth you a cup of cold water in my name, shall not lose his reward.' Is not this character as good as an act of Parliament? Is not the example of Christ and his Apostles, and the 'remembrancer' of the church in its purest ages, as worthy of imitation as that system which had its birth in the christian church in the days of papal usurpation, and which was palmed upon England about the eighth century? Look at some of those kingdoms where christianity stands upon its proper basis. Are morals disregarded—churches abandoned—faithful ministers neglected—literature despised or slighted—or are any religious bodies stigmatized with 'disaffection to the government?' 'Alas! is so momentous a thing as religion to be made the sport of mankind's' ambitious designs? 'Is the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace to be dissevered and broken' by the excluding clauses of Legislative enactments? 'Is the church of Christ to be built upon 'any other foundation than that which is laid in Zion?' Is the welfare of the immortal soul 'to be pendant upon the arm of civil power? Is the cross of Christ to be the stepping-stone to wealth and affluence? Is the unrighteous mammon to be united with the true riches? Is that to be joined together which God hath separated, and that broken assunder which God hath joined together? Not so. 'For the sake of unity, peace, and concord'—for the sake of him who said, 'deny yourselves, take up your cross, and follow me,' 'we will cling with closer affection than ever to his injunctions, and to the institutions of the Apostles; nor shall we, from any suggestions of *private feelings*, or any motives of *self-interest*, desert the foundations which the

scriptures have laid in rearing the external fabric of the church.'

In addition to other considerations have I not experience on my side. From whence did christianity spring? Not from the palaces of power, or the habitations of wealth. Its founder had not where to lay his head—his cradle was a manger—his earthly diadem a crown of thorns. His followers were men of low estate—his means were simple; but what were his achievements? The humble fishermen went forth. It mattered, not tho' the rabble raged, and the priests persecuted—though the magistrates scourged and the Governors imprisoned—though the Jews mocked, and the Greeks ridiculed—though the Stoics frowned and the Epicureans laughed—though earth and hell united all their powers; the simple preaching of Jesus confounded them all. The barrier of Jewish prejudice was broken down—the mist of superstition was dispelled—the pride of Grecian wisdom was humbled—established churches trembled for their safety and their gain;—and even majestic Rome, with her splendid temples, looked and felt with deep concern. Did the progress of christianity cease with the Apostles—did the 'day of miracles' end the day of religious triumph? or, had the followers of the Apostles recourse to any other means than those which had been appointed by the Apostles? Did they 'contend that something more was necessary for the preservation of religious truth and practice'—for the extension and establishment of the church of God? Did their cause droop while the cries of Domitian blood-shed were screeching in their ears? Could the cruelty of a Trojan put them to flight, or impede the progress of their cause? Did the banishment, plunder and murder indicated by an Antonius weaken the energies of their power and drive them into despair? Were they overwhelmed by the hell-invented cruelties of a Severus, who exposed female beauty—innocence and filial love, to the prison—the insulting multitude—the ferocious cow, and the Gladiator's sword? (Recollect 'the day of miracles was passed' long ere this time.) Did the cause of Jesus die

when the unheard-of cruelties of a Decius gorged the blood of christians in every part of the Roman Empire? Did the successive persecutions, raging with Theban fury under Valerian, Aurelian, and Dioclesian, extinguish the light emanating from the Babe of Bethlehem?

Was Egypt, streaming with blood, left without witnesses? Did not the unarmed conqueror thus go forth, and by these foolish and weak things of the world confound the mighty, until he at length became sovereign of those very powers which had hitherto made him bleed?—Is the Lion of the tribe of Judah, who has proved too strong for the powers of earth and hell, to leave his cause pendant on the patronage of Kings, and bow for the support and perpetuation of his church at the shrine of legislative authority? No: He is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; and not one jot or tittle of his word shall be changed or pass away. Am I called upon for *modern* demonstration in behalf of the positions I maintain? What was it that enabled the Augustin Monk, who in his bequeathed detestation of popery, exclaimed, ‘*Pestis eram vivus, moneus ero mors tua, papa,*’ to make the proud Pontiff tremble on his ‘velvet cushion?’ ‘It was the Lord’s doings, and it is marvellous in our eyes.’ Look at the most pious and most useful part of European community. Are not *very many* of them among the non-conformists? Look at *many parts* of British and Republican America. To whom are they indebted for their refinements, piety, and religion, to establishments, or to Dissenters? Let them speak for themselves.

By what means have so many souls been rescued from the jaws of death and hell—religion so widely diffused—and so many invaluable blessings communicated to the world of mankind? By those very means for using which my opponents reproach the ministers among whom I have the honor to be classed. By diligence—perseverance—earnestness—and zeal, a Pericles may ‘thunder and lighten’ in the armies of Greece, and be called great and wise—a Demosthenes may overwhelm the Athenian assemblies, and he held up as an example—a Cicero may cap-

tivate the Roman Senate, and be almost adored—a Paul may make a Governor tremble upon his throne, and be immortalized ; but alas ! should a minister of Jesus Christ *now a days* ‘ lift up his voice like a trumpet, and show the people their transgressions and sins’—should he proclaim with the solemnity and authority of Sinai’s thunder, to the careless world, ‘ Except ye repent ye shall likewise perish’—should he, from a warm and full heart, invite in the words of his blessed Maker, the ‘ truly penitent,’ saying, ‘ Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest ;’ in short, should he teach all the doctrines and precepts of religion with the earnestness of a Chalmers and the zeal of an Apostle, he is immediately dubbed ‘ a self-constituted, enthusiastic teacher.’

Let the world judge between us and our adversaries.

Mr. Editor—I have to apologize for the long trespass I have made on your patience and indulgence. I never intended to make the investigations which I have made in these essays, had not the positions which my opponents have assumed, and the artillery which they have poured forth, rendered it necessary. I shall now, if proper, retire into my beloved obscurity, and resign the field to the more able, learned, and experienced Towgood, who has lately made his second appearance in the Brockville Recorder.

I am, Mr. Editor,

Your Humble and Obligated Servt.

THE REVIEWER.

July 8, 1826.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE KINGSTON CHRONICLE.

REMARKS ON THE “ REPLY OF THE METHODIST PREACHER,”
&c.

Mr. Editor,

The voluminous communications in the Kingston Herald, in answer to my former remarks in your paper upon the critique of the “ Methodist Preacher,” require me once more to solicit your indulgence.

Although the remarks of our “ Reviewer,” as regards

the oponents who have entered the lists against him, are, in general, temperate and courteous, yet I cannot but condemn his disingenuousness in clouding and misrepresenting the meaning of passages, which, in their undisguised state, are sufficiently intelligible, and in thus wresting them to a sense which may favour his own views. Neither can we approve that feeling of virulence—continually elicited—against the Reverend author who first moved his ire; nor withhold our condemnation of many expressions which are at once at variance with the principles of charity and decorum. However, with the learned and amiable Hooker, I will only remark, “To your railing I say nothing: to your reasons I say what follows.”

By the way, I must return the very courteous salutations of a certain champion of dissent in the *Brockville Recorder*, whose war-like aspect and fearful threats are really very alarming; for, Goliath-like, he defies the “whole army of Episcopacy,” and proclaims, whilst he gigantically stalks along with horrid visage and with ringing armour, his fear-inspiring purpose of crumbling upon our devoted heads the whole fabric of our faith. But,

“Quid tulit hic tanto dignum promissor hiatu?”

I am really of opinion—would that so ungrateful a suspicion were wrested from me!—that his Philistine forehead, with all its due proportions of length and breadth, may lack another property which could alone render innocuous, even the smooth pebble of a stripling,

Frontis nulla fides——Juv. Sat.

My gentle friend will excuse me from any farther notice of his *railings*; as for his *reasons*, I can find none to reply to. I will only beg to admonish him that he is far out of the way in ascribing my very humble productions to the worthy divine who presides over the Established church at Kingston—so that he must apologize to *him*, when next he brandishes his arms against *my* “shadow of a name.”

To return to my proper and more respectable adversary:—That “Bishops alone as constituted and perpetuated by Apostolic appointment, are empowered to confer the

ministerial office upon others," is *still* my frank avowal, and my firm belief. To begin with the scriptures, I must refer him again, for proofs of the distinction of the offices he would confuse, to the epistles of Timothy and Titus—in the former, (1st Tim. v.) he will find that the bishop, or overseer, had the power of judging, of rebuking, of encouraging elders; and in the latter, (Titus 1. 5.) he will discover the pre-eminence of the bishop, in his power of "ordaining elders in every city" within his spiritual jurisdiction," and of "setting in order" all things pertaining to ecclesiastical discipline. In the book of Revelations, (Chapt. 2.) he will perceive that *one* "angel" only was addressed as presiding over a church which contained *many* presbyters. It can hardly be necessary to prove, that "angels" here meant any thing else than the bishops or overseers; inasmuch as we have the concurrent testimonies of the early fathers to aid the convictions of reason, with which it would be hardly compatible to think that the language of reproof contained in various parts of those admonitions would have been addressed to celestial beings.

I will not deny that the word *episkopos*, in Acts 20, 28, alludes to the same persons who, in the 17th verse, are called *presbuters*?—but I beg to remind my anagonist, and I hope his ingenuousness will duly prize the observation, that we do not lay so much stress upon the mere *etymology* of the word *episkopos*, as upon the particular *application* of its meaning. In the formation of new institutions, new words are seldom coined in order to convey the meaning and intention of offices and ranks; and, in the present instance, it was perfectly natural for the Apostles to adopt the most expressive word they were acquainted with, for designating the peculiar office of a bishop, although the same word, in its extended sense, might not, in certain cases, be inappropriate to the presbyters, or even to the deacons themselves. Names and titles in all offices, civil as well as religious, vary in their application and meaning in the course of ages; and the word *imperator*, for instance, which at one time was applied by the Romans to the commander of a single regiment, be-

came, in after ages, the exclusive title of the Emperor. A similar incident occurred in the early polity of the christian church. The presbyters, whilst the Apostles lived, were sometimes called overseers, we will grant; but when the Apostles foresaw their approaching martyrdom, they appointed successors, as St. Paul did Timothy at Ephesus, and Titus in Crete, to fill and perpetuate the office which they themselves had exercised. The bishops, therefore, properly so called, were strictly the successors of the Apostles—not in *name* because they would not assume it out of reverence for the peculiar designations of their heavenly master—but in *office*, as is evident from the authority delegated to Timothy and Titus. “At first,” says Ambrose, “all bishops were called Apostles; and, therefore, St. Paul to distinguish himself from such, calls himself an Apostle, not of man, but of God”—(Gal. 1. 1.)—and *Amalaricus* (de off. Eccles. 11. 13.) says, that “they who are now called bishops, were originally called Apostles: but not thinking it decent to assume the name of Apostles, they, dividing the name, left to the presbyters the name of the presbytery, and they, themselves, were called bishops.” This will perhaps satisfy our author, that if, at any time, there was a confusion in the *names*, there never was in the *offices* of a bishop and a presbyter.

I will now advance some other testimonies in favour of my position. “The order of bishops,” says *Tertullian*, “when it is traced up to its original, will be found to have St. John for one of its authors.” *Irenaeus* always derives the succession of bishops, and their original, from the Apostles—in consequence to which he says, that “Hygenus, bishop of Rome, was the ninth in order of Episcopal succession from the Apostles.” (Lib. 1. 28.) *Tertullian*, likewise, in insisting upon the same argument, makes a challenge to all sorts of heretics upon it, and says, ‘Let them shew us the original of their churches, and give us a catalogue of their bishops, in an exact succession from first to last, whereby it may appear that there first bishop had either some Apostle, or some Apostolical man living in

the time of the Apostles, for his author, or immediate predecessor.' (Pert. de Præser. 32.)

It is to be observed, that in the common offices which Presbyters as well as bishops were permitted to exercise—the latter acted by an independent power—the former in dependence upon, and in subordination to the bishops.—In the works of *Ignatius Cyprian*, and in the canons of the ancient councils, we find many passages which agree in this, that nothing is to be done without the bishop, that is, without his knowledge, without his consent, direction, and approbation. But it is unnecessary to multiply quotations in proof of Episcopal preeminence—a thousand could readily be adduced, if required. I will only add, that *St. Chrysostom*, in advancing to the highest the power of the Presbyters, plainly asserts their inferiority in the matter of conferring ordination; (Hom. ii. in 1st Tim. 3. 8.); and the same author (Hom. i. in Phil. 1.) proves Timothy to be a bishop, because the Apostle speaks of his power to ordain, in bidding him to 'lay hands suddenly on no man.' He adds also, (Hom. xiii. in 1 Tim. 4, 14.) that '*the Presbytery which ordained Timothy, was a synod of bishops, because mere Presbyters had no power to ordain a bishop*' I shall only add on this head the saying of *Epiphanius*, (Hær. 75.) that 'the order of bishops begets fathers to the church, which the order of Presbyters cannot do, but only begets sons by the regeneration of baptism.'

To what, then, does all this lead? Does all this mass of testimony prove nothing in favour of Episcopal preeminence? Does it not shew the order of bishops to be not only distinct from, but superior, to the order of Presbyters? Should it not remove every doubt from those who declare themselves unsatisfied by what they call the accidental, and, as it were, interjectional testimonial testimonies of the Apostolic writers? Is not the practice of the Apostles' successors; evinced by the uncontradicted testimonies of three centuries of writers; sufficient to confirm the nature and mode of those institutions on which the Apostles themselves may not have spoken clearly and

at length? Or, were all those ancient fathers; those 'clouds of witnesses,' the wretched dupes of cruelty, or the crafty authors of imposture? Is it possible that all the churches founded by the Apostles, in places too the most distant and disjoined; in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Alexandria, in Corinth, in Rome; would unite in the acknowledgment and use of a constitution which the Apostles had never established? If, in contradiction to Apostolic appointment, would it have been introduced without opposition? Would no voice have been raised against such an innovation? : Would no discontent have been expressed at such a deviation from primitive establishments? No such opposition *was* expressed for nearly four centuries: the early heretics, the Arians, Macedonians, Novatians, Donatists, &c. ever maintained the settled distinctions of ecclesiastical orders, and acknowledged the duty of the inferior clergy to their bishops. Is it possible that, in those days of persecution, when to be eminent amongst Christians exposed to greater trial, and to seek distinction, was to court danger and trouble, torture and death—there should have prevailed such an ambition of *unlawful* advancement as, we find, to have influenced the ablest and the best of Christians?—Are we to charge upon those famous martyrs, to the cause of christian truth, such an inconsistency as, on the one side, to aspire to so unwarrantable a distinction, and on the other, to yield to such unlawful encroachments? Are we to suppose that all those holy men—so renowned for their wisdom, and so conspicuous for their integrity—were, on the one hand, so blind as to overlook such a corruption, and on the other, so wicked as to abet it? Were the whole church of God so weak in judgment as to assent to such an innovation, and so base in practice as to comply with it? Can we conceive, indeed, that all the monuments of christian antiquity—the acts, the letters, the histories, the apologies of the early martyrs and confessors of our faith—would have conspired to deceive us? Shall we, indeed, reject as frauds and fictions every record of those bishops who contended so vigorously for the faith against the falseness of

paganism, and the corruptions of heretics—who here planted the good seed by their labours, and there watered it with their blood ?

Those fathers, my adversary contends, are no authority for us ! Certainly I would not yield them implicit faith in *points of doctrine*, but I will respect their testimony in *matters of fact* : though I would not build my faith on their mere sentiments or assertions, I will give them due reverence when they do not contradict ; nay, attest to the scriptures. Or, are we to discard every historical narrative as fictitious, whose writers were uninspired ? Are we to be sceptical about the existence of a Cæsar, or Cicero, because the volumes of inspiration record not their names or their deeds ? Do we place no confidence, in the relations of profane historians, nor admit their testimony for our knowledge of the manners and customs of a particular age or nation ?—Do we not adduce clauses even of Tacitus and Pliny in support of the evidences of our holy religion, and admit the relations of contemporary pagans as corroborative of the testimonies of christian writers ? Were we to deny all confidence in profane narratives, would not many a paragraph in the volume of inspiration be to us unintelligible ? For a knowledge of the historical incidents and neighbouring customs of which the new Testament makes frequent, though indirect, mention, do we not resort to the compositions of contemporary heathens, and ransack their historians, their philosophers and their poets, to discover the meaning and propriety of slight and casual allusions ? Do our dissenting brethren reject those records of church history which bear witness to the authenticity of that scriptural cannon on which we found our faith, and by which we regulate our practice ? Are we not indebted to the early fathers, if not for the settlement of that cannon, at least for our knowledge, that it is really the volume which the first Apostles compiled ? Do we not depend upon their authority for our rejection of certain spurious volumes, which were, from time to time, foisted into the code of our religious faith ? Are we not indebted to them for the detection of suppositions,

passages craftily inserted into the inspired volume ; and do we not confide in their integrity, and praise their vigilance in thus preserving the purity of those heavenly records ? Are not the writings of the fathers the stamina of that gigantic work, ‘The credibility of the Gospel history’—and was not its author, Dr. Lardner, a dissenter ?

But fancy all these documents of church history destroyed—lead the waters of oblivion over every written tract which emanated from a christian since the days of Saint John ; and where would be those SS. which we now triumphantly hold up as the touch-stone by which to try the soundness of our belief, and the reasonableness of our hopes ? They would either long ago have shared the destruction of those contemporary and succeeding annals to which some yield no authority or credit—or they would have come down to us, so interpolated by every heretical conceit and ‘private interpretation,’ so clogged with the contradictory statements of *oral tradition*, that their pure original would have been lost for ever. The absence of such testimony would, indeed, have ‘made infidelity triumph ;’ and we, I fear, ‘would not have been left to tell the mournful tale.’ Now sir, the same written authority—the same recorded testimony—the coincidences of separated and successive writers, undesignedly testifying to, and proving the same fact—the same indisputable mass of evidence which convinces us of the divine inspiration of that volume which we hold as the ‘rule and guide of our lives,’ does, with every similar instance of candour and truth, convince us also that *the order of bishops* was pre eminent in the christian church—that it was founded by the Apostles—that it alone was the channel of the appointment of christian ministers.

To shew what were ‘the opinions of some of the most learned and most successful defenders of the church of England on this point, and how they accord with’ the reasoning I have advanced, I shall quote and beg of my generous adversary to profit by the following remarks of the celebrated Dr. Isaac Barrow : ‘If any man be so dull or so affectedly ignorant as not to see the reason of

the case, and the dangerous consequences of rejecting this ancient form of discipline ; if any be so overweeningly presumptuous as to question the faith of all history, or to disavow those monuments and that tradition upon the testimony whereof even the truth and certainty of our religion, and all its sacred oracles do rely ; if any be so perversely contentious as to oppose the custom and current practice of churches through all ages down to the last age ; so self-conceitedly arrogant as to condemn or slight the judgment and practice of all the Fathers ; so peevishly refractory as to thwart the settled order of that church in which he was baptized, together with the law of the country in which he was born ; upon such a person we may look as one utterly invincible and intractable : so weak a judgment and so strong a will who can hope by reason to convert ? (Theol. works, 114, 114.) * * * With regard to *religious establishments*, the impure atmosphere of which seems so much to affect the free breathing of our author, that he is rather unintelligible in the expression of his sentiments, I would that he had disproved my detail of the baneful effects of desultory teaching instead of blinding our eyes with that strange commixtion of rhetorical figure which meets us at the opening of his communication. I have read with much interest and pleasure the successive communications of the *Church of England man* in the Kingston Chronicle, and highly approve of the *a priori* argument which he produces in favour of religious establishments amongst christians. Certainly the natural learning and universal practice of mankind bespeaks the innate propriety of such a connexion betwixt church and state, whilst it gives to our argument an antecedent force which a few instances of dissent can no more affect than a few specimens of monstrous productions in nature can detract from the evidence of its general order. We grant that, in many cases, the natural bent of mankind is repugnant to the principles which religion has laid down, and their practice contradictory to the precepts which morality approves—yet, abstracted from my conviction that this bent and practice is something contingent rather than

strictly moral, and arising from the natural fitness of things rather than from the caprice of natural feeling, still, judging from the philosophy of the mind and the practice of all nations, I conceive it to be a property of an instinctive nature similar to that which preserved in all ages and amongst every people the belief of a God and of the immortality of the soul. In the early and patriarchal ages, parental authority was uniformly blended with the exercise of religious offices ; and the leading family of a tribe universally furnished its head as the minister of sacred things. The same thing is observable amongst the aboriginal inhabitants of our own country ; where, we find the untutored Indians are directed by nature or instinct to delegate to the venerable head of a community or nation the chief direction in matters of religion. This, to use the language of Cicero, we cannot denominate any thing less than the *vox naturee*—and this voice of nature has evidently the sanction of God from his own particular appointment in the case of the Jews, and his *permission* of a similar establishment amongst christians. For, I contend with my learned and ingenious coadjutor that a silence upon the subject amounts to a permission ; and the founders of our religion would *naturally* adopt the usages which nature had suggested in the general practice of mankind, and God himself had sanctioned in the case of their sister church ; moreover, unless expressly required, they would in my opinion, have been chargeable with no inferior degree of presumption in overturning that order of society, and in deviating from that rule of government which the natural fitness of things had pointed out—by which mankind had been universally directed—and which God himself had approved. But I leave this argument to the able champion of our cause already alluded to—whose depth and originality of mind are so clearly evinced by the productions with which he has recently favored us, and which do honor to the Church of which he professes himself a member. Let it suffice to add that it is our reasonable belief and pious hope, that God will never leave his Church without those ‘nursing fathers and nursing mo-

thers' which are provided for it in kings and governments; and that the day will never arrive when states and civil societies shall abolish all connection with religious establishments. We shall ever hope for the aid and influence of that authority to preserve concord and harmony in the service of God—that the church of Christ may be kept from an endless division into jarring sects, manifesting not that 'stone which is to become a great mountain and fill the whole earth,' but a disjointed mass of incoherent particles which may be scattered by every wind of opposition from without, and of commotion from within—that Christendom may not present a Babel of confused opinions and contradictory practices rendering 'the truth as it is in Jesus' so mangled and disfigured as to become an object of aversion to the wise and of contempt to the profane. We will not deny that abuses may creep into the most perfect institutions of man; for every thing human is fallible, and the holy structures of God have been marred by the imperfections of his creatures: still we contend for the soundness of the *principle*; and believe that to the pious contemplator of that happy time when 'the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea,' it would present an inconsistency the most glaring to suppose that human governments and the christian church could be otherwise than in unison, or that this reign of truth could exist unless the ordinances of man were sanctioned by the appointments of God, and human politics could admit a conjunction with the institutions of religion.

Much has been said on the fancied interruption of Episcopal succession at the time of the Reformation—grounded upon the idea that as the church of Rome was wholly corrupt and anti christian in its spirit and practice, the chain of that succession was broken, and therefore Episcopacy fell to the ground. My adversary is at some pains to detail the monstrous enormities of which the Romish Popes were guilty with a design to show how impure was *that* channel of Apostolic succession. To his accounts of their flagitious lives I readily subscribe—but

I beg of him to discriminate betwixt the Romish and the *Catholic* church, and not to fasten upon the whole society of the church militant upon earth those horrid impieties which more particularly appertain to the former. The Pope of Rome was evidently an usurper, and had no right, in a spiritual or in any other capacity, to exercise a jurisdiction over foreign churches and realms. It need scarcely be repeated that the church of England, amongst others, early manifested an opposition to this encroachment and gradually struggled with that unlawful domination until she entirely freed herself from the baneful thralldom. And even that connection, whilst it subsisted, had rather the nature of a civil than of a religious alliance—at least, the sanction of the Pope of Rome was not, in a spiritual light deemed necessary to the validity of the Episcopal commission. *He* was not the channel of that order : Bishops were consecrated by bishops in the due line of Apostolic succession ; and to use the language of an ancient Chronicler (Girald. Camb. Itin. 11, 1,) ‘ The Welsh bishops are consecrated by the bishop of Saint David’s, and he himself, in like manner, is ordained by others who are, as it were, his suffragans, professing *no manner of subjection to any other church.*

Most truly the whole of christendom was infected by that corruption in doctrine and discipline which, in general, owed its rise to the Papal usurpation, and loudly called for the reform which it was the happiness of our country to admit. But what does a reform imply? Not surely a demolition of the whole fabric, but the eradication of abuses—not the destruction of the whole constitution of christianity, but its purification from the errors which deformed it. This was done by the *church of England.* They had wandered away from the appointments of their divine Master, and ‘sought out many inventions ;’ but the latter they abolished—to the former they returned. They did not overturn, with sacrilegious hand, the whole system of christianity, and bury, in one indiscriminate ruin, all that was pure and proper, with whatever was corrupt and wicked—no : they carefully

discriminated betwixt the evil and the good ; and whilst they eradicated the former as the corrupt inventions of man, they adhered to the latter as the workmanship of God. They retained every institution which was apostolic and primitive, and would not abandon that medium of the ministerial commission which the first teachers of Christ had settled, and their successors had universally used.

But suppose that all things had been thus overwhelmed—that one wide and undistinguished ruin presented again the melancholy picture of

—chaos ; rudis indigesta que moles—

who was to lay again the corner stone of the new temple, which was now to be erected ?—What Uzzah could touch the ark of God without presumption ? What Korah could offer incense to the people without profanation ?—What Jeroboam could exercise and confer the priestly office without making Israel to sin ? No : such impiety was not hazarded by the church of England—such an annihilation, such a ruin was not contemplated by them : it was contrary to the received maxims of mankind : it was contrary to the revealed examples of Heaven. When man, originally ‘upright,’ had sought out many inventions,’ insomuch that ‘it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth,’ and he decreed their signal punishment—we yet find that God did not *annihilate* the species and cast them anew in a different mould, but he perpetuated the race through the same medium as he had at first established, and left them the same aspect, the same nature, the same propensities. So, the ark of the true church still floated over this ocean of wreck and ruin—the church of Christ, though deformed, was not destroyed by the corruptions which were heaped upon it—the rock of its foundation was unbroken—its model survived unimpaired—its lineaments remained imperishable. By the intervention of the clouds of human error, its glory was eclipsed—but not extinguished. The ‘Spirit of God’ interposed again for the restoration of harmony and order : those clouds were dispersed—and that sun broke forth

once more. It was not a new creation—new lights were not set up in the religious firmament, but the old ones were freed from the spots which had dimmed their radiance.

That fabric as constituted by the son of God—holy and spiritual in its nature—was impalpable to the unhallowed touch of man. He might obscure, but could not alter—he might heap on additions and defile, but he could not destroy. Our reformers cleansed away this rubbish of Popish superstition, and restored to the enraptured sight of man the primitive purity of our holy religion. Our Bishops—the legitimate dispensers of the ministerial commission—awoke from the trance of Popish enchantment, and broke from the thralldom of Romish error : they washed and made clean their garments, and stood again, in their original and unsullied vestments, before the altar of their God.

Although, Mr. Editor, I am conscious of too great a trespass already, I must intrude some further remarks in defence of certain positions advanced in my former communication. My adversary, as I complained at the commencement of this, has spread some of the mists of his own fancy upon my meaning, in speaking of the influences of the spirit. No person can subscribe more heartily than myself to the doctrine of divine grace, as inculcated in our Liturgy and Articles, and in the SS, which are the basis of both ; yet I contended that the workings of that grace were not an *arbitrary* prevention of our wills, nor *irresistible* movement of our feelings. But, Sir, is it not laying claim to that extraordinary aid and guidance—to a most miraculous interference with the known nature of man, to say, as many of that persuasion have vaunted that human attainments were needless for the due qualification of a minister of Christ ; and that the Holy Ghost suddenly and sensibly communicates such a light into their hearts, as to supply at once every deficiency of the former, and to expel every corruption of the latter? *This* would certainly be as presumptuous as it is ridiculous—for whilst it leagued the majesty of heaven with the wild

conceits of man, it would imply the absence of our own freedom of action, and an end to that accountability, a sense of which, is a most powerful restraint upon the evil propensities of our nature, rendering, at the same time, useless and unmeaning, these admonitions of SS. : ‘grieve not the Holy Spirit of God—quench not the spirit.’ Could we grieve that which arbitrarily moves our wills? Could we quench that which irresistibly directs our actions?

It is, perhaps, an erroneous conception of this doctrine which has produced those occasional extravagances in the religious worship of my opponent on which I animadverted, with some severity, in my last communication. Too much dependence upon inward experiences, and a mistake of natural impulse for the incontrollable movements of the spirit, are perhaps the original of those Bacchanalian spectacles which their camp-meetings so unhappily present. ‘By their fruits ye shall know them’—and this, measured by the standard of SS. we assume as the only safe test of the reign and influence of that holy visitant.—Whilst, on the one hand, it is opposed to the indifference manifested in a ‘halting betwixt two opinions’—to that neutrality of the affections evinced in a wavering betwixt God and mammon—we deny that it dictates those ebullitions of enthusiasm, which neither accord with the principles of christianity, nor with the practice of its holiest professors. That is a disease superinduced upon the animal nature ; not the reign of grace in the inner man : it is the wild rule of rebellious passion which has usurped the dominion of reason : it is a tempest of the soul which commonly leaves behind it a wreck and a ruin in decayed faculties and weakened energies. But the devout ecstasies of religion must not participate in the weakness of common passion. *That* joy is not like the transient elevations of animal pleasure—not like that exhilarating rapture which dies away after the first and tumultuary effervescence ; but it is ‘a joy which no man taketh from us’—which spreads a benignant cheerfulness throughout the soul, occasionally elevated in the moments of exclusive communion with heaven, when the heart rushes to

the bliss for which the lips are praying, but settling at length into that 'peace of God which passeth all understanding.' Far less does it savour of that tumultuous gladness which, passing away, leaves behind it a dim cloud of melancholy—oppressing the mind with languor, and the heart with discontent—but the permanent joy it excites, disperses every invidious shadow which would veil the beauty of holiness, and damp the true fervour of religion.

Amongst the first fruits of that spirit is 'love' illimitable love to God and man—drawing us with a gentle violence to the purity of heaven, and embracing, in its benevolent ardour, the whole brotherhood of the family of man. To this conclusion would I bring our present controversy—that kindred minds and kindred hearts may blend into a closer harmony of sentiment, and into intenser feelings of benevolence, that they may speed the arrival of that happy period, the universal reign of heavenly truth, and the unbounded prevalence of christian charity. Whilst it is my prayer and hope, to experience at the latest hour of existence, that consolation which an adherence to the ordinances of my church has preserved during my life—I will entreat that the last sleep of every christian may also be preceded by the 'sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life'—and that if we cannot kneel before the same altar in this world, we may all bow down before the same throne in heaven.

A Member of the Church of England.

August 15, 1826.

FOR THE UPPER CANADA HERALD.

'Observations on the Remarks of the Member of the Church of England,' &c.

Mr. Editor,—

The voluminous communication of the 'Member of the Church of England,' obliges me again to solicit your indulgence. I should have noticed the article, already alluded to, at an earlier period, had not my travels, which have exceeded four hundred miles since its reception, to-

gether with various other duties, rendered it impracticable. I am happy to find that my former cursory observations on the subject of Episcopacy, and unbroken succession have, while they have wrested my opponents from most of their strong holds, given my present antagonist an opportunity of exhibiting an improved good feeling of candour and christian charity. And doubtless it must be pleasing to every impartial reader to see, as well in the present state of the controversy, as in the noble sentiments which closed my adversary's last communication, the truth of an amiable divine's observations, that 'the agitation of controverted points can never be unfavourable to the interests of genuine piety. Truth is always elicited by the collision. The times of revival in the christian church have always been marked by the conflict of debate, and it has not been found in the case of the greatest and best of men, that a spirit of controversy was at variance with a spirit of elevated devotion, or with unfeigned benevolence. Christian charity is not an amalgamating principle: it requires neither a surrender of our most *sacred rights*, nor even a *tacit* compliance with unjust claims.' Those who have no reason for complaint, may urge the propriety of silence, or the uselessness of remonstrance on others; but, sir, is silence becoming, or even justifiable, when the privileges of the members of Christ's church are invaded, and when their duties are involved in the discussion? No sir, in such circumstances the most feeble combatant should not be deterred, either by the fear of giving offence to others, the dread of breaking the spell of imaginary reconciliation, or outward professions of amity between parties, or from an apprehension of fruitlessness in his labours. Any one who will lift up his voice in defence of undisguised truth, as it is in Jesus, and the inviolable privileges of heaven born freedom, has always borne, and must, in the present state of things, expect to bear the frowns of some, while he meets the groundless accusations of others. Bigotry will ever raise the diabolical cry of 'heresy and schism,' prejudice moan out the stale declamation of 'ignorance and enthusiasm,'

and interest will never fail to sound the alarm, ‘Diana is in danger, these men who have turned the world upside down have come hither also, and are teaching without authority from US, doctrines, and customs which are not lawful for men to receive and observe.’ Such have been the hardiness and perseverance of these twin ornaments of prelatical policy, that the mathematical demonstrations of unanswerable argument have hitherto failed in humbling their irritational assumptions & the irrefragable proof of many ages of experience has been too feeble to silence their calumny or sooth their malignity. But while the investigation of religious truth, and the uniform tenor of her unequivocal doctrines and precepts, have not succeeded in banishing the arrogant pretensions of the ambitious and interested to *exclusive* privileges, they have always emitted a light of evidence and consistency, whereby the ignorant are informed, the wavering established, and the impartial convinced. But nothing is more common in the course of these controversial investigations than too much excitement of feeling which leads to a bitterness of expression ‘at once at variance with the principles of charity and decorum.’ Of this my adversaries’ publications afford an abundant proof. By them, personal abuse has been substituted in place of evidence, and an heterogeneous ‘commixtion of rhetorical figure’ for the legitimate deductions of cool reasoning. Indeed such was the severity and indecency of their abuse, and such their ludicrous pretentions, ‘wealth power, and dazzling prospects,’ that I was compelled to derogate from the solemnity and dignity of the subject, in order to expose their futility, rembering the proverb of the wise man, ‘to answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own eyes,’ and not forgetting the well known saying of the poet :

“*Ridiculum Acri fortius.*”

But I am happy that my present adversary has, in his last communication, seen the impropriety of such a course, and has adopted a method for which he is worthy of respect and praise. However, it seems that the most ho-

nest and well meaning men are not free from imperfections, and, hastily assuming a wrong position, and urged on by a misguided zeal to support it, they involve themselves in inconsistencies and contradictions which they are unable to reconcile. Such is the case of my antagonists with regard to each other, and such is the case of my present antagonist with respect to himself. Having made a sad mistake, with respect to the influence of the Holy Spirit, in his first publication, and having thus brought himself in direct contact with his *professed* principles, he now endeavours to secure a respectable retreat, by charging me with the 'misrepresentation of his sentiments.' I should wish my learned friend to show wherein I misrepresented his sentiments, or clouded them 'with the mists of my own fancy.' Did he not affirm as positively that it 'is presumption to lay claim to a heavenly aid and guidance, which is only promised as a *furtherance* to our own good endeavours, and that the Holy Spirit is not given as an extraordinary illumination of our faculties,' as he did, that the 'workings of that grace are not an *arbitrary* prevention of our wills, or an irresistible movement of our feelings.' The former I disputed, the latter I left unnoticed. I am sure I never even entertained such an opinion, nor do I believe that any member of the body to which I belong has ever advanced such a sentiment. I defy my antagonist to produce an instance of it. Have I not in my publications from first to last insisted upon the necessity and importance of literary acquirements as indispensable requisites to an able minister of the gospel? And do not the indefatigable exertions of the body of which I am a member declared the same? Who then supports the idea that the 'working of divine grace was ever an *arbitrary* prevention of our wills, or an irresistible movement of our feelings? No body but my antagonist. He roundly affirmed, that 'in the age of miracles it was so.' If men 'in the age of miracles or if the apostles were 'arbitrarily' prevented and irresistibly moved, 'where was their accountability?'

"When will and reason (reason also is choice)
Of freedom both despoiled made passive both,
Had serv'd *Necessity* not God."

Hence it appears in the conclusion, that my antagonist has become the greatest enthusiast with whom we are acquainted. 'For my own humble self,' while I maintain the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's influence, and that 'God works to will and to do of his own good pleasure,' I also maintain that *we* are to 'work out *our own* salvation,' and I therefore affirm with St. Augustine, '*Qui fecit nos sine nobis, non salvabit nos sine nobis.*' To entertain us with an essay, on the influence and fruits of the Holy Spirit, or the christian religion, quite irrelevant to the subject of debate, my adversary introduces his remarks, by disingenuously taxing '*my worship* with occasional extravagancies,' and the Methodists, with believing in the 'uncontrollable movements' of the Holy Spirit, and attributes to this mistaken notion, 'the original of those Bacchanalian spectacles which our infamous camp-meetings so unhappily present.' Now, Mr. Editor, it is well known, that no persons are warmer advocates for *moral*, as well as religious freedom, than the Methodists; and although as a *private individual*, I am no advocate for camp-meetings, when other religious means supersede their necessity, I would ask my learned friend, what are his objections to them? Does he object to the place of assemblage? We have the example of him 'who taught as never man taught.' Does he discountenance their praying collectively at once? His own Liturgy authorises the 'Minister, Clerks, and people, to pray with a *loud voice.*' Does he condemn those religious extacies which some experience and express? The most pious of men, 'a man after God's own heart,' became quite a Bacchanalian in the eyes of his frowning Queen, and accomplished friends, when he even *danced* before the Ark of God, not in a ball room, but in a *religious* extacy. If there be any such thing as a sound conversion to God—a condemned criminal to become a subject of pardoning mercy—a guilty sinner to become an adopted and beloved son, is there not a time when this change takes place, and can we be insensible of a change so conspicuous and astonishing? And as this change is wrought upon the feel-

ings and inclinations of our minds, must it not affect our passions more or less? And if an Euclid without being charged with madness, could run thro' the Athenian streets, exclaiming '*eureka*,' when he had solved the 47th Problem, is it a matter of ridicule that a universal condemned soul, when he receives the 'oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness'—when he hears the voice of God say to his troubled soul, 'Peace, be still; thy sins, which are many, are all forgiven thee'—is it passing strange that he should 'rejoice with a joy unspeakable and full of glory?' Are we surprised that he should, 'with a loud voice, glorify God?' (Luke 17, 15.) But to return; 'By their fruits,' says my antagonist, respecting 'those infamous camp-meetings,' ye shall know them. Let us for a moment examine their fruits by the 'only safe standard.' How many, how very many persons are there, in almost every part of this Province, as well as in other parts of America, who have, through the instrumentality of camp-meetings, been induced to reform their lives? The drunkard has become sober—the profane swearer has learned to set a guard before his lips, that he offend not with his tongue—the sabbath breaker has been persuaded to remember the 7th day to keep it holy; and many of these highly salutary reformatations have, in their commencement, been effected by means of camp-meetings. And it is a remarkable fact, that our present Indian Preacher, the first of the Indian converts, and who has been the principal instrument in producing the astonishing reformation which we joyfully witness among the aborigines of this country, was converted to the christian religion at a camp-meeting. What glorious results may not yet ensue from the conversions of such individuals? I grant that there may be occasional improprieties at these meetings, and to borrow the language of my adversary, I further remark, that 'abuses may creep into the most perfect institutions of man,' but these no more derogate from the propriety and usefulness of the institution itself, 'than a few specimens of monstrous productions in nature can detract from

the evidence of its order.' I feel opposed, and believe it my indispensable duty, both in private and in public, to discountenance and condemn enthusiasm of every kind : but at the same time, that charity, which is the end of the commandment and the bond of perfectness, will ever teach me to be cautious, what I denominate *enthusiasm*, and who I dub Bacchanalians. As to my views of the christian religion in general, I will briefly remark, that it is divine in its origin, spiritual in its nature, and mysterious in its manifestations : its seat is in the heart, its energy controuls the passions, and its amiableness is transfused into the tempers : its holiness new models the life, its wisdom shines in the conversation, and its righteousness gives dignified character to action ; and it is a principle in the soul which ' no man knoweth but he that receiveth it.' Having been reluctantly drawn to make the above remarks on subjects foreign from the main point in dispute, I shall now let them rest, and direct my attention to the Dedalian maze of episcopal successions, where wresting myself from the sceptical chains of Pyrrhonian uncertainty, in which I am supposed to be unhappily bound, and putting all the faith of my novel credulity to the utmost stretch, I will try once more to seek for ' the original of my opponent's church, and a catalogue of his Bishops, in an exact succession from first to last, whereby it may appear that their first bishop had either some apostle, or some apostolical man living in the time of the apostles for his author, or immediate predecessor.' I must confess, sir, that with the faith which would remove mountains, I begin to waver, when I am informed that ' the ark of the church of England floated upon the tempestuous ocean of Popish corruptions for more than a thousand years ; for on board that ' ark,' which was tossed upon those waters, I cannot find one officer which did not receive the ' mark of the Beast which was making war against the Lamb.' And how the ' ark of the true church,' which when she launched forth, had, according to the most ancient accounts, but two kinds of officers aboard, could, after coasting upon the shores of Italy for

so long a time, rest upon an *apostolic* mount, with the additional orders of King, Parliament, Archbishop, Archdeacon, Deacon, Proctor, &c. &c. is a system of conjuring concerning which the Scriptures favour me with no account, and therefore cannot be received as an article of my faith. But my astonishment is increased when I am informed, this 'ark was not only tossed upon the billows of Popery,' but 'overwhelmed' and 'deformed,' and that even then she retained all her ancient 'lineaments' and primitive 'light.' This, sir, I think, must be ranked among those miracles for which the Italian climate is so remarkable, and with which the Popish dogmas so plentifully abound. Upon what principle of theological reasoning will we infer that a "foul, filthy old withered harlot" can bring forth a pure and holy daughter, with the high and *exclusive* claim to heaven delegated authority? Does the church or authority of Christ dwell in the embraces of the 'Scarlet Whore'? is 'Antichrist' to be the sole dispenser of the Holy Ghost, and his divine authority? To remove this difficulty, my antagonist 'begs of me to discriminate betwixt the *Catholic* and the Romish church.' Will he have me discriminate betwixt that which is identified by an act of the Imperial Parliament? Suppose I should discriminate, what would that favour his case? If there had been a church from the apostles to the present time, as pure as the church triumphant, it would not prove that the church of England derived her Episcopal authority from that church. My adversary, in his first communication, did not intimate a doubt respecting the delegation of his Episcopate from the Romish Church. Nay, so far from it, that he maintained in the most unqualified term the 'validity of their Episcopal authority,' even to such a degree, that no Royal mandate could nullify it. Now Mr. Parker, the only source, of church of England Episcopacy, was ordained by Romish bishops or he was not. If he was not ordained by Romish Prelates, from whence did he obtain his Episcopal authority? If he was ordained by bishops of the church of Rome, as all agree, and as my adversary tacitly acknowledged,

how then was his authority apostolic according to my adversary's articles of faith? Is there any union betwixt 'Christ and Antichrist,' betwixt a 'filthy old withered harlot' and the heavenly bride? But suppose that the Romish orders were exclusively valid, they deny ever to have imparted this precious gift to the church of England Prelates: and besides, it is affirmed in the act of Supremacy, which I quoted in my last communication, 'that Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, have *no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastic but by and under the King's Majesty,*' and consequently the bishops deposed by Queen Mary could have no ecclesiastical authority to ordain Mr. Parker. To obviate the force of this argument, my adversary readily assures us, that 'no prince nor power can *take away*, though they may *forbid* the exercise of this sacred commission. If a Prince has a right to forbid the exercise of this sacred commission, can the ministration of the suspended persons be valid during the period of their suspension? Indeed the ordination of Parker appeared so doubtful, that an act of Parliament was passed 8 years afterwards, pronouncing it valid. If it was not valid before, could an act of Parliament make it so? Queen Elizabeth deposed the Romish bishops whom she found, and their Episcopal powers ceased. In like manner did Queen Mary deprive the bishops who ordained Parker, and their authority ceased. For if it was right in Queen Elizabeth, it was equally so in Queen Mary. She was Sovereign in England as much as Queen Elizabeth: and if it was right in Queen Mary, what becomes of Parker's ordination? That the King, or even Queen, could not only *unmake*, but *make* bishops whenever he or she pleased, is obvious from the following letter of Queen Elizabeth to the Bishop of Ely, respecting the disposal of some land within his diocese, and as it is remarkable for the sentiments, and the spirit which it breathes throughout, as well as illustrative of the present subject, I will give it in her own words.

'PROUD PRELATE,

'I understand you are backward in complying with

‘our agreement; but I would have you know, that I who made you what you are, *can unmake* you; and if you do not forthwith fulfil your engagements, by God, I will immediately unfrock you.

‘Yours, as you demean yourself,

‘ELIZABETH.’

From whence did her Majesty or any Prince get authority to turn the key of heaven, and unmake bishops at their pleasure? This is what some gentlemen call ‘Apostolic authority and practice.’

“*Hec vatium ignarae mentes !*”

My adversary, in ascribing the glory of the reformation to the ‘Church of England’ and to her ‘Bishops,’ who he says ‘awoke from the trance of Popish enchantment, and broke from the thralldom of Romish error,’ seems to be as wide of the mark of historic truth, as he was when he referred us to Clement of Rome, to prove his Episcopate. Luther and his contemporaries in Germany, burst assunder the chains of Papal tyranny, and asserted the rights of accountable beings, before England had opened her eyes, or had dared to lift the voice of remonstrance; and the charms of Anne Boleyn effected as much towards throwing off the yoke of Popery as any Prelate in England. So far, Sir, from the Bishops ‘breaking the thralldom of Romish error they were, with very few exceptions strenuously opposed to any reform. To save their heads and their livings, they submitted to the act passed under King Henry VIII, and Edward VI. But when Queen Mary ascended the throne, these acts being repealed, and the Pope restored to the Ecclesiastical supremacy of England, the Clergy became Popish, and the Mass book superseded the common Prayer book. Queen Elizabeth however, differing in her religious sentiments from her predecessor, established the protestant religion. But were the Bishops the principal promoters of the reformation under Queen Elizabeth? No Sir, they were opposed to the present establishment—so opposed were they to it that Archdeacon Echard assures us, that ‘fourteen Bishops, twelve Deans twelve Archdeacons, fifteen heads of colleges, fifty

prebendaries, and eighty Rectors, were deprived by the *Queen* ; and it was strongly believed, that of the rest, the *greatest part* complied against their *consciences*, and would have been ready for *another turn*, if the *Queen* had died while that race of incumbants lived, and the next successor had been of *another religion*.' (Hist. Eng. p. 330.) It would be much to the credit of my adversary, if he were as famous for his historical correctness, as he is eminent for his sophistical obscurity.

Upon a consideration of the whole subject of unbroken succession, I beg leave to make the following supplementary remarks.

1. I believe the notion of unbroken succession chimerical, because my adversaries have not answered a single argument that I have adduced against it.

2. Because it would unchristianize the church of England and every other reformed church.

3. Because it must be traced through schismatics, heretics, infidels, idolators, drunkards, adulterers, Simonists, Sodomites, and murderers, and then cannot be proved.

4 Because my antagonists have not produced an argument to prove it uninterrupted, nor has any writer in favor of succession ever been prevailed upon to trace it. I therefore have a right to assume that they cannot do it.

5. Because fair reasoning, and strong evidence have been adduced to prove, that the succession of Bishops has been broken ; I am therefore justified in believing that my adversaries cannot prove to the reverse.

6. Because it is contrary to the sentiments of the reformers.

7. Because it is contrary to the Homilies of the church of England, (see Hom. on Whitsunday part II.) and an insult to common sense.

Lastly, the succession being interrupted and broken, I infer every dissenting minister has as good authority to administer all the ordinances as a clergyman of the church of England.

FOR THE UPPER CANADA HERALD.

‘Observations on the Remarks of the Member of the Church of England.’ &c.

Mr. Editor,—

The conclusion to which I have drawn the above remarks, involves the next subject of discussion, viz. whether, what we call in modern language, *episcopal ordination*, be essential to the lawful exercise of Ministerial functions:—with respect to the advantages or disadvantages of different forms of church government, they are subjects foreign to the present question, and concerning which, I hope every one will peaceably enjoy his own opinion.—The question now is, whether any particular form is *essential*—and, in the next place, what particular form of church government was established by ‘apostolic authority and practice.’ As to the first of these, I have already given the opinion of several learned church of England divines, in one of my former communications; I shall briefly add further, if any particular form was essential, or if ‘*Bishops alone* are empowered to confer authority,’ to administer the government of the church, ‘it was needful (to borrow the language of Dr. Barrow) that a commission, from God, its founder, should be granted in downright and perspicuous terms; that no man, concerned in duty grounded thereon, might have any doubt of it, or any excuse for boggling at it.’ [Works vol. I. p 561.] But, Sir, is there any precept for *Episcopal government alone*, granted in ‘downright and perspicuous terms?’ The only condition of the everlasting gospel is, ‘believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved—he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.’ But certain gentlemen would add, ‘if he be baptized by a minister who has been ordained by a Bishop who ‘alone is empowered to confer the ministerial office upon others.’ Is such a qualification specified in scripture? Let such remember the advice of Solomon:—‘add thou not unto the words of the Lord, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.’

The next principal question is, what form of church government did the apostles establish, or rather how many

orders of church officers did they institute? I answer, two—my adversary says three. This, Sir, is the simple statement of the question. Before I enter into the discussion of this subject, it will be proper to enquire upon what authority we may most safely rest our belief? ‘The standard of Scripture,’ says my adversary, ‘is the only safe test.’ And this is the touchstone to which I wish to bring him on the present subject. But in doing so, do I reject the authority of every uninspired author, and denominate the ancient Fathers ‘ambitious impostors,’ and their writings falsehoods and forgeries? So my adversary would have it, it, and would fain make me the abettor of a scepticism more dangerous, than that which was introduced by Pyrrho. But this is the offspring of his own fancy. As to the valuable remains of antiquity, who does not highly value those ancient monuments both of philosophy and poetry, of ethics and history? It is by the last of these we learn that out of a church government purely presbyterian, grew diocesan bishops—out of diocesan bishops, grew metropolitans—out of metropolitans grew patriarchs—out of patriarchs, grew Pope, who at length concentrated in himself the sole right to apostolic authority, and, with the assurance of modern pretenders, claimed it immediately from St. Peter. As far as the Fathers corroborate the testimony of scripture, they are to be believed, and no further. Hence it is of no consequence to the present question whether the primitive church, after the apostle’s death, was established after the congregational, presbyterian, or episcopalian plan. If three orders of church officers, or, if the superiority of bishops over presbyters, cannot be made out from the records of scripture, in which we have a particular account of the primitive churches, and if the ancient Fathers distinguished between them, or assigned them separate duties, it necessarily follows, that some change must have taken place in the form of church government after the decease of the apostles. This was actually the case. But the change was gradual, and it was not till near the third century that the distinction between bishop and presbyter became universal, although it obtained in

many places at an earlier period. Dr. Pearson acknowledges that the terms bishop and presbyter, were interchangeably used both by Irenæus, who wrote about the middle of the second century, and by others, to the close of it. Among the many examples, I might adduce to illustrate and establish this opinion, I shall only notice the authority of Clement of Alexandria, who wrote about the end of the second century.—Having shown that there are generally two kinds of ministry, the one subordinate to the other, and having illustrated his distinction by examples drawn from philosophy and physic, the former being superior, as it administers to the soul, and the latter inferior, as it only relieves the body, he observes; ‘just so in the church; the presbyters are intrusted with a dignified ministry, the deacons, with a subordinate. Both kinds of service the angels perform to God in the government of this lower world.’ Is not obvious that the distinction betwixt bishop and presbyter was of notice, even at this advanced period? For he draws a plain distinction betwixt *presbyter* and *bishop*.

The first ecclesiastical author who mentions three orders of church officers is Ignatius, who is believed by some to have written about the sixteenth year of the second century, and by others earlier. I have passingly observed, in relation to this author, that, taking his sentiments in their widest extent, a bishop was nothing more than a pastor of a single congregation; and this fact is supported by the unvarying testimony of early history. As there are many things in the supposed writings of Ignatius, which are repugnant to scripture, religion, and even decency, the most learned and judicious, in justice to him, believe his writings corrupt; and that they have been interpolated by the ecclesiastics of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, who wished to exalt the clerical dignity and power. But allowing, contrary to received opinion—contrary to the obvious and necessary inference which would result from a critical examination of his writings, that they are genuine, what do they prove? They only prove that the distinction betwixt bishops and prebyters obtained at An-

tioch and in Asia Minor at an earlier period, than it did in Macedonia, and in other christian churches. In refutation of the very disingenuous quotation of my adversary, from Clement of Rome, for which he made no apology, I have shown that Clement affords us the most unquestionable testimony in favour of but two orders of church officers. And it is worthy of remark here, that Clement in whose writings true ecclesiastical orders are so specifically mentioned, that they are declared to be the fulfilment of an ancient prophecy, was pastor of the church of *Rome*, from whence the Pope and all his descendants profess to derive the exclusive rights.

The testimony of Polycarp, who wrote before, or about the middle of the second century, is of equal authority in support of the same opinion. In his letter to the Philip-
pians, (chap. 5.) he enjoins on the people subjection ‘to their presbyters and deacons;’ and although in chap. 5. he explains the qualifications and duties of deacons, and in chap. 6, those of presbyters, concerning whom he mentions every qualification necessary for judges and governors; and although he, throughout the whole letter, enforces the duty of the people to their pastors, he neither mentions the office, qualifications, nor duty of the bishop, nor the duty of the people towards him. How can we account for his silence, if there was any such office?

I ask in the words of my adversary, ‘to what does all this lead? Does all this mass of testimony prove nothing in favour of presbyterian, as well as of ‘episcopal preeminence?’ These three fathers are the only contemporaries of the apostles, whose writings have come down to us; and I leave the judicious reader to judge on which side their testimony preponderates.—I will here ask, Mr. Editor, to whom we ought to give the preference with regard to St. John being the author of episcopacy, to Tertullian? (who wrote about the beginning of the third century, and who is well known to have held many spurious notions,) or to Polycarp? (who was a disciple of St. John, and died a martyr to the christian faith.) But the passage which my adversary quotes from Tertullian is

misrepresented in such a way as betrays the badness of the cause which it was introduced to support. He gives us the following quotation:—‘The order of bishops, when traced to its original, will be found to have John for one of its authors.’ This is a gross misrepresentation of our author. The following are his words: ‘Ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem redensus, in Joanem stabit auctorem.’ [Lib. 4. adv. marc.] ‘The order of bishops, when traced to its origin, will terminate in John its author.’—I would ask my learned friend, by what rule of construction he was taught ‘in the Gymnasium of science in which he was trained up,’ to render *auctorem*, ‘one of its authors?’ It is obvious, from the proper construction of the passage, Tertullian thought that *John alone* was the institutor of what was then called Episcopacy; and that the other apostles did not authorise this subordination among the pastors of those churches established by them. If he had thought so, he would not have referred *solely* to John, concerning whom, and whose labours, we have but a very partial account. Instead of saying.—‘Joanem auctorem,’ he would have said, ‘Joanem unum auctorem,’ or apostolos auctores.—Doubtless Tertullian founded his opinion [for it is only his opinion] upon the Apocalypse, which is mentioned by him in the same paragraph. Now if he thought that St. John established the Asiatic churches upon a different model from the other churches, he must have supposed that the form of church government was an accidental circumstance, and by no means essential, Tertullian, with all his foibles, seems to have been a stranger to that excluding system, which had its origin in a later and darker day. In his exhortation to chastity, wherein he reprobates second marriages, founding his opinion upon St. Paul’s command to Timothy, that ‘a bishop should be the husband of one wife,’ from which he infers that a bishop should not marry a second time; he represents his adversary as answering, that the forbidding of a bishop, argues the permission of a layman. Tertullian replies that distinction between the ministry & the people, is an invention of the church;

and to establish his position, he refers to what was even at that time [notwithstanding the encroachments which had already been made by the clergy] an established and approved practice:—‘Where none of the ecclesiastical order [says he] is established, a layman consecrates the Eucharist, baptizes, and is a priest to himself. For where there are three, though laymen, there is a Church.’*—These are his words:—‘Ubi ecclesiastici ordinis neu est consensus, et offers, et tinguis et sacerdos es tibi solus.—Sed ubi tres, acclesia, licef laici.’—I do not refer to Tertullian as any authority, one way or the other; I will only remark, that I think his opinion respecting the origin of episcopacy, may, without doing injustice to him or to the cause of my adversary, stand upon a par with his opinion concerning the illegality of marrying a second time, especially when we have the additional testimony of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John.—As it regards the truth of Tertullian’s statement, that the episcopal order terminates in John its author, I shall only observe, it yet remains of Tertullian and my antagonist, to prove that the person whom St. John addressed by the title of ‘Angel,’ was more than the pastor of a single congregation, or that he was not a presbyter. The address of St. John ‘unto the angel of the church of Ephesus, &c. may, with equal propriety, be rendered, ‘unto the messenger or ambassador of the congregation of Ephesus,’ &c.*

* I will here observe by the way, that when I wrote the Review, not having read these words of our Antiquary for some years, not having any history by me, and writing from an imperfect recollection of former reading, I quoted them as the saying of Cyprian, for which I have been loudly arraigned by all my adversaries, who have warmly charged me with ‘misrepresentation, disingenuousness,’ &c. What did I gain by attributing them to Cyprian? I gained nothing; but I lost the antiquity of half a century, and the authority of the first of the Latin Fathers. But, Mr. Editor, had I been detected in palming *my own* sentiments upon the first of the apostolic fathers—misrepresenting the sentiments of others—and ‘distorting the truth of history—and at the same time, been found accusing my adversary with ‘disingenuousness,’ &c. with what would I have been charged? or with what would I not have been charged?

* The same observation may be made on each of his addresses to the other Asia churches.

The next reference my opponent makes to Tertullian, is a most unfortunate one for himself on the present subject. For if I were to challenge my adversaries in the language of the Latin Father, 'to give us a catalogue of their bishops from first to last, whereby it may appear that their first bishop had either some apostle, or apostolical man living in the time of the apostles, for his author or immediate predecessor,' I fear they would be in a worse condition than the heretics of Tertullian's day. If it were necessary to show the original of their churches at that time, how much more important now? And as the church, in all ages, has complained of swarms of unauthorised teachers, who knows but the Bishops of my opponents' church, are the spurious offspring of those heretical bishops? It was not on account of the illegal administrations of those ancient heretics, that they were called upon to show the original of their churches, it was on account of the tenets which they held and the doctrines which they taught. For we learn from Bingham's Antiquities [B. iv. ch. 7, sect. 8,] that 'Ansias, bishop of Thessalonica, with a council of his provincial bishops, agreed to receive those whom Bonosus an heretical bishop of Macedonia, had ordained. Liberius admitted the Macedonian bishops to communion, and allowed them to continue their office, upon their subscription to the Nicene creed, and abjuration of their former heresy. The general council of Ephesus, made an order concerning the Massalian heretics, otherwise called Euchites and Enthusiasts, that if any of their clergy would return to the church, and in writing anathematise their former errors, they should continue in the same station they were in before. And nothing is more certain, than that the African Fathers so treated the Donatist.'

Now sir, if the bishops of the church of England, should be found among the descendants of those heretical bishops, who were admitted into the church, what a deplorable condition would we all be in? What proof have we to the reverse? None. Nay, they stand nine chances out of ten to be among them. Therefore, as the

subject is of so great importance that our all hangs upon unbroken succession, we hope our adversaries will have compassion upon us, and not let us perish for lack of knowledge, but ‘show us the original of their church, and give us a catalogue of their bishops from first to last, whereby it may appear that some apostle or apostolical man was their first bishop.’ We are not required to believe christianity without evidence; and shall we be denounced heretics and schismatics, sceptics and enthusiasts, because we will not believe what we are informed is of equal importance, upon the dictum of a few polemical divines, without even the shadow of evidence—nay, against the strongest presumptive proof—against historic evidence as clear as day? I will here remark once for all, that in making any of the above observations on the ordination and succession of the church of England, I do not object to the validity of their orders; I only intend my remarks as an *argumentum ad hominem*—to show that if the principles of my adversaries, were the only foundation to support the edifice of ecclesiastical authority, it would have fallen to the ground long ago.

The groundless supposition of Chrysostom is scarcely worthy of notice. He flourished about four hundred years after the apostles, when great wealth and secular power were attached to the episcopate, and was himself not only bishop, but patriarch; and his notion that the presbytery which ordained Timothy, was a synod of bishops, is destitute of the shadow of evidence, and repugnant to the uniform application of the term in christian antiquity. My adversary might have found a testimony of equal weight, among the lordly claims of the Popes during the 25th and succeeding centuries.

What then, Sir, is the result of our antiquarian researches? Are we likely to find an infallible guide, by this medium, to ‘apostolic authority and practice’? Is it not a fact too plain to be denied, that the more profoundly we are ‘versed in the reasures of musty and strangely written manuscript,’ the more deeply we are involved ‘amid contardictory testimonies’?

Our adversaries dub us 'sceptics and schismatics' for differing with them on this point—and to convince us of our error, they open their 'valuable treasures of musty and strangely written manuscripts, amid contradictory testimony!' Quite an original method, indeed sir, to expose error and elicit truth, by 'contradictory testimony!!' Now Mr. Editor, it is my opinion, and I dare say you will agree with me, that, to settle our faith on this point, we should open some 'treasure' that is not 'musty'—examine 'manuscripts' which are not 'strangely written'—and produce 'testimony' that is not 'contradictory.' What 'treasure' more free from 'must' than the holy scriptures—what testimony more harmonious—and what record of higher authority? And as all and every thing is there revealed, which is necessary for our salvation, both as it regards our faith and practice, we may safely appeal to those scriptures as the only proper and safe touchstone.—And if it be found that the 'preeminence of bishope over presbyters' is not established by the authentic manuscripts of holy writ, I will concede to my adversary and his 'musty treasures' the sole credit of engendering and bringing it forth, and will content myself with standing on that humble foundation, laid by Jesus Christ and his apostles.

Another faint appeal is made to Timothy and Titus. I could fain ask of my opponents that justice which I have, in every instance, done to them—to answer my arguments before they urge those which have been refuted as often as they have been advanced. I clearly showed the authority and office of Timothy in the Review; and in my remarks to the Brockville clergyman, I proved that Timothy had no higher ordination than that of presbyter. My adversary has not attempted to refute one of my arguments: I therefore take his taciturnity for a reluctant confession that he cannot do it. I shall only further observe on this point, in the language of the learned Dr. Whitby, that 'if by saying Timothy and Titus were bishops, the one of Ephesus, the other of Crete, we understand they took upon these churches, or dioceses, as their fixed and particular charges, in which they were to preside for a term

of life, I believe that Timothy and Titus were not thus bishops ; for both Timothy and Titus were evangelists. Now the work of an evangelist, says Eusebius, was this,' &c. [the same as in the Review, which see.] 'As to Titus, [says Dr. Whitby] he was only left in Crete to ordain elders in every city, and to set in order the things that were wanting. Having therefore done that work, he had done all that was assigned him in that station, and therefore St. Paul sends for him the very next year to Nicopolis.' [Tit. III. 12.] The office of an evangelist, like that of an apostle, was extraordinary, and therefore, could not be successive, but ceased with those who filled it. There is not a passage in the New Testament in which Timothy or Titus is called bishop ; nor is either of them called so by any writer during the first three centuries. Even the directions which St. Paul gives to Tim. and Titus, abundantly show that they were employed, not in governing old churches with established pastors, but in planting new ones, and elders to superintend them ; and the advice, he gives them to go to different places, and at length to come to him, proves that their charge was not stationary.

But my adversary, elated in contemplating the greatness & grandeur of his episcopate, has found that our present bishops are the successors, not only to the offices of Timothy and Titus, but are ' strictly the successors of the apostles.' Perhaps, Sir, in his next publication, he will inform us, that, like the Pope, they are the vicars of Jesus Christ.—The apostles may be considered in two points of view, as pastors and teachers in the church—and as apostles of Jesus Christ. As to bishops being the successors of the apostles, in what belonged to their apostolic office, I beg leave to remark, that this office was extraordinary, and of temporary duration, and therefore it could not admit of succession. I am aware, Sir, that Matthias was chosen by the apostles in place of Judas ; but this forms no exception to my assertion. This was previous to the apostles entering on their charge, and they knew it to be our Saviour's intention that twelve from among those who

had personally accompanied him from the beginning, and had been eye witnesses to his resurrection, should be employed to attest this truth on which the whole fabric of christianity rested. And the words of St. Peter on that occasion, show the requisite qualifications for the office, as well as the arrogance and presumption of modern pretensions. (See Acts I. 15—26.) But James, the brother of John, was put to death by Herod, [Acts XII. 2,] and nothing was said of a successor, and so with the rest of the apostles.—In the next place, the apostles were commanded to ‘go into all the world—and teach the gospel to all nations.’ Consequently [to borrow the words of Chrysostom] ‘they were appointed of God, rulers, not each over a nation or city, but all were intrusted with the world in common.’ Now I have never yet heard of any, whose episcopal charge embraced ‘all the world;’ and I therefore infer, as such a broad commission is incompatible with the office of an ordinary pastor, that there is no successor of the apostles.—Again; the apostles received their commission not mediately, but immediately from Christ—and were empowered to confer miraculous gifts to whom they pleased—and, to know the whole doctrine of Jesus Christ by the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost. [See Gal. I. 1 ; 2 Cor. XII. 12 ; Gal. I. 11—17.] As no modern bishops possess any of these qualifications or powers, I therefore infer that they are not the successors of the apostles.—It was likewise requisite for an apostle to have seen Jesus after his resurrection. (Acts X. 41 ; XIII. 31 ; 1 Cor. IX. 1.) Hence Sir, the apostolic office must have become extinct at the death of those ocular witnesses.

But it is possible my adversary may not see fit to claim his succession to the apostle in their extraordinary office? perhaps he will condescend to become their successor in their ordinary capacity of pastors in the church. In this view, I readily grant, that the apostles are the predecessors of all who preach the gospel and administer the ordinances, to the end of time. But here the question again returns, did the apostles, in appointing successors in their common character of rulers and teachers, divide them into

three orders, or into two? This involves the last topic of discussion.—It is agreed on all sides, that the offices of presbyter and deacon are, and ever have been, distinct. The question now is, whether the words *episcopos* and *presbuteros*, are names of the same, or different offices?

My adversary ingenuously yields the argument founded upon the ‘etymology’ of the term *episcopos*, and rests his cause upon the ‘application of its meaning.’ Why then did he assure us, in his first article, ‘a competent knowledge of the original tongue of the New Testament, would aid the conviction that the terms *episcopos* and *presbuteros* are entirely distinct?’

—*Sentio enim simulata mente locutum.*

It was not upon the etymology of the terms I rested the argument, or even insisted; it was upon the promiscuous application of them. The fact is, the etymology of the terms *episcopos* and *presbuteros* equally preponderates in my favour. ‘So that if we determine things by the importance of words and things signified by them, (says Bishop Stillingfleet, *Iren.* part II. p. 286,) the power of ordination was proper to the name *presbuteros*, (*presbyter*) and not *episcopos*, (*bishop*) because the former name did then import that power, but not the latter.’ For ‘the truth is, (says Dr. Campbell) the word *episcopos* was properly the name of office, and *presbuteros* was a title of respect, borrowed from the Jewish custom, which was indeed analogous to that of other nations of calling not only the members of the Sanhedrim *presbuteroi*, elders or senators, but also the members of the city councils.’ (Sect. vol. I. p. 126.) This explains the reason of their promiscuous application. And I defy my adversary to produce a single passage from the New Testament, in which it can be proved that the terms *presbuteros* and *episcopos* [when they relate to the officers of the christian church, refer to different offices. I will go further: I affirm there is the strongest evidence, if uniform usage be sufficient, that they always refer to the office.—The same official characters, whom St. Paul calls ‘bishops & deacons,’ (*Phil. I. 1.*) are called by Polycarp

who wrote to the same church or congregation more than fifty years afterwards, [ch. v.] ‘presbyters and deacons.’ —The same persons, who are called ‘elders’ in Titus I. 5, are designated by the title of ‘bishop’ in verse 7, [likewise in Acts XX. 17, 28.—And the same persons whom St. Peter calls ‘elders,’ [ch. v.] are directed by him v. 2—[episcopountes] to execute the office of bishops.’ What mattered it, Sir, whether they were bishops or presbyters, since presbyters were authorised to perform episcopal duty? would elders, in the present day receive such directions from our modern apostles? Ah! no Sir, instead of being instructed to do the duty of bishops, they would be ordered ‘to attend to the bishop.’ ‘But from the beginning it was not so.’

Quod manifesta negas?

Further, the apostles are not called bishops once in the New Testament, but are called elders in three places. (1 Pet. v. 1; 2 John, 1; 3 John, 1.) And in all the epistles of St. Paul, to different churches and persons, he neither describes the qualifications of, nor addresses nor mentions, but two orders of church officers, who are sometimes called bishops and deacons, and at other times, presbyters and deacons. If there were three orders, why did he not mention the qualification and duties of three? The apostle, in every instance, speaks of the qualifications of deacons, and most undoubtedly, the duties, either of bishop or presbyter, if they were distinct, were of greater importance.

‘But names and titles in all offices, [to borrow the words of my adversary] civil as well as religious, vary application and meaning in the course of ages; and as the word imperator, for instance, which at one time was applied by the Romans, to the commander of a single regiment, became, in after ages, the exclusive title of the Emperor;’ so, the word bishop, ‘which at one time’ was uniformly synonymous with the word presbyter, and, applied by the apostles and early fathers, to pastors of ‘single’ congregations, ‘became, in after ages, the exclusive title of’ diocesan bishops, and at length, ‘the exclusive title of the ‘Pope of Rome.

Mr. Editor, although I have long trespassed upon your indulgence, for which I return my sincere and humble thanks, I must beg the same liberty once more, in examining the 'a priori' of the 'Church of England Man.'

Your very Obligated Servt.

THE REVIEWER.

Sept. 30th, 1826.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE KINGSTON CHRONICLE.

My task is to prove that 'Church of England discipline and establishment are in strict conformity with Apostolic authority and practice ;' and my respect for your indulgence, Mr. Editor, requires that I should perform that task in as brief a manner as possible.

I shall begin with the defence of the 'Establishment :' in conducting which I lay down the position, that 'it is in strict conformity with Apostolic authority that in every country there should be a religious Establishment.'

In that period of delightful promise, when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea, what aspect with reference to this matter of religious establishments, will human societies present? When Christian principles, under the fullest efflux of divine grace, shall have acquired their most complete ascendancy over the nations of the earth, and men, if ever, will deserve to be entitled reasonable and religious beings, I presume that, in that most perfect state of society, there will be some public mode of addressing the Deity—some consecrated ministry, by instrumentality of which the prayers and praises of faithful congregations may ascend in holy unison to heaven. If Christianity be, indeed, destined to regenerate the race—if that grain of mustard seed ever attain its legitimate growth—that heaven ever leaven the whole lump—and the truth and faithfulness of God be signally illustrated on this globe of earth—there must be a public priesthood—a church connected with the State—or else the Saints of the millenium will fall in one important respect, behind even the more impure ages. Such a priesthood will, no doubt be unpolluted by the corruptions,

which have often hitherto degraded the representatives of the Messiah upon earth—their discipline may be less objectionable—their establishment less imperfect, than those which in this age we witness—but in that blissful time, throughout every community of mankind, no feature will be more prominent than this, that beside the King will stand the Priest—before the congregation will minister, in priestly array, the meek appointed and admitted Servant of the Lord. I say I presume that such will then be the order of society—I cannot, tho' I try, divest myself of that idea, as often as the glorious millenian age presents itself to my imagination ; and as

Homo sum ; humani nil a me alienum puto.

I take it for granted, that such must also necessarily be the conviction of every considerate Christian.

Nor am I disappointed, when, leaving my own impressions, I investigate the indices, submitted to me, of the convictions of others. The persuasion within my own breast, upon this subject, is but in harmony—I then discover, with the voice of nature—the voice of all mankind. For whether I consult sacred, or profane history—whether I regard the ancient, or the modern world—whether I look to the friends or the foes of existing establishments—all mankind—every religious individual admits and sanctions the principle, that there ought to be a holy priesthood connected with the State, which, towards God, might make supplication for the people—and might shed a sanctity over the relations of life, that would be a better preservation of the social welfare, than the strength of enacted laws, or the assiduity of the strictest police.

To mention a few examples—in ancient times, the Egyptians had a remarkable priesthood. Balak, son of Zippor, would have promoted Balaam to riches and great honour. All the notices we have of the tribes of Canaan go to prove the existence among them of similar establishments. In all the revolutions of Israel. the chosen people came in contact with no nation which had not a religious establishment. Why should I speak of the Persian, Greek, and Roman States, in a matter in which their practice was so notorious ?

In modern ages, all discoveries of Portuguese, Spaniard, English, Dutch, or French, go to prove the truth of this position that there is no nation without a religious establishment.

In the rude and savage nations, it sometimes indeed appears less obvious—but the establishment (relatively to other idolatrous nations) is, uniformly, imperfect only in a ratio corresponding with that of the general imperfection of their social state—or in other words, there cease to be establishments where there cease to be men.

What is very remarkable—in some or all of these nations, old establishments have been, occasionally, swept away by the violence of change—but what then? They were almost immediately supplanted by others. The latter have differed materially from the former in their tenets—in their modes of faith—in their objects of worship—in their bearings on practice—but amid all changes, the principle of an establishment—of a connection between Church and State—has escaped unimpaired. It has been experienced, over and over again, that the idea is in human nature, and cannot be eradicated. It has been demonstrated a thousand times to the conviction of the most obstinate, that it is founded in human necessities, and ought not to be eradicated, even if it could.

It was this voice of nature—it was this necessity of mankind, that in the age of Constantine, throughout the Roman Empire, and in every subsequent age, throughout the Kingdoms and States of Christendom, gave birth to establishments of Christianity. There were, confessedly, other motives, and they were strong—but still, there was none more holy—none more strong, than this general, this uniform conviction and practice of mankind, that the Church ought to be connected with the State.

Now, if this be the voice of mankind, that ‘in every polity religion should make a part,’ Christianity must have confirmed that voice. For if the religion of Jesus opposed itself, radically, to the genuine voice of the race to which it was addressed, such oppositions would be an invincible argument against its divine origin. But no such

condemnation has been made—nor was Christianity intended to tear up human society by the roots. On the contrary *ex necessitate rei*, it fostered the general principle of an establishment—it only amended the subject-matter to which the principle was to be applied.—The benefit it did was in supplanting Moses by Christ—and the Heathen by the Christian priesthood. If it had attempted more, it would have effected less, as I shall shew in another place.

So that to do away with the general principle of an establishment by any arguments deduced from Christian revelation, a vast weight of New Testament evidence must be brought. That evidence, also must be clear—must be direct—must be unexceptionable. And, if there be a single positive passage in its favor—or if there be an approved analogy it is sufficient to sustain the principle—and to stamp it with the revealed approbation of God. If unfortunately, all the evidence derived from that volume should be against it, I know not how, upon any principle of reason, we are to uphold the system of a divine revelation, which overthrows the divinely-established order of mankind—and arms the Deity against himself.

A CHURCH-OF-ENGLAND MAN.

FOR THE KINGSTON CHRONICLE.

In continuing my defence of the establishment, I proceed to say, that although no data can be surer than those from which I drew the conclusion, stated in my preceding article, that the voice of nature, illustrated in the practice of mankind, enjoins establishments—and that upon that sole ground, it may be certain, that Christianity, if it be a divine revelation, confirms the voice—yet it would, possibly, give further satisfaction to the argument, if we could find an instance in which God himself has, decisively, and by revelation, sanctioned the principle. For if any such can be found, the right and duty of nations to maintain establishments, may be supposed not only proved, but commanded. I do not say, that any would be bound to copy the detail of such an establishment; but I affirm that

all would be thereby obligated, on revealed grounds, to receive the principle.

Fortunately for the best interests of mankind, such an instance is producible. In the theocracy of Israel, there was an establishment. In the permitted change which took place in their state, by the creation of an earthly king among them, there was the establishment continued. Here was an establishment sanctioned by express revelation ; and very remarkable it was. For out of the twelve tribes of Israel, one tribe was selected ; that of Levi. The members of that tribe were separated to holy offices ; were intermixed with and distributed for priestly purposes, throughout the common wealth of Israel ; and were appointed so to last during the ages of their existence as a nation in that promised and possessed land.

The idea was not original in Moses. It was no discovery, then made by revelation from God, but merely that divine conformity, which in a matter of the kind we might expect, with the necessary principles which govern our race. The Egyptians, in whatever way obtained, had a similar priesthood long before the existence of the Mosaic polity ; as some nations of the East Indies have at the present day, and had not improbably also, prior to the period of that foundation.

Now, between the Mosaic and christian dispensations, there was this difference ; that the former was intended for one nation, made up of ten or twelve distinct communities ; the latter for all the nations of the earth ; the promises of the former had respect ; not absolutely, but principally, to things temporal ; those of the latter, not absolutely, but principally, to things spiritual. And, of course, in the ratio of the difference, must be the direct force of the argument, from the Israelitish Establishment to the Christian.

I leave the direct force just to that degree of strength which each individual's knowledge, guided by his integrity, may please to allow it. Whether it proves more, and how much more it proves, is at present no business of mine : but this, I conceive, it at least establishes, that

God, in every common wealth, expects that a public and consecrated Priesthood will be set a part to his service by the community ; or he would not have adopted the institution, out of the practice of the nations of mankind, to rest so mainly upon it the most prominent part of his peculiar polity.

Thus far, then, have I advanced in my argument, in favour of the general principle of a religious establishment in every country ; I have shewn that it is but the natural offspring of the necessities of mankind ; and that the voice of nature is on its side. I have produced an instance of a revelation from God, wherein the principle has been signally upheld. Already my case appears to be made out ; for, be it recollected, that all confess, that these are, in a manner, the premises of Christianity ; from which the certainty of the truth as it is in Jesus flows.

A CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAN.

—o—
FOR THE KINGSTON CHRONICLE.

Sir,

In taking up the volume of the New Testament, I wave the advantage to my argument in favour of ' establishments,' from the example of the founder of our religion, who was a Jew of no ordinary scrupulosity in the very matter in hand. I wave also the auxiliary advantage derived from a consideration of the example of the Apostles ; not when alumni, only under the instruction of their Lord, but when they acted as delegates, appointed to lay the foundations of christianity throughout the world, and after they had been filled with the Holy Ghost. And I wave these, because it is becoming in a Christian to have some feeling for the dilemma of an opponent.

And here, if it be admitted ; notwithstanding some seeming authorities ; that in the whole New Testament, there is not to be found a single passage which bears directly and fully in favour of my side of the argument, so it holds true, on the other hand, that there is an utter absence of all condemnatory matter. This silence is expressive ; and with judicious minds, must determine the

question. For it is clear therefrom, that the mould in which human society was cast, remained untouched by Christianity ; and that, in particular, the principle of establishments was not struck at.

But if it was not attacked, the reason must have been that it was approved of. If establishments prevailed universally ; if in Jewry itself, one eminently prevailed ; such a silence in the sacred writers was ; not permission, only of their existence ; but amounted to approval ; to authority ; to the force of express command, and positive institution.

The fruit, which, in many cases, establishments bore, was the subject of the peculiar animadversion of the Apostles. The idolatry ; the evil practices of priest and worshipper ; which had, in any case, been accidentally engrafted on the establishment, were severely, and in spirited terms, condemned. But not a word against the principle. What was this, but to the voice of nature in the world at large, and to the voice of God in the Mosaic dispensation to superadd, in favour of religious establishments, the fullest authorith of the spirit of Christ ?

A CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAN.

FOR THE KINGSTON CHRONICLE.

Sir,

Establishments, then, are in strict conformity with Apostolic authority. But I undertook to prove that they were also in close conformity with their practice. With an ordinary opponent ; a decent infidel, for example ; the one would be esteemed included necessarily in the other ; & if I were romantic enough to believe that the ' Methodist Preacher,' alias ' The Reviewer,' would adhere to the principles which he affected to call his own, in his reply to my first paper, I should deem this portion of my task already accomplished. But

*Ille suæ contra non immemor artis,
Omnia transformat sese in miracula rerum.*

I shall maintain, therefore, my own position in its utmost latitude, out of respect for myself, and not in the hope of

bending such a mind by the simple sublimity of rational argument.

Nothing is more true than that the rays of light proceed in straight lines, while nothing is more common than to have the light intercepted by intervening objects. The truth of the rule is not disputed, because accidental causes intercept the effect. So when I affirm that establishments were sanctioned by the christian practice of the Apostles, I do not go the length of saying, that they actually founded establishments; for neither God nor man had given them the power to do so, and they were not of the genus of 'The Reviewer,' for assuming it without such authority—but what I have to contend for is merely this, that from what we read of their conduct and rules of action, there is enough to satisfy us, that, having the power, they would have established their religion.

In Ephesians, 6th Chapt. 1st verse, St. Paul writes, 'Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right.' By the latter part, 'for this is right,' the Christian Apostle sanctions the code of natural morality. He confirms, appeals to, and exalts that voice of mankind, which I have already shewn to be the parent of establishments. It is very humiliating to be obliged to remind a Preacher of Christianity of this; and one is apt to suspect that Dr. Strachan; instead of confining his charge of notorious ignorance to the American strolling declaimers, might justly have extended it to an individual among the Methodists (peut etre) who would pass himself off for something.

In 1st Timothy, 6th chap. the words are, 'Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren, but rather do them service, These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, &c. he is proud, knowing nothing, &c.' So says St. Paul. Ignorance was the galling charge I brought against The Reviewer; (excepting a few remarks on the temper of his Review,

which he is too much a man of the world to reply to ;) ignorance, I say, of the Christian scheme, which if its mischief had been confined to his own private affairs, or to the unhappy flocks that it might have fallen to his lot to teach, would have claimed commiseration—but ignorance, which urging itself light-headedly upon the public observation, and exalting itself, with unpardonable effrontery, against what in the state was served silent contempt, or severe rebuke. I adopted the more charitable alternative, and rebuked it. For what but ignorance the most gross could have overlooked the strong confirmation of the natural order of society contained in the above quoted passage. Now, would the Apostle tolerate slavery, and at the same time abolish religious establishments? In 1st Cor. 7th chapter, 12th verse, St Paul writes, ‘ But to the rest speak I, not to the Lord. If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband—else were your children unclean; but now are they holy. But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. This passage proves, a fortiori, the christianity of establishments; and it is from the directions of an Apostle.

I might multiply the number—I might increase the variety of proofs of apostolic practice in this matter. But till those already produced are overthrown, it will be unnecessary.

So that upon these grounds, I conclude, that ‘ nothing is more true, than that it is in strict conformity with Apostolic authority and practice, that in every country there should be a religious establishment.’

A CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAN.

FOR THE UPPER CANADA HERALD.

REMARKS ON THE 'CHURCH OF ENGLAND
MAN'S A PRIORI ARGUMENT,' &c. &c.

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM.

Mr. Editor,—

With due deference to the merit of conflicting opinions, nothing is more entertaining and profitable, than the investigation of different systems, whether literary or moral. To enquire after truth, to search out which, the ancient philosopher assures, labour and attention are necessary, is the undisputed right of all—of every man. And there is no stronger proof of a superficial mind—a pitiable and narrow-hearted bigotry—the sister of hypocrisy, than for one to push from him civility and good nature, and to set those down as hopeless sceptics—'bold infidels—scismatics and rebels,' who differ from him on points, a belief or disbelief of which does not comprehend moral character—and on subjects which have no relation to civil polity. It is not only the privilege, but the duty of every man, especially a minister of the gospel, earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints ;—but this duty is never more painful, than when one is required to defend his sentiments from the shafts of an antagonist, who shows himself a stranger both to the phraseology, and spirit of the Bible. A man of such a spirit generally defeats his own object—and being conscious with the ancient moralist, that '*malitia ipsa maximam partem veneni sui bibit—hoc habentibus pessimum est,*' I silently leave my present adversary to bear that disgust and reproach to which his malevolence on the present occasion exposes him ; and, will briefly weigh the force of his arguments in favour of establishments, as being founded upon the 'voice of nature'—as being a principle of christian theology—and as being authorised by the Founder of holy religion.

'The voice of nature,' which is otherwise called 'the necessities of mankind,' my adversary ascertains from 'the universal practice of mankind' by which he assures us it is illustrated.' I think sir, to every judicious student of

Divinity, or of human nature, there must appear a very obvious difference between the ‘necessities’ and the ‘universal practice of mankind.’ To infer that the former is synonymous with the latter is to reject the Homilies, Prayer Book, and Bible, and to level a blow at the very foundation of the Christian system. And to ascertain the nature and obligation of a moral duty by conforming it to the ‘universal practice of mankind in all ages,’ is to set aside Christianity altogether.

What is, and has been the ‘universal practice of mankind’ when led by ‘the caprice of natural feeling’? Let the most accredited authors answer :—‘There is none that doeth good, no not one.’—‘The world by wisdom knew not God.—And when men knew God, even his eternal power and, God-head, as far as he is made manifest by the things which he has made, they glorified him not as God, but became vain in their imaginations’—so much so, that by their craftiness or superstition, wickedness or ignorance, they were led to form establishments of their various religions, in the establishment of which, their supposed ‘necessities’ called upon to enact laws by which all men were commanded to worship living and dead men—stalks and stones, dogs, cats, monkeys, onions, &c. &c ;—while other nations more modern, and of course more wise, were called upon by their supposed ‘necessities’ to quench the fire of God’s wrath with human blood, and adorn his altars with human victims. Of which ‘necessities’ Spain and Portugal afford us an abundant proof, and England is not without her witnesses. This is the ‘voice of nature illustrated by the universal practice of mankind.’ How very melodious must it be in the ears of our modern divine—especially when it brings with its sonorous sound, two or three hundred pounds per annum, and that whether he preaches or legislates, or whether he does neither ! I ask sir, whether this ‘voice of nature, illustrated by the universal practice of mankind,’ originates from the ‘necessities’ or the vices ‘of mankind’? If universal vice, idolatry, and bloodshed, are the fruit which have grown upon the tremendous tree of establishments, can it be a

good tree? If the 'fruit of establishments was the subject of the peculiar animadversion of the apostles,' (which my adversary acknowledges) I think sir, they must have had an eye at the tree also; for our saviour positively declares; that a 'good tree cannot bring forth corrupt fruit.'

To this the objector may possibly reply, that although 'the practice of mankind is, in many cases contradictory to the precepts of morality,' yet, this does not affect the general principle. 'Christianity, (says our present polemic) if it be a divine revelation, must confirm this voice of nature, illustrated in the universal practice of mankind.'—What is the 'voice of nature—the caprice of natural feeling—the natural bent of the human mind'? We are informed by a very authentic history, that the natural bent of the human mind is only evil, and that continually—and that the mind itself is enmity against God. Now sir, if the natural mind is enmity against God, can the caprice, affections, feeling, or bent of the mind be otherwise? Is 'Christianity to confirm this voice of nature'? or is she not rather to exalt the voice of obedience, instead of rebellion—of love instead of enmity—to establish her principles and unfurl her banners among the rebellious sons of men by means which, so far, from being taken from the 'universal practice of mankind' appeared foolishness to the self conceited Greeks, and a stumbling block to the self righteous Jews? Even some of the Heathens were too well acquainted with the golden precepts of Apollo's Temple (Gnothi Seauton) to make the practice or natural bent of mankind the established law of religion, the sure 'data' of divine revelation. One of the wisest of them assures us that,

Omnia in omnibus vitia sunt.—SEN.

Another with equal propriety declares, that

Unicuique dedit vitium natura creato.—PROPER.

A third bears this lamentable testimony,

Nam vitiis nemo sine nascitur.—

Gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas,

Nititur in vetitum semper cupimus que negata.—HOR.

And a fourth with apostolic correctness, declares that,

Ad mores natura recurrit

Damnatos, fixa et mutari nescia.—JUV.

As it is therefore acknowledged upon all sides, that the heart of man is desperately wicked, are the inventions of that untoward, deceitful heart, the rule and principle upon which Christianity is, or must be established? If religion be the cure of the soul, (*Therapeia psuches* as it is called by an ancient writer) must it oppose, or ‘confirm’ the disease of the soul? If the wisdom of man (the best property belonging to him) is earthly sensual and devilish, must the ‘voice of Christianity ‘confirm,’ or bring to naught that wisdom? But sir, my charitable friend has not given us the slightest intimation that there is any disease to cure—any vices to be opposed—or any errors to be rectified, except those of the ‘indecent infidel, who has entered the lists against him; and him (the ‘indecent infidel’) he considers beyond the reach of medical skill; and he roundly affirms, that if the whole tide of New Testament should be against him, it would prove it to be not of divine origin. What a modest gentleman—what an orthodox divine! Who can help bowing to his sovereign authority, and yielding implicit faith in his inspired precepts? How great, sir, must be the ‘necessities’ of the Church of England to rest upon such a prop for the support of her ‘orthodox faith.’

However it is stated and clearly explained in the Prayer Book and Homilies of the Church of England, and, acknowledged by every man of common understanding in the Christian religion or nature of man, that there is a moral disease to cure—that the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint;—and, therefore, all agree that some remedy is necessary. It is agreed by all who believe in the divine origin of Christianity, that the blood of Christ is the only effectual medicine for the moral diseases of the world;—but to secure the judicious application of this heavenly balm, some spiritual physicians consider religious establishments the most effectual method. I shall therefore consider establishments, in the second place, in the light of a principle of Christian theology.

Is there a necessary connexion between the religion and civil constitution of a state—does it belong to the civil magistrate to take cognizance of religious opinions, and provide for the religious instruction of his subjects? This is a question of the greatest moment, for if the civil magistrate possesses this authority by a divine right, then no Dissenter from national establishments, can be defended from the charge of presumption and criminality.

If the civil magistrate has a right to provide for the religious instruction of his people, they have no right to provide for it themselves. For if he has a right to command in this respect, of course it is their duty to obey. The right of the one destroys the right of the other. And if the civil magistrate has a right to procure the religious instruction of his subjects, and prescribe what they shall believe, it necessarily follows, that he has a right to decide what they shall not believe; and, consequently the magistrate, becomes the sole judge of right and wrong, of orthodoxy and heresy—and the sovereign arbiter of the faith, understanding, and consciences of his people. If this authority is visited in the civil government of one kingdom, it equally belongs to that of another kingdom. For why has not the Sovereign of France, and the King of Spain, as high authority to establish a religion and priesthood for their subjects, as the King of England? And why is not this authority, as high and as valid in one age as in another. Of course it is. Hence, Sir, the same authority which compels us to receive the doctrines of Popery in one age, and in one kingdom, compels us to receive the protestant code of doctrine in another kingdom. It is right to be a Protestant in one kingdom, it is felony to be one in another. Civil authority makes a man a Papist in Spain; civil authority disfranchises him from holding some offices for being one in Britain—civil authority makes Presbyterians in one part, and Episcopalians in another part—civil authority makes England Protestants at one time, and Papists at another time—civil authority burns Protestants under Queen Mary, and imprisons Papists and Puritans, and hangs Brownists under Queen Elizabeth !!!

If religion is to be so connected with the state that the civil magistrate is to provide for our religious instruction, why are we endowed with a mind to think—a judgment to decide—or a will to choose? Why are we informed that we are individually responsible to an Invisible Being? Why do the works of nature furnish us with proofs of the existence of a Supreme Divinity—the state of human society, indicate the necessity and truth of a general judgment—or, the manuscripts of the Bible solicit the examination of their credentials to the high claim of Divine inspiration? Why are we commanded by Him, whose presence the rich and the poor—the King and his subjects, stand upon a level, to prove all things, and hold fast that only, which is good? How will we separate our accountability to God, from ‘unshackled freedom of judgment in matters religious’? and how will we unite this ‘unshackled freedom of judgment in matters religious’ with the right of the civil magistrate to establish a particular system of religion among his subjects?

But possibly my gentle adversary may condescend to confine the divine right of establishing religion to christian Monarchs or Governors. I would then ask, Sir, who are christian Monarchs and Governors? Is an implicit faith in the doctrine, & a strict obedience to the precepts, of christianity necessary to constitute a christian Governor? If so, England was not governed by a christian Governor, but by one of the most treacherous and basest Monarchs, that ever disgraced the British Throne, when that most powerful of all bulwarks, the Act of Uniformity, was reared to keep and deliver England from ‘heresy and schism.’

But, if by christian Governors, we are to understand those who preside over kingdoms where christianity generally prevails, I ask, from whence did they receive their authority? If they have not this right when they are heathens, do they become heirs of it when they are converted to the christian religion? or when christianity becomes generally prevalent throughout their dominions? How and from whom is this authority delegated to them,

and what credentials have they to show that they are the lawful possessors of it ? ‘ Is it from heaven, or from men’ ?

Our Lord commands us to render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s, and unto God, the things which are God’s ; but what things are left to God, when the civil magistrate imposes upon his subjects, his own creed—his own forms—his own teachers—his own system of religion ? Christianity, Sir, is a revelation from God to man ; to all men. Neither the interpretations of its doctrines or precepts ; the regulation of its institutions ; nor the administration of its ordinances, is vested in the hands of any magistrate to model as he may see fit. Christianity recognises in each, in every man, a moral agent—a personal accountability to God ; and therefore excludes any human interference or restriction.

Among other numerous ‘ voices’ which come within earshot of my listening adversary, he hears a very dolorous speaking about the time of Constantine. We are not at all surprised that he should hear this ‘ voice of necessity’ about that period ; for then it was, that Ecclesiastics conceived a very ardent desire for both wealth and power—this desire being conceived, brought forth want ;—and as covetousness and ambition are qualities which very much resemble Pharaoh’s lean kine they could not be satisfied with any thing less than the whole. To obtain the whole, the ‘ voice of necessity’ cried ‘ incorporate religion with the state.’ It was done : but what was the result ? If the ‘ voice of necessity’ was now satisfied, the clamorous ‘ voice’ of discord began to yell in every part of the Roman Empire. The Nicene creed was established by one Emperor ; & the Arian creed, by another. Mutual war and havoc glutted the appetites of these two brothers—these two defenders of what each called, ‘ the orthodox faith.’ Constantine’s established religion of the East, became heterodox, under Constantius. Valentinian destroyed the Arians in the West ;—and Valens killed the Nicenians in the East. All this was done to quiet that

loud 'voice of necessity which has lately awakened my modest adversary from his philosophic slumbers.

It is worthy of remark here, that the 'voice of necessity' which called upon Constantine, to incorporate religion with the state, for the pretended purpose of perpetuating and extending it, was never heard during the first three centuries of the christian era—was never heard while the Shepherds of Christ's flock, having food and raiment, were therewith content. And what grave rise to the hungry cry in the age of Constantine, I leave the public to judge, and the 'deep, original' mind (for certainly his mind is very 'deep' and very 'original' in some things) of my adversary to explain.

But my humble antagonist, who has promised 'to persuade every honest man to think as he does,' engaged to prove that 'nothing is more true than that the church of England discipline and establishment are in strict conformity with apostolic authority and practice.' With respect to the discipline of the church of England,' my adversary's 'original' mind seems very much averse to any thing like restraint; and he has therefore passed over this part of the subject in profound silence. And there seems to be such a famine in the New Testament respecting this 'voice of necessity,' that my adversary's 'original' mind has been crying all over the heathen world after it. And such has been his success, in his suppliant travels through modern Spain, ancient Egypt, Greece, Persia, &c. &c. that he feels himself amply supplied without any Bible assistance whatever. He, therefore, in the 'original' display of his superabundant benevolence towards the 'bold and indecent infidel,' 'craves the advantage to his argument from the example of our Saviour and that of his apostles.' How great his love—how long suffering his charity! But alas!

'Pride brandishes the favours he confers,
And contumelious his humanity:
What then his vengeance? Hear it not ye stars!
And, thou pale moon! turn paler at the sound.'

However, to repair the loss which he has sustained on

account of his christian affection for 'legion,' he has had recourse to means which indicate quite as much 'originality and depth of thought,' as some other parts of his philological exhibition. In his peculiar 'originality,' he has found that the 'silence of the apostles,' even on subjects concerning which 'they had received no authority from God or man, mounts to the force of express command—to positive institution.' He roundly asserts that the apostles 'had no authority from God or man*' to incorporate religion with the State, and yet claims their 'express command' for it, and even 'waves the advantage of their **EXAMPLE**!!! And to complete his climax, his 'original & deep' mind has hatched up an 'a fortiore' argument in favour of establishments from the permission of St. Paul to the 'believing wife to remain with her unbelieving husband,' and vice versa, seeing that by this means 'their children would be holy.' I suppose Sir, (for, his language and argument are so very 'original and deep,' that I cannot with certainty scan his 'high designs,') I suppose, Sir, that this *Primus inter literatos* would infer from this, that the believing church may, by divine permission, remain with unbelieving state—and he being thus begotten, and therefore, made holy—and being prevented by the law of the land from ever being expelled from the church—lives 'in a sure and certain hope of a glorious resurrection to eternal life.' It is probably this consciousness of his own safety which has given impulse to his illimitable and tender compassion towards the 'bold and indecent infidel, and even 'legion' himself. Now Sir, upon this mighty conclusion of this mighty antagonist, I would observe, that although marriage, being instituted by God himself, was not disannulled by either party embracing christianity—and so far from it, that their children might be considered holy, i. e. might

* My opponent, who in general seems to be considerably affected with flightiness, appears to have come to himself at this instant; and I would ask him, in his cool and rational moments, if our Saviour withheld the authority of forming his holy religion into a national establishment, from the 'apostles,' to whom did he delegate it? Has he granted a revelation and authority to others, which he has refused to grant to the 'stewards of his mysteries—those who have the keys of the kingdom of heaven?'

be fit subjects for admission, 'to those peculiar ordinances, by which the seed of God's people are distinguished;' (see Dodridge and Coke) yet this proves nothing in reference to establishments, except what militates against them. For while the apostle asserts the legality of nuptial bands between those who were thus united previous to the conversion of either of them, he, at the same time forbids those believers who are in a state of celibacy, to be yoked with unbelievers; assigning as a reason, that light has no communication with darkness, nor Christ with Belial.—Hence, if this proves any thing, it proves that the union of church and state is a violation of the divine command. And I very much doubt, sir, whether it can be proved that the church of Christ ever consented to this matrimonial union with the state; (for I have always been taught that our Saviour was the Bridegroom of his church) or that the Almighty ever permitted this union. For I believe polygamy is allowed in no part of the New Testament. And how children thus begotten are so very legitimate as to exclude all others, requires a little more of a certain gentleman's 'originality and depth of thought' to explain. That our Saviour and his apostles authorised 'establishments' when they themselves, and their followers after them, were murdered by the civil power, is a contradiction so glaring, that it scarcely needs mentioning to be exposed.

The argument with which our prophet was inspired when he heard his Apollo cry from the corrupt parts of corrupted christendom in the third century—from credulous Egypt—crafty Greece—voluptuous Persia—and Inquisitorial Spain, has proved so much that it has proved him altogether out of the Bible, and even beyond the uttermost boundaries of christian theology.

With equal 'originality' my opponent has attempted an elaborate proof that nothing but 'ignorance' exalting itself with the 'most unpardonable effrontery,' could induce any one to contend that the kingdom or church of God, is, and should be, separate from the kingdoms of this world; and to excite solemn reverence to his supe-

rior wisdom and acquirements, he has given us as a specimen of his orthodox divinity, that the 'universal practice of mankind' is the law to which the precepts of the gospel must conform—and that if 'the whole tide of New Testament testimony should be found against it, it would prove it to be not of divine original'—to display his historical knowledge, has gravely (and of course conscientiously) affirmed that 'the authority and practice of the apostles, prove the divine original of 'the church of England discipline and establishment'—As an example of his profoundness in biblical philology, he declares that when Saint Paul says it is right for children to obey their parents, he means 'the universal practice of mankind is right—and as an overwhelming exhibition of his inductive philosophy, he infers that when St. Paul permitted a converted wife still to remain with her unconverted husband, he declared 'a fortiore' that religion should be incorporated with the state. Now, Mr. Editor, so far from thinking that my learned opponent in any respect resembles 'ignorance,' I can scarcely help

——— with gravity
T' admire his 'deep' theology.

Si ille conspiceretur oculis, mirabiles amores excitaret sui.

Quando ullum invenimus parem ?

As I noticed the Jewish constitution in my former remarks on establishments, it would be superfluous to advert to it again at present. I shall therefore conclude the present subject in the words of the learned Doctor Campbell, whose sentiments on this point carry in a very high degree the weight of an *argumentum ad vericandiam*: —'Christ's kingdom is not of this world.' It is not of a secular nature, to be either propagated or defended by the arm of flesh, or to have its laws enforced by human sanctions, or any such temporal punishments as merely human authority can inflict.

'Let the law of the land restrain vice and injustice of every kind, as ruinous to the peace and order of society, for this is its proper province ; but let it not tamper with religion, by attempting to enforce its exercise and duties.

These, unless they be free-will offerings, are nothing ; they are worse. By such an unnatural alliance and ill-judged aid, hypocrisy and superstition may, indeed, be greatly promoted, but genuine piety never fails to suffer.' (Lectures vol. I. p. 41, 73.)

Mr. Editor, I am now ready, if advisable, to lay down my pen. If not, the half has not been told. I possess no animosity against either the church of England, or my opponents. I only wish to defend ourselves, and our just rights. It is my heart's wish and prayer to God, that, although minor differences cause us to worship in separate assemblies on earth, we may all worship in the general assembly of the church of the first-born in heaven.

With respect to those trembling anticipations that we are 'bringing down the grey hairs of the church of England in sorrow to the grave,' I have only to say, it is my desire to belong to a church whose 'grey hairs will never come down in sorrow to the grave'—to a church which never has been, and never can be in danger—to a church against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.

Your Obligated Servt.

THE REVIEWER.

October 26th, 1826.

—o—
FOR THE KINGSTON CHRONICLE.

No. 5.

Mr. Editor,—

In a late number of the Herald, 'The Reviewer,' after a length of time, has attempted the arduous task of replying to the argument comprised in the four articles on Establishments, which appeared in your columns last summer. But, except in the satisfaction he has found in pouring out a torrent of vulgar abuse on the writer of them, he had better have left the subject untried—there being nothing contained in his rhetorical paper, which in the least affects the solidity of the reasoning assailed.

Premising that he has miscalled my argument an a priori one, which properly it is not, I beg leave to remind you, that a principle laid down in my first number was

this, that 'if the religion of Jesus opposed itself radically to the genuine voice of the race to which it was addressed, such opposition would be an invincible argument against its divine origin.' I confess that, here I thought my self securely sheltered under the authority of St. Paul, who in the persuasion that such was the proper test to be applied to a divine revelation, and in the firm faith that the Gospel of Christ would triumph by that test, appealed to this very right of judgment in the breasts of men. 'But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, let him be accursed.' The venerable testimony of St. John, I likewise fancied would support me, who in a similar strain of rational piety writes—'Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God—because many false prophets are gone out into the world.' Nay! I was credulous enough to imagine, that in maintaining this principle, I was complying with the express injunction of the founder of our religion, who said to his disciples, 'Take heed that you be not deceived—for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and the time draweth near: go ye not therefore after them.'—where the examination into the pretensions of the false Christ included necessarily the application of a test, by which in the hearts of men the pretensions of the true Messias were to be traced. These were reverend authorities, but I was not fortunate enough to have in addition the countenance of 'The Reviewer'—and that doughty polemic, who 'out herods Herod,' accordingly hooted at the principle—and the truth for which the Apostles and their Lord stand pledged not being to his peculiar palate, particularly coming from a Church-of England quarter, he clothes it in the mantle of derision, and cries out, 'away with it, let it be crucified.'

Now the genuine voice of the race, to which divine revelation has been made, is known thus: Not so much from the overt actions of men in current life, because *Video meliora, proboque: deteriora sequor*, as the Poet say: by a frailty of nature, they each indulge themselves in violations of the acknowledged rule of right. But it is rather

ascertained, either from particular instances of illustrious virtue in individuals, which instances though none may imitate many may blame and all unite to persecute yet, notwithstanding, command the secret, tho' unwillingly, approbation of all, and carry a fair fame with them down to posterity ; or else from such sentences, as my adversary has quoted, where all unite with the poet or philosopher in the condemnation of vice, tho' each, like Seneca, may be individually guilty of the very things they condemned. So, when Horace, insinuating the decrees of philosophy amid the sweet sounds of his lyre, sings, *Integer vitæ scelerisque purus*, &c.—or *Justum et tenacem propositi virum*, &c.—the general assent which such noble sentiments encounter, is the genuine voice of mankind.

And it is necessary before a sound faith—a faith any thing more than implicit—any thing indeed better than superstition—can exist, that the tones and doctrines of Christianity be compared in each man's breast, with these internal sentiments, and these dogmata of natural reason. The advantage in this comparison lies altogether on the side of true religion—for, as the author of nature and of mankind knows his own work, and the constitution of the creatures whom he has made, any revelation from Him must be suitable to that nature & to those constitutions—while false prophets and false Christ on the contrary will be sure to blunder in the attempted accommodation of their systems to the same. And I should be happy to learn from the wisdom of my adversary, on what other foundation than this a reasoable faith can be built up in any man's mind. Or how—if he charges me with want of faith on this account—how is it, that he rejects what are called the spurious Gospels, and squares his principles by the writings contained in the canonical scriptures only. Or in short, why he believes in Christ, rather than Mahomet?

Consistently with the principles here laid down, the universal prevalence of Establishments has shewn that the genuine voice of nature was in their favour. That great and enormous abuses were intermixed with them

—that the multitude erred egregiously and deplorably, was every where but too true. But nevertheless, tho' all saw, and very many deplored the extravagance of the multitude, the universal conclusion of their reflections was that the Deity ought to be publicly worshipped. Tho' the inhabitant of one Egyptian city might pay divine honours to a rat, and that of another to a crocodile—tho' the Persian bowed to Mithras, and the Greek to Olympian Jove—still throughout all, and only the more apparent from the undue excess, ran the firm principle (a necessary result as it were of the constitution of the human mind) that the Deity was entitled to public honour and praise—as due to his own adorable nature, and as the vinculum of human society.—Here was common ground on which all mankind met—here the sage and peasant—the soldier and the citizen—the ruler and the subject agreed in principle, whatever errors each, after the inventions of his own heart, might engraft upon it. Any deviation from this was remarkable, and the instance remembered; as in Lucretius:

'Humana ante oculos fœde cum vita jaceret
In terris oppressa gravi sub religione;
Quæ caput a cœli regionibus ostendebat
Horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans;
Primum Graius homo mortaleis tollere contra
Est oculos ausus, primusque obsistere contra;
Quem, &c.'

where the philosophic poet affirms the fact of the universal pervalence of establishments before his day, and instances the first individual, who maintained the principles of my opponent respecting them. And it is remarkable that this principle, generating establishments, was so inherent in human nature—so truly the offspring of all its holiest and most unprejudiced reasonings—that legislators & politicians could only (as in the celebrated political attempt of Nebuchadnezar on the plains of Dura) make their plans subservient to it, and not controul it. The mass of men would have a public worship of the invisible Deity—the states man was powerless against this determination—and all that he could do was to draw

the multitude to such or such forms, or modes. And strangely indeed should we have thought of God's handiwork, had it been otherwise in the societies of his rational creatures.

Now, had Christianity taught otherwise—had it bid men to give neither public honor nor praise to God—had it declared war with the nation, which included a public priesthood in it, of propitiation by sacrificial blood—it would then have run counter to as general and ineradicable a principle as there is in our nature ; nor is it conceivable how in that case it could have made its way to sound belief in the human mind. It is because, on the contrary, it has lent its sanction to such principles, that we are left at liberty to examine its pretensions, and see the hand of God in the dispensation. Having enlarged thus far on a principle respecting which my adversary is more ignorant than he ought to be, let me call your attention, Mr. Editor, particularly to this, that the Reviewer has given no answer whatever to the argument in my first paper ; which ran thus :—Establishments of religion have always been general—indeed almost universal in the world—and every where indestructible, i. e. one being removed, another, though not unfrequently of different character shortly sprung up—Is this fact ? The fact Mr. Reviewer has not ventured to impugn.—Then what follows. That it is the necessary condition of the healthy existence of human society that there be establishments. Neither has he attempted to controvert this inference. But till the fact is disproved—or till the fallacy of the inference is demonstrated, he does not advance one inch in his argument against establishments, though he fill every column of the Herald with his verbiage.

He has the merit, however, of having attempted to answer something in the first paper, and it has been more his misfortune than his fault, that he has not succeeded. But to the second important one, in which I produce the instance of a divine establishment of religion among the Jews, he has not thought fit to give one word of reply. It remains, therefore, and I think it will remain, in unimpaired integrity of strength against him.

The third, which it was easier to ridicule than to answer, he has caricatured—it being, I hence conclude, one of the accomplishments required in a Methodist Preacher, that, in the holy search of truth, whenever such a person encounters a formidable argument, which militates with preconceived ideas, instead of yielding a modest assent, he is to place himself in the easy chair of the French philosopher, and with a ribald wit, laugh where it would be virtue to adore. Notwithstanding the sneer, however, I am old-fashioned enough to hold still to my argument, till reason and truth wrest it from me; and I shall, therefore, continue to believe, that, without laying stress on the example of our Saviour & his Apostles, the silence of the New Testament writers respecting a practice universally prevalent, is sufficient evidence of their approbation of that practice—after the same form of reasoning by which I perceive my neighbours to conclude, that it is lawful for them to pass to and from the United States until some positive enactment shall forbid them. Nor shall I be easily persuaded that the animadversions of the Apostles against idolatrous corruptions, imply an abolition generally and in principle of establishments till it shall first have been proved, by the skill of my opponent, that the solemn and frequent invective of our Saviour against Sadducees, Pharisees, Scribes, &c. implied an abolition, not of their sins only, but of all those orders of men—i. e. of almost every order in the state.

To my last paper, where I produce three texts from Scripture, in confirmation of my preceding argument, the gentleman has been prodigal in nothing but impertinencies. Unfortunately, Dr. Paley, an author quoted with honor by himself, comes in for a full share of the sarcasm bestowed upon the first, for in a note at the end of the ch. 'duty of children' in his *Moral Philosophy*, he will be found to have given the same ludicrous 'example of his profoundness in biblical philology,' which, in the humble writer of this provoked the risibility of the ignorant, and therefore facetious, divine.

The second text from Timothy a very conclusive one

on the matter in hand, has not felt the dagger of the Reviewer, nor been noticed : for it could not be laughed away any more than it could be answered. The tone of the ill-mannered answer to the third, where, with the spleen of a vanquished struggler, this manly Reviewer, himself unknown, attempts to be personal against an anonymous antagonist, I despise too much further to notice—though, as far as there is argument in it, I shall promise a reply, whenever, by fair reasoning, the Reviewer may have beaten me off the ground, to be captured before he arrives at this.

The conclusion of my argument then, which stands on the four pillars noticed, remains true—viz : that ‘it is in strict conformity with apostolic authority that in every country there should be an Establishment’—for nothing has been produced invalidating these heads of argument ; that the universality, and indestructibility of Establishments in the world prove them to be necessary parts of the constitution of human society—that God himself, by adopting the Jewish Establishment from the, already prevalent practice of the nations, has signally sanctioned the principle, and hallowed what before was felt necessary—that while the personal example of our Saviour and his Apostles favoured the thing, the writers of the New Testament, by their silence as to a practice then universal, fully permit it—which permission, in such a case, according to the customary interpretation of men in matters analogous in common life, has the force of positive institution—and that there are texts every where strewn through the sacred writings indirectly favouring their existence.

In conclusion, Mr. Editor, I shall say this, that I have no objection to carry on my argument till it comes to a victorious close—but I am not a match for ‘The Reviewer,’ in scurrility, and ungenerous, insinuation, neither my natural genius inclining me, nor my habit in such practices qualifying me to be a suitable opponent to a person so disposed.

A CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAN.

FOR THE UPPER CANADA HERALD.

REMARKS ON THE 'FIVE PAPERS' OF 'A CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAN.'

Mr. Editor,—

It is an essential rule in essays of every description, that the principal terms which are used, should be defined, and that they ought never to be used in a sense different from what is at first applied to them without giving notice of the change. This rule is important for two reasons; by using the same terms in different senses, we deceive our readers, and lead them to wrong or false conclusions. It is the violation of this truly mathematical rule which has furnished my adversary with a second essay or a fifth paper on Establishments. In his first papers he assured us that 'the voice of nature,' which he pronounces infallible, is ascertained or 'illustrated by the universal practice of mankind; now he tells us 'this genuine voice of the human race is made known not so much by the overt actions of men in current life; but it is rather ascertained either from particular instances of illustrious virtue in individuals; or else by such sentences as his adversary quoted, where all unite with the poet and philosopher in condemnation of vice, though each like Seneca, be guilty of the very things they condemned. But he seems not to have comprehended the full meaning of those philosophers and poets to whom I referred. It was not so much in the condemnation of vice that they agreed, as in our continual proneness to run into it. Having in his first 'four papers' (as he calls them) drawn his conclusions in support of establishments from the 'voice of nature illustrated in the universal practice of mankind;' and having found himself on that score compelled, to renounce, a priori and a posteriori, both the credenda and agenda of christianity, changes his position; and instead of attempting to answer my arguments, flies from his captivated fortress, and, Prometheus like, sallies forth a second time in another shape.

What he formerly termed the 'voice of nature,' he

now calls the 'frailty of nature,' the 'violation of the acknowledged rule of right.' What he has usually styled 'the universal practice of mankind,' has now become 'particular instances of illustrious virtue in individuals; and what he once called the 'necessities of mankind,' he now styles the 'dogmata of natural reason!'

Coepisti melius, quam desinis.

'The term reason (says an able divine) is as liable to be abused as the faculty itself. If it mean the light which God has imparted to our minds, and by which we are enabled to judge of truth and falsehood, it is certain that a doctrine contrary to it, must be absurd, because the decisions of reason, when regularly exercised, and acting within its proper sphere, are final and do not admit of an appeal. But reason often signifies the opinion of an individual, or of several individuals who are united in their views, and, consequently, is entitled to no deference, unless it can be supported by such arguments, as clearly establish its conclusions.' (Dick's Essay on the Insp. of the S. S. P. 315.) It is the abuse of the term reason—the confounding of the 'dogma of natural reason' with the 'universal practice of mankind,' that supports my antagonist throughout the very obscure sentences of his fifth paper. But.

Nunquam hodie effugies: veniam quocunque vocaris.

Now Sir, if christianity opposed itself to the 'genuine voice of the race to which it is addressed' in the former sense in which we have defined reason, it would then 'prove it to be not of divine original.' For in such a case the Almighty would not address us as rational creatures, or as having a power or right to decide. So far from this, the language of Jehovah is, 'harken, consider judge' ye.' &c.

But to the 'voice of nature' in the latter sense, viz : when it is identified with public opinion, christianity may stand opposed with invalidating, in any way whatever, its claim to a divine original. This I have abundantly proved in my last communication.

According to these principles I maintain as well as my

opponent, that in both natural and revealed religion we are (as the Apostle says) to 'prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.'

The question here arises, how are we to distinguish between the true and the false, or, to use the words of my antagonist, 'why do we believe in Christ rather than Mahomet?' To this I answer that I believe the divinity of Christ and his doctrines, to the rejection of the Koran and the false Prophet, because the internal and external evidence in behalf of the former, when examined at the bar of that reason or 'light which God has imparted to our minds, and by which we are enabled to judge of truth and falsehood,' preponderates over the evidence adduced in favor of the pretensions of the Arabian Impostor. Hence Sir, our faith is not to be built upon the native bent of the mind, but, upon evidence.

Having made these explanatory remarks, I shall enter more particularly into a refutation of my adversary's arguments.

He commences by a *petitio principii* which only needs to be mentioned that it may be exposed. He assumes what has not been and cannot be proved, viz : that I deny the 'right of judgment in the breasts of men,' and upon groundless presumption, introduces two or three passages of scripture quite foreign to the point, and to their proper and intended meaning. Having, therefore, shot at a man of straw created by his own confused brain, instead of his adversary, let him now go and learn what that Scripture meaneth.

My opponent next talks about the 'genuine voice of nature,' and it is thus that he conceals the weakness and deceitfulness of his argument :

He ascertains the 'genuine voice of nature by particular instances of illustrious virtue ; but how does he prove the divine origin of establishments? Not by 'particular instances,' but by their 'universal prevalence ;' and at the same time confesses that 'violations of the acknowledged rule of right' were universally prevalent. I might therefore very properly draw the conclusion from these silly

contradictions, that establishments are violations of the acknowledged rule of right.

Upon this part of the subject I will further observe, that the universal prevalence of any notion or conduct, proves neither its divinity nor propriety. 'Sin would be sin (says Dr. Simson) though the whole world should follow it.' And we know (says St. Paul) that the whole world lieth in wickedness. If the universal prevalence of a notion or a system defying its claims, paganism has a much stronger and prior claim than the religion of Jesus Christ. Therefore his argument on this supposition falls to the ground.

Again sir, my learned friend affirms, 'as the author of nature & mankind knows his own work & the constitutions of the creatures whom he has made, any revelation from him must be suitable to that nature and to those constitutions.' Here his meaning is quite ambiguous also. If by a revelation suitable to our constitutional nature, he means that the religion of Christ must communicate strength to our weakness, (John, XV, 5 ; Phil. IV. 13,) light into our darkness, (2 Cor. IV. 5,) holiness to purify our corrupt hearts, (Ezek. XXXVI. 25,) and the Holy Spirit to guide us into all truth, (John, XVI. 13,) I agree with him. But if by a revelation suitable to our nature and constitutions we are to understand such a remedy for the disease of the moral world, as the 'dogmata of natural reason would suggest, I think he is in a capital error.— This sentiment goes to preclude the necessity of a divine revelation altogether. For if the 'dogmata of natural reason are the only safe standard of divine revelation, what need of any revelation? The 'dogmata of natural reason [according to this doctrine] are infallible, and that system which lays claim to a divine original is received or rejected, not according to weakness or strength of the evidence by which it is supported, but according as it agrees with, or differs from, the 'dogmata of natural reason.' I ask sir, has the taper of 'natural reason' ever guided a soul to immortality and eternal life? Has any of the learned philosophers in their two hundred and eighty eight o-

pinions concerning the chief good, made it consist in the knowledge and enjoyment of God? Does my adversary possess more wisdom than Socrates? Is his genius more sublime than that of Plato? or has he more penetration than Aristotle? I think his modesty [which, by the by, is in his most distinguished quality] will hardly lay claim to such a prerogative.

Therefore, to make the 'dogmata' of natural reason an infallible guide, or a standard of divine revelation, is erroneous and presumptuous; since, [as Young says]

"Reason (undiseased in heaven) on earth runs mad,
And nurses folly's children as her own,
Fond of the foulest."

Then Sir, if the 'dogmata of natural reason' are not the 'sure data of divine revelation,' they cannot be a 'sure data' of the divine origin of establishments.

Again; by an ignorantia elenchi my kind friend hatches up another intended argument, which is (if possible) more ridiculous than the last mentioned. He says 'as the mass of men would have a public worship of the Deity, 'therefore,' the principle of generating establishments was inherence in human nature,' and truly the offspring all its holiest and most unprejudiced reasonings.' Now Sir, to give public worship to God, and to give public worship to the civil government (which is a consequence inseparable from establishments) are two distinct things; & to identify them manifests an ignorance of the question in debate. If there can be no public worship without establishments, and if there can be no teachers of religion except those who are appointed and supported by legislative authority, then there was no 'public worship and no teachers of christianity during the first three centuries of the christian era! Oh! sir, if our Saviour had had 'a Church of England man' to help him how much better he would have arranged matters.

But that public honour and praise should be given to God, is not the question. (For this maintained by all.) The question is, are establishments the most effectual means of giving public honor and praise to God? With

respect to the principle which my opponent has laid down 'that the mass of men would have a public worship of the Invisible Deity,' I remark, that so far from it, the 'mass of men' would not have God in all their thoughts. (Psalm XIV.) And instead of giving 'public worship and honor to God,' the mass of men 'changed the glory of the Incorruptible God like unto corruptible man, and professing themselves wise (like some of their admirers (became fools, and their foolish hearts were darkened. See Rom. chap. I. 21 ad fin.) Having corrected my orthodox antagonist on this point, I shall dissect the other part of his celebrated argument. He observes 'that the common ground on which all mankind met was, that the Deity was entitled to public honour and praise, whatever errors each after the inventions of his own heart might graft upon it.' I will here ask him if establishments are not one of the errors grafted upon this principle of divine adoration which is taught by God himself? Can he produce an instance where the establishments of the Heathens did not tend to corrupt what is commonly called natural religion? He has affirmed that all mankind agreed that public worship and praise should be given to the Deity. I ask him to give any instances among the numerous establishments of the heathens, where public worship and praise were not given to a plurality of Deities. What constitutes the highest glory of the writings of Socrates, Plato, &c.? It is that they wrote with considerable propriety (tho' with uncertainty) on some of the chief doctrines of Theism, such as the existence of one God the immortality of the soul, &c. But sir, was not polytheism the prominent feature of all their establishments? A pure fountain cannot produce corrupt water, and if the 'principle of generating establishments' be of heavenly birth, it will, of course produce corresponding fruits proportionable to its influence.

The truth, Mr. Editor, seems this : there is a principle in the human mind which leads men to acknowledge and adore one Supreme Being. But this is not innate—not natural—not inherent in the mind ; but it is introduced into the mind by 'that Light which lighteth every man that

cometh into the world.' (John 1. 9.) 'The Heavens declare the glory of God, [says the Psalmist] and the firmament sheweth his handy work ; [Ps. XIX] and [says the Apostle] the eternal power and Godhead of Jehovah are clearly seen by the things he has made, [Rom. 1.] It is from such sources that every holy principle originates which leads man to the knowledge and worship of God. This principle by which men unaided by revelation are taught to adore a Supreme Being, is called the law of God written on the heart. Rom. II. 14. 15.]

Now it may be abused and perverted, and debased by erring or wicked men who wish to accomplish their own political and selfish purposes. And as in the commencement of establishments under Constantine, a flood of corruption was poured forth, which fulfilled in the christian church what Sallust said of the Romans, *sublata imperii aemula, non sensim sed praecepiti cursu, a virtutibus descitum ad vitia transcursum* ; so in the Gentile world. The politician and statesman abusing and perverting this unearthly principle, made it subservient to earthly purposes ; and under the modern pretence of 'supporting and extending' it, established as many forms of worship, created as many Gods to worship, as their ignorance and wickedness saw fit to invent. Thus Sir, those ambitions and crafty men [whom I suppose my opponent would call excellent theologians] possessing, like some of their disciples, *gloriae silis*, deified as many heroes—inspired as many oracles—and taught as many kinds of doctrine, as best answered their purposes of legislation and conquest. And although they all saw, and many moral philosophers and poets lamented the superstition and wickedness of their day, but who, like many pious divines of the Church of England, though they bewailed the prevalence of vice, could not see the cause of it, especially as it was covered with gold and guarded by power ;—yet they said with the princess Medea, who was going to murder her child,

*Video meliora proboque
Deteriora sequor ;*

and therefore 'changed the glory of the incorruptible God

into an image like unto corruptible man, and to birds and four footed beasts, and to creeping things.' This Mr. Editor, is 'A Church of England Man's' divine origin of establishments.—I think, sir, he now begins to say to his beloved heavenly principle of generating establishments, as the dying Adrian said to his soul,

*Animula, vagula, blandula,
Hospes, comesque corporis,
Quae nunc abibis in loca
Pallidula, rigida, nudula,
Nec, ut soles, dabis jocos.*

It is somewhat remarkable that my determined adversary, who 'expects nought but complete victory,' should pass over the golden age of Constantine in entire silence—that boasted period when

*Protinus irrupit venae peioris in aevum
Omne nefas; fugere pudor, verumq; fidesq;
In quorum subiere locum fraudesq; dolique,
Insidiaeque, et vis, et amor sceleratus habendi.*

I think, sir, he ought not to have dismissed it so unceremoniously.

As to the Jewish polity which my learned friend says 'remains in unimpaired force against me,' I observe again that I quite removed its supposed 'force' in my communication on establishments, which appeared in the *Herald* about the middle of August, 1826.

And it is worthy of remark, Mr. Editor, that out of all the vast resources of learning and talent with which the 'gymnasiums of science' have furnished my adversaries, no answer has been attempted to that article. 'Natural reason' would lead us to suppose that some of those gentlemen who do not 'much heed the arguments of the *Methodist Reviewer*,' would have broken their philosophic silence before this time. And if establishments are such invaluable blessings to the human race, surely their history for fifteen centuries, can produce some proofs of their happy effects.

And the reason of my not answering my present opponent's 'last summer's papers.' at an earlier period, was, that the above mentioned article and the *Review* have

never been replied to ; nor should I have thought his ' four papers' worthy of notice had it not been for the complimentary remarks of his learned coadjutor. However, having learned at length that he was ranked among the magi, I thought it was no more than my duty to chastise him gently for his former insolence, and expose the weakness of his puny attempt.

But to return to the Jewish polity.

' In this polity or state (says Dr. Campbell) we find that what concerns religion, forms an essential, or rather a principal part. Every thing in their constitution seems to act in subserviency to this great end, the preservation of the parity of their faith and worship. In this there was a very material difference between them and pagan nations. [Also in modern nations.] In these last the established superstition, [or religion] on whatever popular traditions it may have been originally founded, was modelled by the ruling powers in such a manner, as that it might best answer the purpose of an engine of government. The religion of such nations, therefore, can be considered in no other light, than as one of those political machines which in various ways co-operated for the support of the whole. With the Jews, indeed, it was totally different : for in their establishment, the religion was manifestly not the means but the end.

God hath been considered in some respect the Chief Magistrate, and the government for that reason has been not unfitly termed a Theocracy.—And when the Kingly sway was established among them by their own solicitation, the preservation of their religion, and of their code of laws, contained in the Pentateuch [for they had no other] effectually prevented this change from being a subversion of their polity. The King himself was considered [though in a way somewhat different] as a minister of religion. His office was holy, and he was inaugurated with the like religious ceremony of unction with which the high priest was separated for the discharge of the duties of his sacred office.—Nevertheless the legislative power was not in the monarch. God was the sole legis-

lator ; for, as was before observed, they had no other permanent bodies of laws than the books of Moses : besides, on every emergency of importance, the Deity was consulted by Urim and Thummim.—Of any of the Pagan [on modern] nations we may say with justice, that their religion was a political religion ; but of the Jews we should say more properly that their polity was a religious polity.’ [Lect. Vol. I. p. 35—39.]

Now sir, when my opponent proves that his Majesty is a religious officer, and directed by immediate revelation from Heaven—that the Bible is our civil code of laws—that our civil and religious polity are one—that Religion is the great end of our civil policy—and that every department of our present constitution is established by the immediate authority of God, he may find an example in the Jewish theocracy, to rest for a short season the sole of his foot while pleading the cause of establishments.

My gentle friend makes an appeal to the New Testament. It is quite-surprising to hear so zealous an advocate for the infallibility of ‘natural reason’ refer to revelation as a decisive authority. But quod non est, simulat; dissimulat que quod est. And at the conclusion of his ‘fifth paper,’ he even manifests a credulity worthy of the most tender commiseration. But his faith is not the faith of evidence, nor of revelation, but in his own wonderful works. He talks about ‘four pillars’ which form an unshaken foundation for his ecclesiastical Babel. But those ‘four pillars’ prove to be nothing but four bits of ‘papers’ inserted in different numbers of the Chronicle to conceal their weakness and hide their deformity ; and which had already been confuted and consigned to a disgraceful oblivion.

However the two particulars in his former papers to which he alludes, viz : the indistructibility of Establishments : and St. Paul’s remarks on the duty of servants, shall now receive a moment’s attention. As to the first, the principle of Establishment’s having been exploded, it proves too much, and therefore proves notheng at all, I might favour him with a similar instance in the christian

world. No sooner had Papal tyranny been abolished in England than Protestant tyranny commenced. But it was tyranny still.

Mutato-nomine, de te.
Fabula Narratur.

Unfortunately St. Paul to Timothy VI. 1. nulitates directly against the cause of my antagonist : for first he is quite mistaken in his assumption that St. Paul tolerated slavery. And in the next place, the direction to Timothy clearly shews that it is not the design of Christianity to interfere with the civil government, nor lawful for the civil government to interfere with the institutions of Christianity. St. Paul taught children to obey their parents—servants their masters—and subjects to obey the powers that be in the Lord. The rights of conscience and our duty to God, he regarded (even unto death) as sacred. But in his civil capacity he submitted himself and commanded his followers to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, that the name and doctrine of God be not blasphemed.

With regard to the learned Dr. Paley, my good friend ought to have sagacity to distinguish between the code of natural morality, * and the 'universal practice of mankind.'—And if there be any 'honour' in quoting an author with giving him credit for it, my opponent possesses it 'unimpaired.'

As it respects our Lord's 'invectives' against the Scribes and Pharisees, I observe, that establishments stand in the same relation to the religion of Christ as the traditions and vices of the Scribes, &c. did to law of Moses:—and therefore the traditions of the Saducees, Scribes and Pharisees, and Establishments ought to be abolished in order to 'purify' all orders of men in society.

* The following is the note of Dr. Paley, with whom I hartily agree:—"Upon which two phrases (says he) "this is right" and "for this is well pleasing unto the Lord," being used by St. Paul in a sense perfectly parallel, we may observe, that moral rectitude, and conformity to the Divine will, were, in his apprehension, the same." Neither St. Paul nor Dr. Paley say that 'the voice of nature, illustrated in the universal practice of mankind, is right.

My learned friend asks for Scripture to prove the positive prohibition of the union of Christ's Kingdom with the world. At present I refer him to the principles contained in the following Scriptures. John, XVIII. 36, XVII. 14. 1st John, II. 15, 16. James, IV. 4. Gal. I. 10, 2d Cor. VI. 14, 18, and if these are not sufficient, I will favour him with a 'paper' professedly on the subject.

Having, Mr. Editor, trespassed at an unexpected length upon your praiseworthy indulgence, I beg leave to sum up my remarks in the words of the excellent Campbell, to whom I am indebted for several useful quotations :

'The Christian Church (says he) being founded in the concurrence of its members in the faith of the doctrine and observance of the precepts of Christ their common Lord, and being supported by brotherly affection one to another, as well as ardent zeal for the happiness of the whole, it was in no respect calculated to interfere with the rights of princes, or to afford matter of umbrage or jealousy, to the secular powers. But what God makes upright, man always corrupts by his inventions. This was the case with the human species itself. This was the case of the first religion, call it traditional, or call it natural, which in process of time, did, in different nations of the earth, degenerate into the grossest idolatry and abominations. And as to what has been communicated since by written revelation, this was certainly the case with the preceding or Mosaical institution. And this is found to have been eminently the case with the present or Christian dispensation.'—(Lect. Vol. I. p. 46.)

Jan. 1st, 1827.

THE REVIEWER.

FOR THE KINGSTON CHRONICLE.

Mr. Editor,

The scholar or the divine—the discerning critic, or the ingenuous man would, I am assured, upon a careful comparison of my last communication with the lucubrations it has drawn forth from the 'Methodist Reviewer,' readily admit that I have now nothing to reply to but the stale repetition of long refuted casuistry and the coarseness of

vulgar raillery. Instead of overthrowing my arguments, he renews positions which have been long ago overturned : instead of refuting my conclusions, he abstracts a link here and there from the series of my reasoning—striving thus to present a deformity of his own illicit junction of incongruous particles, or to manifest a defectiveness by his own fraudulent theft and disguise of those parts which must be united to constitute a whole.

— vanæ
Fingentur species ; ut nec pes neccaput uni
Reddatur formæ.

Whilst I shall only observe, in defence of my arguments on the subject of the ‘ Spirit,’ that the above remarks are entirely applicable to his mode of replying to them, I shall—purely to warn him against the indulgence of this kind of fancy—briefly notice the contradiction he evidences in discountenancing Camp meetings as a ‘ private individual,’ but supporting them as a public preacher. Is it not a very natural inference from this admission, that his private feeling is opposed to public good ; for he favours us with an elaborate detail of their good fruits ? or, are we to conclude that privately he condemns them for their ‘ evil’ tendency—publicly he supports them that ‘ good may come’ ? I wish him joy of either alternative. I might take a similar notice of many similar inconsistencies throughout his communications—communications, indeed, chiefly composed of attempts to expose the fancied trippings of others—were not such an employment foreign to the matter in hand—contrary to my ideas of christian ethics—a trespass, Mr. Editor, upon your indulgence, and a still greater intrusion upon the patience of your readers.—I remember and respect the saying of Dr. Jortin, which I shall quote, for the benefit of my adversary : ‘ An author should avoid, as much as he can, replies and rejoinders ; the usual consequence of which are loss of time and loss of temper.’ Yet, as there is little need of any reply to his sailings ; responding here, too, the honest plaint of the learned Erasmus, ‘ octavum occupant

apologiæ. Me miserum ! et hæc justum volumenc effici-
ent.'

To my arguments in favour of uninterrupted episcopal succession, he replies by indecent allusions, pointless ridicule, and 'Pyrrhonian' evasion.

Verum ubi correptum manibus vincisque tenebis,
Tum variæ illudent species.

To one who proposed the hackneyed question, 'Where was your church before the time of Henry VII?'—a certain Church of England Man replied by this quaint but astounding interrogatory, 'Where was your face this morning before you washed it?' The accumulation of things extraneous could no more impair the lineaments of either structure, than can the fanciful additions and corrupt interpretations of our Reviewer, affect or destroy the reality and soundness of the arguments which have been brought against him.

We cannot be astonished at the astonishment of our Reviewer, when he sees the 'ark of the true church not only tossed upon the billows of Popery but overwhelmed and deformed, and even then retaining all her ancient lineaments and primitive light'—for such a monstrous creation or a deranged fancy cannot but shock its own found proprietor and partial parent.

Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam
Iungere si velit, et varias inducere plumas—
Spectatum admissi risum teneatis, amici?

But, 'how unfair, how irrational, how arbitrary [says Mr. Burder] is such a mode? They insulate a passage; they fix on a sentence; they detach it from the paragraph to which it belongs, and explain it in a sense dictated only by the combinations of the syllables or words, in themselves considered. Thus dissected and tortured, what language may it not seem to speak—what sentiments may it not appear to countenance—what fancy may it not be made to gratify?' Go, Sir, and 'sin no more.' There is a sanction for the occasional use of metaphors and figures—to be found, I dare say, in 'Murray's Grammar'—of which I had taken the liberty to avail myself for the

sake of illustration, as well as for a reason recommended by an author whose judgment in these matters, has met with very general respect in the literary world ;' *variare autenti orationem magnopere oportebit : uam omibus in rebus, similitudo est satietatis mater.*' [Cicero, de Invent. I. 41.] Now, Sir an ark may be tossed upon an ocean : a temple or fabric may be deformed by superfluous additions—a sun may be deprived of its light by intervening clouds. Again, Sir, that ark may survive its tossing : that fabric may be freed from its unseemly additions without destroying the whole : that sun may recover its radiance by the dispersion of those clouds.—To these I severally compared the true christian church ; and I trust I may rely on the approbation of those whose good opinion is worth seeking, not only for the fairness of these similitudes, but for their appositeness to the subject in which they were introduced.

Our Reviewer speaks with more pleasantry than prudence on the 'mark of the beast,' affixed to every officer who had served under the papal standard. I know not why they could not have rid themselves of this uncomely badge as readily as honest Martin put away the shoulder-knot, tassels &c. so indecorously superinduced upon his garment by his brother Peter : whilst there was no more need of cleaving the head in the first instance than of rending the coat in the second. [Vid. Swit's Tale of a Tub] My opponent will grant that it was not a natural or inherited, but an affixed 'mark ;' yet if he insists that it was not to be put away by any cleansing application, then I fear we shall discern the same unhappy impress on the forehead of our Methodist Reviewer himself. The Rev. John Wesley being a presbyter of the Church of England must, by his hypothesis, have exhibited the same lamentable 'mark,' and so have communicated to all his spiritual posterity or successors in office. Alas ! discerning that latent sign will he exclaim in horror and despair,

Bellua multorum es capitem : nam quid sequar ? aut quem ?

On the subject of ecclesiastical orders in the Church of

England, he will perhaps deem it sufficient for me to quote the words of a writer who was at some pains to discover tenets and usages of every christian society. 'The united Church [of England and Ireland knows but three orders of Ministers, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; but the word order sometimes denotes, not a spiritual power or degree in the Church, but also a rank or degree in the Church, but also a rank or degree in the frame of Ecclesiastical Polity. In this last sense, she has several orders of which the most remarkable are Archbishops, Deans, Archdeacons, Rectors, Vicars and Curates.' [Adam's Xtian World, II. 381.] The latter, to borrow the words of a contemporary, are 'purely adventitious, and by no means necessary to the existence of a church,' according to apostolic order and primitive constitution: 'They are adopted for the sake of expediency—possessing the sanction of venerable antiquity and tried experience, whilst they affect not the vitality of religion nor contradict the appointments of scripture.

'The Bishops deposed by Queen Mary could have no ecclesiastical authority to ordain Mr. Parker,' says our Reviewer. But, sir, they had episcopal and apostolical authority—an authority purely spiritual and of which no prince nor power could deprive them—an authority which possesses this unearthly sanction, 'As my father hath sent me, so send I you'—and 'lo I am with you always even unto the end of the world.' The jurisdiction of the Monarchs of England extends to the persons of the Clergy, but not to their heaven—derived and inalienable office: the latter they could never annul or take away, though from their control over the former, they might forbid its exercise. 'When Dr. Parker was consecrated Archbishop upon a question of the competency of the Bishops to consecrate, as they had been legally deprived in the late reign, it was determined that as they had been once consecrated, the Episcopal character remained, and they might convey it.' (Adams's Xtian world II. 377, Neale's Puritans, I. 89.)

My courteous adversary charges me with an ignorance

of ecclesiastical history for saying that the Bishops of the Church of England awoke from the trance of Popish enchantment, and broke from the thralldom of Romish error. To avoid multitudinous references to a score of authors, I will rest my justification on his own admission, that there were 'Protestant Bishops in the reign of Queen Mary.' I will be allowed to change my mode of expression and say, 'the Bishops of the Church of England protested against the errors of Popery.' For my further justification in using, on that occasion, 'our Bishops' for 'a part of our Bishops,' I beg to refer him to 'Murray's Grammar,' under the head of synecdoche.

But did I in my last communication ascribe the glory of the Reformation particularly to the Church of England? Did I deny that Luther was the first who burst assunder the chains of Papal tyranny? I was speaking of the Reformation in England, and had no particular occasion to name the great German Reformer—yet that England may nevertheless enjoy her meed of praise, I shall mention Wickliffe as an English reformer, who published very similar sentiments with those of Luther nearly 200 years before him, and quote the opinion of a writer to to whom I find our author has occasionally paid some regard: 'The Church of England has been styled the Bulwark of the Reformation, and that justly; for almost from the days of Wickliffe to the present time, she has all along equally supported the Protestant cause, and opposed all false doctrine, heresy, and schism.' (Adams's *Xtian World*, II, 390.)

In reply to his 'supplementary remarks'—to his VII divisions, and to his 'lastly,' I need only say, that the claim of the Church of England to an uninterrupted succession of ordination from the Apostles to these times is defended by all historic testimony as far as it can be obtained—that there is every antecedent probability that it was never broken—that our adversaries cannot advance a single positive instance of its interruption—and that, therefore, until they do so, we are not required to exhibit the whole chain of succession in any particular church.

Our Reviewer relies for some of his support upon the language of certain Church of England divines ; but I shall point out one or two instances of his mode of selecting and applying these expressions. The words quoted from Dr. Barrow in his last communication were not applied by that celebrated author to this subject, but were introduced on an occasion totally different : and what this learned divine's real sentiments were on the subject of Episcopacy may partly be gathered from the remarks I selected from my last communication, and more fully ascertained from his four sermons on ' obedience to our spiritual guides and governors,' Nor is his quotation from Bishop Pretyman, in a former communication, applicable to the spirituality (if I may use the expression) of episcopal constitution and succession, but to the external polity of the Church—his meaning will be now perfectly understood by the scope and context of the whole article from which that selection was made—and perhaps not a little elucidated by the following sentiments which occur in a preceding page : ' We maintain that there have always been Bishops, Priests and Deacons in the Christian Church since the days of the Apostles, with different powers and functions, it is allowed, in different countries and at different periods ; but the general principles and duties which have respectively characterized these clerical orders have been essentially the same at all times and in all places.' [El. of Theol. II. 399.]

The remark of Mr. Gisborne quoted by our Reviewer, is a manifest *petitio principii*, and so proves or disproves nothing ; whilst both his and Archdeacon Paley's eccentric position are well combated by Mr. Law in the following manner : ' we do not say that Episcopacy cannot be changed merely because we have Apostolic practice for it ; but because such is the nature of the Christian priesthood, that it can only be continued in that method which God has appointed for its continuance. The apostolical practice shows us that Episcopacy is the order that is appointed ; the nature of the priesthood assures us that

it is unalterable.' My antagonist, I hope, will comprehend this most conclusive argument.

Our very ingenious Reviewer, takes too an insulated sentence from Stillingfleet to favour his own purposes—I beg to furnish him with certain sentiments of that learned divine on the subject immediately in discussion; 'The universal consent of the Church being proved, there is as great reason to believe the Apostolic succession to be of divine institution, as the canon of Scripture, or the observation of the Lord's day. Some of the books of the cannot of SS. were a long time disputed in some churches: but the churches coming at last to full agreement in this matter, upon due search and inquiry. hath been thought sufficient to bind all after-ages to make no alteration in it. And as to the divine institution of the Lord's day we do not go about to lessen it, but only to show, that some examples in SS. being joined with the universal practice of the Church in its purest ages. hath been allowed to be sufficient ground not only for following ages to observe it, but to look on it as at least an apostolical institution. Now, it cannot but seem equal, not to allow the same force where there is the same evidence; and therefore, our church hath wisely and truly determined, that since the Apostles' times there have been three orders, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and in a regular well-constituted Church are to continue to the world's end,'—To the above judicious and conclusive argument, I shall only add, that the very important institution of infant baptism may be adduced as depending on similar authority.* I will close this head with the remarkable fact that the witnesses of the Episcopal government of the Church are earlier and by far more numerous than those who testify that the Gospel of St. Matthew was written by that Apostle, or that the Revelation of St. John, was canonical Scripture. Wedded as our Reviewer seems to be to the doubting philosophy, I hope his scepticism will not here betray

* Vid. on this head an ordination sermon lately published by the Rev. Archdeacon Mountain, Quebec, in which there is a happy union of soundness of argument and excellency of speech, p. 17.

him into a repetition of this dangerous assertion, ‘ the fathers are no authority for us !’

‘ It necessarily follows [says our most logical Reviewer] that some change must have taken place in the form of Church government after the decease of the Apostles.’ True : if we admit his premises—which it is a rule in logic to settle first—but the probability on which that argument is founded is somewhat counteracted by the greater plausibility of such reasoning as this ; ‘ Episcopal government [says Chillingworth] is acknowledged to have been received universally in the Church presently after the times of the Apostles ; between the Apostles and this presently after, there was not time enough, nor possibility of so great an alteration ; and therefore there was no such alteration as is pretended. Had Episcopal government been an aberration from, or corruption of the government left in the Churches by the Apostles, it had been very strange that it should have been received in any one Church so suddenly, or that it should have prevailed in all for many ages after. Had the Churches erred, they would have varied ; what, therefore, is one and the same among all, came not sure be error but tradition.’ There is, too, so much good sense, in the following words of the well-known Dr. Wells, that I cannot refrain from annexing them in support of this argument : ‘ Since all men are naturally prone, more or less, to pride and ambition, ’tis not rationally to be supposed that the whole order of Presbyters should, at first, so tamely and quietly submit themselves to the authority of their respective Bishops in the several parts of the then X^{tian} world, if they know that the said authority was unduly usurped, especially since in those earlier times the prelates were not armed with any civil power to compel or frighten their Presbyters to such an undue submission.’ (Letter to a Dissenting Teacher, p. 79.)

Dr. Pearson acknowledges (says our Reviewer) that the terms Bishop and Presbyter were interchangeably used by Irenæus, so he will that St. Paul the Apostle calls himself a Deacon, Eph. III. 7.—but that the same Ier-

næus, admitted a distinction in their offices, is I think, to be collected from these words : ‘ Out of Miletus were assembled Bishops and Presbyters, &c. Lib. I. 28. The little copulative, or, would probably have better suited the purpose of our Reviewer.

I am sorry to dismantle my adversary’s strong hold in Clemens of Alexandria for the existence of but two orders in the ministry, by these unfortunate words which occur in Lib. vi. of his stromata ‘ There are in the Church the different degrees or progressions (prokopai) of Bishops Presbyters, and Deacons in imitation of the angelical glory.’

With regard to the authority of Ignatius, when our Reviewer refutes the ‘ Vindicia Ignatianæ’ of the learned Bishop Pearson, and various other defenders of that father, I will resign it altogether. Yet, to show that something more was meant by Ignatius (genuine or suppositions) than the men priority of Episcopal pre-eminence in Asia Minor, I will annex his conclusion to the injunction he gave the Trallians to be subject to the Bishop, to the Presbyters, and to the Deacons—‘ without these there is no elect church, no congregation of holy men.’ Are we not to infer from hence that Ignatius regarded this description of officers as essential to a true church, in all parts of the world ?

The quotation from St. Clement in my first communication I do not conceive affected by any thing as yet advanced by our Reviewer.—It was hitherto, I believe, very generally admitted to have the import in which I used it, and it can, I repeat, have no force or meaning unless understood as an analogical reference to similar grades in the Xtian priesthood. The following words of St. Jerome afford a valuable commentary on that citation : ‘ What Aaron & his sons & the levites were in the temple; the same the Bishops, Presbyters and deacons challenge to themselves in the church. Indeed the analogy betwixt the Jewish and Christian dispensations is alluded to by our Saviour himself in Luke xxii. 80.—it is express and frequent in the writings of St. Paul, and in the

Revelation of St. John—it is perpetually admitted by the Fathers—and will ever be regarded by Christians on the principle that the Jewish & Christian Church are not so much different establishments, as two editions, (if we may so say) of the same Church of God, the former constituting, as it were, the ground-plan upon which the latter has been built. (Arch. Danbery.)

With respect to the venerable Polycarp. his silence is at least no contradiction. As well might we infer from the observation of Eusebius that Polycarp quoted the first Epistle of Peter and not the second, that therefore the latter was not acknowledged by him.

Pius, a Bishop of Rome, A. D. 155, addresses Justus of Vienna as Bishop, and prays that the Presbyters and Deacons may give him due reverence. This testimony has the support of Blondel; and may, therefore, be reasonably advanced by an advocate for episcopacy.

To the idle pedantry displayed on one of my quotations from Tertullian, I will only answer that no rule of syntax will warrant the rendering of the preposition in which our Reviewer gives us—that every scholar, word the passage as you may, will coincide in the correctness of this interpretation, “The order of Bishops when traced to its original, will rest upon the authority of John”—and that his own version will suit my purpose and favour my argument as much as the translation I myself give.

Besides the external evidence afforded by the testimonies of various writers that the ‘angels of the seven churches’ were bishops, I will briefly claim his attention to some internal testimonies also. It is stated in Acts xix. 40. that all they which dwell in Asia heard from St. Paul the word of the Lord Jesus—and in Acts xiv. 23. that elders (not one, but many) were ordained in every church. Now if all Asia Minor had heard the word from St. Paul, that is, about 60 A. D.—if even then more than one elder or presbyter was ordained in every church: is it probable that thirty years after when St. John wrote his Revelation, each of these churches had but one pastor?—Is it not more rational to believe that the ‘angels’ mentioned by

the latter were presidents, or Bishops with many presbyters under them?

Alas ! if we must wrest from St. Chrysostom his long-admitted claim to a 'golden utterance' and a pure integrity, I will defend my position by the words of Ss. themselves—that the 'presbytery' mentioned 1 Tim. iv. 14. were, in the ordination of Timothy, merely the coadjutors of St. Paul. who affirms 2 Tim. i. 6. that 'the gift of God was bestowed upon him by the putting on of his (St. Paul's) hands;' I beg also to call his attention to the fact that the Greek preposition *meta* joined with 'presbytery' denotes concurrence, whilst *dia* which is used in the latter text, signifies the instrumental cause. I will only add on this head, that Calvin, the famed advocate of Presbyterianism—expressly denies that a college of Presbyters was meant in the first of the above cited texts, and affirms it as his opinion, grounded upon the last quoted verse, that Paul alone ordained Timothy. (Instit. iv. 3.)

Whenever, in future, our Reviewer is in any doubt as to the cause of my 'taciturnity' on his manifold positions, I beg once for all to assure him that it arises from a conviction that they need no reply.

As our Reviewer seems to have so much respect for the testimony of Dr. Whitby, I must request his attention to the following passage from the same learned author: 'From these words, 'the things which thou hast heard from me commit thou to faithful men, who shall teach others also,' it may be fairly gathered that a succession of Bishops was to be constituted in every city as persons that were to take care of the Church of God'—a passage which will be allowed to overthrow any authority he may attempt to derive from that celebrated writer for so ridiculous and unscriptural a position as this, 'the office of an Evangelist like that of an Apostle was extraordinary and therefore could not be successive.' Was the cause, Sir, of such an appointment, & the design of such an office ever to cease? Will not the command to 'do the work of an Evangelist,' be applicable to every X^{tian} minister unto the end of time? How are we to interpret this promise of our Saviour, 'lo!

I am with you always even unto the end of the world,' if the Apostles to whom it was addressed were to have no successors?

I contend, notwithstanding the Protean evasions and confused reasoning of our Reviewer, which disprove nothing I have already advanced, that the terms Bishop and Presbyter, are distinct when we regard the application of their meaning as collected from the SS. themselves and the co-inciding voice of antiquity. He has not deigned to notice the explanations I had cited from Ambrose and A-malarious which I think are quite decisive on this subject.

And now, Mr Editor, have I waded through the tedious 'observations' of the 'Methodist Reviewer,' and cleared myself, I trust, from his course and disingenuous imputations. I have to apologize for the unavoidable leangth of this communication, and do most sincerely hope it will be the last trespass I shall make upon your praise-worthy indulgence. Now, Sir, I know my man; and need not in future much heed his arguments or his railings. The former seem entirely to depend on the stale and unprofitable sentiments of long answered controversialists, incoherently strung together and exhibiting a monstrous conjunction of private interpretaion with foreign authority—whilst his propensity to the latter seems not to have been corrected by the sub dio assemblages which, on his own testimony, have effected such wonders.

That God may grant him a 'right judgment in all things,' and a 'zeal according to knowledge,' is the sincere prayer of.

A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Nov. 14, 1826.

REMARKS ON 'A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND'S' LAST REPLY TO THE REVIEWER.

Mr. Editor,

'He that ruleth his spirit, (says Solomon) is better than he that taketh a city.' To this enviable honour my ad-

versary might have attained, had he maintained the moderation of feeling in his last communication, which, with a few exceptions, characterized his preceding production. But, to his misfortune, forgetting the spirit of christianity—renouncing the fairness of the logician—and the candour of the divine, he commences with an exordium of unjust abuse and incorrect assertions—proceeds with a ‘monstrous conjunction’ (and for ought I know ‘sub die assemblage’) of foreign authority, (which by the by was not the case with his adversary) and closes with the expended effusions of rancour and bitterness.

‘His acrid temper turns, as soon as stirr’d
The milk of his good purpose into curd.’

I am sorry that justice to truth and myself compels me to give the above characteristic of a production proceeding from so able a pen as that of my learned opponent. But to such unjustifiable lengths do even candid and amiable men go in advocating the cause of Romish bigotry & high church arrogance.

Their Doctrines “are indeed a public scourge,
Their mildest physic is a farrier’s purge,”

To the railing accusations with which his production abounds, I shall say nothing any further than they are connected with the points in dispute. For ‘when our enemies are much incensed against us (says the Rev. Mr. Bradley) it will generally be found that to reply to their aspersions serves only to increase their violence. And if it were not so, where is the man, who is sure that he can bridle his tongue when he has suffered it to undertake his defence?’

“No skill in workmanship, however just,
Can be secure against a madman’s thrust.”

I am not in the habit, Mr. Editor, of either opening or closing my communications with the Goliath-like boasts of my prowess and my ‘training up in the gymnasium of science,’ nor am I in the least degree alarmed by such unmeaning threatenings; and, armed with the two edged sword of divine truth, I shall attempt to penetrate the brazen armour of my adversary’s Philistine security, and

humble those vain pretensions to episcopal succession, which are better adapted to the ages of Franciscan superstition, than to the enlightened christians of the nineteenth century.

Before I enter into the subject of episcopal succession, I beg leave to remark, that my antagonist had no ground from my observations to assert, that I discountenance Camp meetings under any circumstances whatever. I affirmed, as a private individual, I am no advocate for Camp meetings when other religious means supersede their necessity. This plainly implies that the necessity of Camp meetings may be superseded by other religious means ; and that, under such circumstances, I should not advocate them on account of my own personal advantage, or as a private individual. It also implies that when other religious means do not supersede the necessity of Camp meetings. I shall advocate them both from motives of private advantage as well as of public good. Why did my opponent not answer my arguments on the subject of the Holy spirit's influence or that of Camp meetings, instead of attempting to conceal his retreat under so contemptible a mask as that of personal invective ?

“ In vain he points his pow'rs against the skies,
In vain he closes or averts his eyes,
Truth will intrude—she bids him yet beware—
And shakes the sceptic in the scorner's chair.”

Episcopal succession.

The ‘ quaint but astounding argument, where was your face this morning before you washed it ? ’ is the first, with which my opponent astounds me. By this he would seem to compare the corruptions of the Romish church (which he acknowledges infested by ‘ doctrine, discipline,’ and practice) with the dust upon a man’s face before he washes in the morning. I would ask him if he who is Antichrist before his face is washed in the morning, becomes a friend and successor of Christ as soon as his face is washed ? and does the washing of her face, transform a harlot into an honest matron ? And yet the corruptions of the Romish church, according to my adversary’s creed—

constitute her, in the darkest sense of the word,—‘ a foul filthy old withered harlot,’—and his holiness the Pope my opponent’s spiritual grand-father, a ‘ false prophet, and an Antichrist.’

How very unseemly it is Mr. Editor, for pious children to distinguish their ‘ high, heaven delegated parents, by the peculiar titles of filthy harlot and Antichrist. It is probable my learned friend gets his authority for the occasional use of this figure also from ‘ Murray’s Grammar under synecdoche or precision, or possibly from the fifth commandment of the decalogue.

Again, sir, my opponent assures us that the mark of the beast—alias the Pope, who was making war against the Lamb, was not a ‘ natural, or inherited, but an affixed mark.’ Granted—but I will ask him, is not the mark of the Holy Ghost, an affixed mark also ; and may it not be put off by either false doctrine, unscriptural discipline, or unholy practice ? And further, can the Beast who is making war against the Lamb, affix his own mark, and at the same time, affix the mark of the Lord Jesus Christ ? To assert this, (which is all the strength of my adversary’s argument) supposes that a fountain can send fourth bitter and sweet water at the same time, and that the devil can communicate the Holy spirit !!—Hence it follows sir, upon every principle of rational reasoning, that the officers who received the mark of the Beast, and served under the papal standard, never had the heaven derived mark of the blessed Jesus, and therefore, could not put it off or dispense it to others. Thus my antagonist, his ‘ shoulder knot tassals,’ and his ‘ Tub’ are carried down stream together.

But are not the mark of the Beast and the corruptions of the church of Rome, more closely connected with the essential principles of her constitution, than the shoulder knot tassals are, with the shoulders of honest Martin ? My learned friend acknowledges that the Romish church was deplorably corrupt in ‘ doctrine, discipline,’ and practice. Now sir, do not these comprehend the whole internal polity of the church ? And if the whole be corrupted,

where are the Holy Spirit and his authority, which never dwell with Belial or his children? I suppose 'Murray's Grammar under synecdoche will tell us where.

Mr. Editor, to put this point beyond dispute, I will give you my adversary's creed respecting the Romish church and the popes, and you will then see how this corresponds with his 'astounding' assertions that the Popes are the possessors and legitimate dispensers of 'high—unalienable, and heaven-derived' authority.

'The Bi-shops of the church of Rome (says the Homily for Whitsunday) have for a long time made a sore challenge that they possess the Holy Ghost, reasoning with themselves after this sort : (in the very same way as my adversary reasons with dissenters) 'The Holy Ghost (say they, the popes) was promised to the church, and never leaveth the church. But we are the chief heads, and principal part of the Church, therefore, we have the Holy Ghost forever; and whatsoever things we decree are undoubted verities, and oracles of the Holy Ghost ! 'That ye may perceive the weakness of this argument, it is needful to teach you, first, what the true church of Christ is, and then to compare the church of Rome therewith, to to discern now well they agree together. The church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the Head corner stone. And it hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is know : pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments administered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. Now if you will compare this with the church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is at present, and hath been for nine hundred years and odd ; you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far from the nature of the true church, that nothing can be more. For neither are they built upon the Apostles and Prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesus ; neither yet do they order the sacraments, or else the ecclesiastical keys in such sort as Christ did first institute them ;—and they curse the Godly with

bell, book, and candle—absolving the reprobate who is unworthy of any christian society.—We may therefore conclude according to the rule of Augustine, that the bishops of the church of Rome are not the true church. Where now is the Holy Ghost which they do so stoutly claim to themselves? Where is now the Spirit of Truth that will not suffer them to err? If it be possible to be where the true church is not, then is it at Rome : otherwise it is but a vain brag and nothing else.

“ Now to leave their doctrine, (continues the Homily) and to come to some other points. What shall we say of the Pope’s intolerable pride? The scripture saith, that God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble.—Now as the lion is known by his claws, so let us know these men [the Popes] by their deeds. What shall we say then of Pope Clement VI. who made the noble king Dandalus to be tied by the neck with a chain, and to lie down before his table and gnaw bones like a dog—of Pope Paschal II. who armed the son against the father, causing him to be taken, and to be cruelly famished to death contrary to the law both of God and nature? What shall we say of Pope Beniface the VIII. who came into his popedom like a fox*, reigned like a lion, and died like a dog—of Pope Hildebrand, most worthy to be called a fire-brand, who made Henry the Emperor, with his wife and child, stand almost naked in the gate of the city, in the rough winter, without any thing to eat from morning till night, and that for the space of three days? Shall we say that such tyrants had God’s Holy spirit in them, and not rather the spirit of the devil?”

Now Mr. Editor, this is the character which is given of the church of Rome and her Bishops in my adversary’s creed ; and yet he affirms that these men are the legal dispensers of the Holy Ghost—and applies to those whom his creed calls devils in human shape, the words which our Saviour addressed to his apostles : ‘ as my Father

* Does a legal successor of the Apostles obtain his apostleship like a fox ? and can a fox beget an Apostle ?

hath sent me, so send I you, and lo ! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world !"—Is not this as antichristian a perversion of our Saviour's sacred commission as that of which Pope Alexander III. was guilty when he applied the thirteenth verse of the ninety first to himself, while contemptuously treading Frederick under his feet ? Who can impartially weigh such testimony as the above, and conscientiously say that Episcopal succession is unbroken ?

The only refuge left for my opponent on this point (as he has declared the ' validity of the Romish orders,' and that his own ordination is derived from them] is, to suppose that personally, a bishop may be as wicked as Satan, and be officially full of the Holy Spirit ! ! This is to believe that Christ hath concord with Belial, and the Holy Ghost and Beelzebub do dwell together ! ! Could the believing Abraham believe this ?

Again, although my adversary, in his preceding communication, denied [in order to evade the force of my arguments] that the church of England ordination is derived from the Popes ; yet, having in his last paper acknowledged them again as his spiritual ancestry, my arguments in reply to the Brockville clergyman remain, and I trust will remain in full force against him. And he must either deny the historical facts to which he then subscribed, or, deny the authority of ' the Holy Scriptures and the ancient canons,' or confess that the chain of Episcopal succession has been snapped asunder.

" Believe and show the virtue of man."

Again Sir, if Episcopal succession be the only medium by which apostolic authority can be conveyed, and if without a bishop there 'is no elect church, no congregation of holy men,' how hopeless must be the boasted cause of my adversary, ' Where then was the church of Rome,* when from the martyrdom of Fabian, and the banishment of Lucius, the church was governed only by the clergy ?

* And where was the Church of England when Secker was archbishop ?

So the church of Carthage, when Cyprian was banished ; —the church of the east, when Miletius of Antioch, Eusebius, Samosatenus, Pelagius of Laodicea, and the rest of the orthodox bishops were banished for ten years space, and Flavianus and Diodorus, two presbyters, ruled the church of Antioch the mean while. The church of Carthage was twenty four years without a bishop in the time of Hunneric, king of the Vandals ; and when a bishop was offered them they declined receiving him'—doubtless preferring the simple apostolic plan. [Still. Irenicum, p, 376.]

Now Mr. Editor, are not these undeniable facts—these scriptural arguments—and these positive instances, sufficient to convince the 'scholar or the divine—the discerning critic or the ingenuous man,' that Episcopal succession has been broken for 'nine hundred years & odd'? And what are the arguments adduced on the opposite side of the question? A church of England man's astounding question, 'where was your face this morning before you washed it?'—'honest Martin's shoulder knot tassals, illustrated by Swift's tale of a Tub.' Admirable arguments indeed! which weigh about as much in the scale of rational reasoning, as my adversary's 'synecdoche' weighs in the balance of truth when compared with his former statements.

With regard to Archbishop Parker, my learned antagonist cautiously avoids making any reply to the reasoning which I think has clearly proved [if there be any consistency in the policy and law of England] the illegality of Parker's ordination; and rests his whole cause upon his own unsupported assertion, and the authority of an *ex post facto* law. Into how many gross inconsistencies does our Episcopal champion involve himself, in the support of his daring policy. One Monarch strips their Rev. Lordships of their episcopal authority, and their ministrations become null and void ;—her predecessor treats some of her Prelates in the same manner, and their authority lies beyond her reach and remains as firm as the 'battlements of heaven.' And wherefore this wonderful difference in the

Royal prerogative? Not because it is consistent or reasonable; for it is contrary both to reason and common sense;—but because the infallible state policy required—and thus only [and not then] can an Episcopal succession be made out: and therefore, reason, scripture, and the Holy spirit himself must not oppose it. When state policy requires it, a woman can ‘make, and unmake, frock, and unfrock’ a bishop as she pleases—when state policy requires it, a bishop is too holy to be touched with the unsanctified fingers of any monarch. When state policy requires it, a Secker is a true successor of the apostles—when state policy requires it, he is an intruder and an impostor. When state policy requires it, a presbyter is a bishop—when state policy, or rather the successionist, requires it, a presbyter is not a bishop. When state policy requires it, the King is one time, Defender of the faith for supporting the pope against protestantism, & at another time, the King is Defender of the faith for supporting protestantism against the pope. When state policy and the successionist requires it, the popes and their spiritual progeny are at one time the only legitimate successors of the apostles, and, at another time, ‘the popes and their adherents are so far from being the true church, that nothing can be farther’—and therefore, the only apostolic way of being in the Episcopal succession is, to separate from them, and anathematize them with law, bell, book and candle!! This is the kind of logic by which our logical successionist unites the links of his Episcopal chain.

“Vociferated logic kills me quite
A noisy man is always in the right.”

But what, in addition to the above contradictions and a multitude more which I could easily enumerate—dooms to a worse than Pyrrhonian scepticism on this point is, that our adversary refuses to give us any proof whatever that there is any such chain in existence. His own dictum, that ‘episcopal succession is defended by all historic testimony as far as it can be obtained,’ is the only evidence which can, on a point as important as the truth of revelation, be elicited from his ‘gymnasium of science.’ Did

the defenders of the christian revelation, Mr. Editor, content themselves with merely asserting, that the claims of the Holy Bible to a divine original, are defended by all historic testimony as far as it can be obtained? Did they not produce from their gymnasiums of science and talent those irrefragable proofs which either convinced or silenced their opposers. But my opponent on a doctrine with the truth or falsehood of which Bible institutions stand or fall, gives us nothing but his ipse dixit, adorned with 'Swift's tale of a Tub.'

He confidently tells us that no positive instances can be produced that Episcopal succession is broken. I think sir, he is now left without this plea for his silence; for positive instances have been produced that Episcopal succession has been broken for 'nine hundred years and odd,' and, if necessary. I will produce a greater number to the same effect.

He opened his communications with the avowal that modern Episcopacy is the only scriptural medium through which ecclesiastical orders can be conveyed to others; and assured us that it could be defended by 'all historic testimony,' both scriptural and ecclesiastical. But did he stop here? No sir—he has favoured voluminously on this subject from 'the musty treasures' of both ancient and modern 'manuscripts.'

He avowed the same with respect to episcopal succession, and said 'thus only can a lawful episcopate be derived.' But has he entered into a proof of this as he has of Episcopacy? No sir, he leaves us as ignorant of his probabilities and his historic testimony on this point as a child is of Hebrew. 'Now it cannot but seem unequal (to use his own words on another occasion) not to allow us the same force where there is' not only (as he tells us) the 'same evidence, but the same importance. He has laboured for months to prove the one, why does he not try to prove the other? However he shall have the credit for attempting once to prove his succession, and then it was his misfortune more than his fault that he succeeded in nothing but self contradiction. He therefore considers

it unnecessary to attempt it again ; and proclaims his cause so clear that it amounts to an axiom, and consequently needs no proof. It is indeed sir, as clear ' as the Tiber itself.' Bellarmine informs us, ' thrt for above eighty years together, the church for want of a lawful pope, had no other head than was in heaven.' Would our Saviour be the head, or husband of a ' foul, filthy old withered harlot ?' My opponent says so, and of course he cannot err. ' How deformed was the Roman church (says Baronius, another popish historian) when strumpets, no less powerful than vile, bore the chief sway at Rome, and, at their own pleasure, changed sees and appointed bishops ; and, which is horrible to mention, did thrust into St. Peter's see their own gallants, false popes ? Christ was then, it seems, in a very deep sleep ; and, which was worse, when the Lord was asleep, there were no disciples to awaken him.' But to eclipse this sunshine of incontrovertible facts, my learned friend

" Flings at our heads conviction in the lump.
And gains remote conclusions at a jump."

The fact is, he has no other way of gaining them.

" Perhaps at last, close scrutiny may show,
The practice dastardly and mean and low."

From the various testimony we have now adduced, I think we are fully authorised to conclude—unless we are ' too much wedded to the doubting philosophy' to believe the Homilies of the church of England—historical facts fully authenticated, and the Holy Bible,—that episcopal succession is interrupted ; and, therefore presbyterian ordination is as good as episcopal.

Who knows sir, whether one half of the popes were ever ordained at all or not ? Who knows that the persons that ordained were not impostors ? No man living. Who knows that the course of the Spirit has been interrupted, if Episcopacy has not ? Every body.

The heretics, from Tertullian wrote against, asserted, like our Episcopal logician, that they were descended from the Apostles, and that their succession could ' be defended by all historic testimony as far as it could be ob-

tained.' But did this satisfy the Latin Father? No Sir — Tertullian, with all his foibles, had too much good sense to believe their empty and deceitful pretensions. Nothing less would satisfy him, than the 'origin of their churches, and an exact catalogue of their bishops from first to last.' We ask nothing more of our Episcopal opponents; and no candid man would ask our belief on any other terms.

Mr. Editor, I might add other instances of the inconsistency of my adversary on this subject, and other proofs that his pretensions to Episcopal succession are a 'vain brag and nothing else;' but I am unwilling to develope facts which must shock every pious and virtuous mind, any further than is indispensably necessary. I shall therefore enter on the other part of the subject, viz. ordination and church government, and will present another charter upon which we claim apostolic authority to administer the ordinances of Christ's church.

THE REVIEWER.

Feb. 14th, 1827.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE REVIEWER CONTINUED.

ORDINATION AND CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

Mr. Editor,

'Invective and reproach (says the pious and eloquent Saurin) seldom proceed from the mouth of a man who loves truth and defends it. They are the usual weapons of them who plead a desperate cause; who feel themselves hurt by the arms of their adversary; who have not the equity to yield when they ought to yield; and who have no other part to take than that of supplying the want of solid reasons by odious names.'

One would think Mr. Editor, that Saurin, in making the above remarks, had the conduct of our modern high church-men immediately in view; since the most formidable weapons with which they assail Dissenters, are the bug-bear exclamations of 'heresy and schism, presumption and sedition.'

These are the arms with which the Romish divines

attacked the Protestants; and the latter, to justify their protestations and expose the futility of Papal pretensions, arrayed themselves with the armour of truth, &, consequently, pled the necessity of dissent. They also contended that the Roman Ecclesiastics, in order to establish the claims, must prove that God had 'granted them in downright and perspicuous terms.' It was in repelling the arrogant assumptions of the Romish Church, that the learned Dr. Barrow, introduced the words which I quoted in a former communication, which rejecting the arrogant assumptions of Episcopal preeminence, and for which I have incurred the stale charge of 'disingenuousness'

Cum tua praevideas oculis mala lippus inunctis
Cur in amicorum vitiis tam cernis ocutum
Quam aut aquila aut serpens Epidaurius ?

But the protestants did not content themselves with merely pleading the necessity of reform and that the authority of the Church of Rome had never been 'granted in downright and perspicuous terms,' they likewise assumed the other positions of Dissenters, viz : that Episcopus and Presbyter, (to use the words of Arch Bishop Usher, in a letter to Dr. Bernard) gradu differunt non ordine, and consequently, that in places where Bishops cannot be had, the 'ordination of Presbyters stands good ;' or, as he expresses himself in a letter to Baxter, 'the king having asked me at the Isle of Wight, whether I found in antiquity that Presbyters alone ordained any?' I replied yes; and that I could show his Majesty more, even where Presbyters alone successivly ordained Bishops.' On this point I might add numberless other testimonies of equal weight and authority, if it were expedient.

But when our consistant high Church casuists, labour, like their Romish predecessors, to establish themselves on the ruin of others, they spurn from them the only weapons by which they can defend themselves against the claims of the church of Rome ; and, sofar from admitting with Bishop Stillingfleet, that 'Bishops and Priests were, at one time, not two things, but both one office in

the beginning of Christ's Religion,' they make them differ as much as master and servant.

Nescio Protea nodo. Having made these general remarks, Mr. Editor, I will now analyze the '*Rudis indigestaque moles*' of my adversary, and show that it is made up of nothing but *non bene junctarum discordia semina rerum*. I trust I have already freed myself from the imputation of 'disingenuousness' in quoting Dr. Barrow; and I could produce many other passages from the same author, which operate as strongly against the exclusive claims of high Church men, as they do against the Pope of Rome.

My adversary's remark on Bishop Pretyma are another proof of the weakness of his cause.

By a divination unknown to common divines (and yet it is known to every one) he informs us, that when Bishop Pretyma acknowledged 'there is no precept in the New Testament for Episcopacy,' to the exclusion of other forms of church government, he meant that the external polity of the church might be changed without affecting the spirituality of Episcopacy. This is all I endeavoured to maintain. But the efficacy of his quotation is altogether lost by those unfortunate words—'since the days of the apostles,' or as Chillingworth says—'presently after the times of apostles.'

These little phrases slip over a period of nearly two centuries and form a gulf between our adversaries and the apostles, over which they never have been, and never will be able to pass. This I shall show fully hereafter.

His 'most conclusive argument' from Mr. Law 'is a manifest *petitio principii*, and so proves or disproves nothing.' Every logician establishes his premise before he draws his conclusions; and accordingly, my antagonist ought to have proved that 'apostolical practice shows us that episcopacy is the order that is appointed,' before he overwhelms us with the conclusion that Episcopacy is essential and unalterable.

His quotation from Bishop Stillingfleet is foreign to the point and perfectly coincides with his sentiments which I

have introduced in this, and in a former article, and with those of the same author whom I shall have occasion to refer to again. With respect to the divine institution of Apostolic succession, of which Bishop S speaks in the former part of my adversary's quotation, I have neither affirmed nor denied. The Presbyterian, as well as the Episcopalian, maintains the divine institution of apostolic succession. Whether it be so or not, is not my province or intention to determine. The quotation now is, is Episcopacy of divine institution? With respect to this, Bishop S's observations, on three orders of church officers in every well constituted church, are not applicable to the spiritual authority, but to the jurisdiction, of Bishops: for Bishop Stillingfleet observes that 'before the jurisdiction of presbyters was restricted by mutual consent, the presbyters enjoyed the same liberty that presbyters among the Jews did, of ordaining other presbyters, by that power they were vested in or with at their own ordination. In the first primitive church the presbyters, all acted in common for the welfare of the Church, and either did, or might ordain to the same authority with themselves; because the intrinsical power of ordination is equally in them, and in those who were afterwards appointed governors over presbyters. And the collation of orders doth run from the power of order, and not merely from the power of jurisdiction.' Thus, sir, although the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Bishops and presbyters; might, by a mutual consent, differ in after ages; yet, their spiritual order or authority remained virtually the same, and no human institutions ever could, or ever can alter it. Therefore every presbytery, John Wesley and his colleagues among the rest, had or has authority; apostolic authority to ordain their successors.

My antagonist appears to be much concerned (and considering the cause he advocates, well he may be) that I dare espouse so dangerous a sentiment as this; 'the Fathers are no authority for us;' and, to awaken me from my sceptical slumber, he informs us that the institution of infant baptism, in depending upon similar authority with

episcopacy, viz. upon the authority of the Fathers. I beg to remind him that the divine institution of infant baptism is not depending upon the authority of the Fathers, for its support. The nature and design of the ordinance of baptism, and the relation in which infants stand to God,—which are ascertained from the scriptures alone together with supposed scripture examples, are basis on which we establish the institution of infant baptism. And although the early practice of the Church in admitting infants to this holy ordinance, as well as in observing Sabbathical institutions, corresponds with the scriptures; yet these institutions are by no means depending upon Church history for the support of their claims to apostolical origin.

Let him establish episcopacy upon the same foundation. Let him give us proofs or apostolical examples that ‘episcopacy is the order which is appointed,’ and we will believe him. And could he do this, it would then be left for him to prove that presbyters have not the same authority with Bishops. But no—that episcopacy is the order which is appointed to the exclusion of presbyters from the power of ordination, is what he neither has nor can prove: therefore his pretensions are a ‘vain brag and nothing else.’

My opponent surely cannot mistake the light in which I hold the ancient Fathers. As witnesses of matters of fact I give them all the weight which their candor—discernment, and piety demand: and therefore consider that the canon of Scripture, established by Dr. Lardner, upon evidence collected from the writings of the Fathers, is supported by all the external testimony which the nature and exigencies of the case require. But sir, does this respect and this obligation to their authority by which we are warranted in believing that the books of the New Testament were written by the persons to whom they are attributed, at the period usually assigned them, and were in the main, as we possess them, do these considerations bind us to acknowledge the Fathers as expositors of the Gospel, and as theological guides? How soon sir, did they distort the face of Evangelical truths by their allego-

rical interpretations—blend the doctrines of Revelation with their absurd Philosophy—and infuse into its morality the spirit of their own discipline? even the facts, the most notorious facts contained in the New Testament are differently represented by them. Ireneus who relates that he had his information from the Elders of Asia, to whom it had been communicated by John and the other Apostles makes our Lord's ministry to continue nearly twenty years; Clements Alexandrinus includes it in one. And are these Fathers to be authority for us? No sir, Cedite Romani Scriptores, Cedite; Graii. 'The Scholar or the divine—the discerning critic or the ingenuous man' though he had intellectual power by which he could.

Aeris tentare domos, onimoque rotundum Transmigare polum, yet never could he (as Chillingworth says) 'find a place to rest the sole of his foot but on the rock of the Bible only. I see plainly (says he) and with mine own eyes, that there are Popes against Popes; councils against councils; some Fathers against others; the Church of one age against the Church of another age: traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are none to be found. In a word there is sufficient certainty but of Scripture only, for any considerate man to build upon.' Are the Fathers then, to be authority for us, concerning doctrines or facts contained in the Bible? yes—as far as they agree with the Bible. Now sir, suppose there were Bishops in the Church as early as the ancient writers whom my adversary quotes, does this prove that there were Bishops in the days of the apostles? Does it prove that there was a bishop in this Colony 50 years ago, because there is one here now? or does it prove that because there is a bishop in Canada now the whole population would have been buried beneath the ruins of heresy and schism and been left to the uncovenanted mercies of God, unless his Lordship or some other of the Episcopal tribe had traversed the boistrous Atlantic, to visit men (according to Dr. Strachans history) more savage than the raging element, and open to their wretched souls the king-

dom of Heaven by the magic power of Episcopal baptism and communion? Such sin must have inevitably been the case, if there be any truth in my adversary's argument. He refers to authors who wrote a century and a half after our Saviour, to authors who merely mention the existence of three orders, and then infers not only that bishops were ordained by the Apostles in an exact succession, but also, that without a bishop there is no congregation of holy men, and consequently those lights of the world—the Harvey's and Baxters—the Henry's, the Bateses & Flavels—the Watts, Dodridges and Whitefields—'Men whose life, learning, faith and pure intent would have been held in high esteem with Paul,' together with the millions of their followers, and the hundreds of thousands of the most deluded of all the Methodists' lights are impostors, hypocrites, and heathens, and are left to perish forever in the fatal pools of Erebus!!

Happy art thou O! Canada! that such have risen upon thee to dispel the gloomy shades of thy dissenting darkness! happy country that such men have come to thy rescue

Meek and humble mouthed—and hearts
—cram'd with arrogance, spleen and pride,

But Mr. Editor, as little support as the ancient writers can afford my opponent, he has not even their authority to justify his claims. He infers that Ireneus could not mean the same persons whom he promiscuously called bishops or presbyters, because St. Paul called himself a deacon. Of what sir did St. Paul call himself deacon or servant? Of the church as a church officer? No sir, of the Gospel, being made obedient, or a servant thereto, by the effectual working of divine power; and in this respect our Saviour is called deacon or Minister of the circumcision—(Rom. xv. 8.) The higher order it is admitted on all sides, includes the inferior, but this does not hold conversely. A bishop may be a Presbyter, but will my adversary admit that a Presbyter is a bishop? However Ireneus speaks of both in nearly the same terms—as entitled to obedience from the people—as succeeding A-

postles in the ministry of the word—and what at one time he attributed to bishops, he at another, ascribes to Presbyters. And the very promiscuous usage and application of the words Presbyter and bishop which my opponent does not deny, prove that the distinction was scarcely notable even in the days of Ireneus.

Were the terms bishop and Presbyter ever thus confounded in succeeding centuries? Was ever Cyprian called a Presbyter? or Rogation, bishop? No sir—the distinctions were considered too important in their day ever to be blended.

Clemens Alexandrinus confirms what I have already observed that the distinction between presbyters and bishops, began to obtain about the middle of the second century. My quotation, in a former article, shows as clearly as language can express it, that there were but two ranks of church officers: and the passage cited by my adversary, when taken in its proper connexion, makes directly against him, and affords a presumptive proof, that there were two orders only.

As to Ignatius, I have already shown that whether his writings were interpolated or not, they contain sentiments which contradict the Holy Scriptures and put reason to the blush—and his assertion that without a bishop there is no elect church, no congregation of holy men, is no more a proof that bishops were known in other churches, than his assertion, that those who would attend to the bishop, should be eternally saved, proves that obedience to a bishop was universally believed to be the way to Heaven. My adversary seems to lose his usual sagacity when he adverts to Clement of Rome—he cannot conceive that Clement meant two orders of church officers, although Clement enumerates but two, and declares them to be the fulfilment of an ancient prophecy, and Clement does not refer to the Jewish priesthood as a prototype of the Christian, nor will the connexions of his words admit of such an application. Clement is enforcing the duty of the people to their pastors, and observes, that as the Israelites rendered obedience to the priests, so ought Corinthian Christians to be in subjection to their ministers.

The idea that the bishops, priests and deacons of the Christian church, succeed to the offices of high priests and levite in the Jewish, is as absurd as it is unfounded. It is acknowledged by every one, who has ever read the Scriptures, that the ancient high priest was a type of our Saviour who is a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec—granting then sir, that the Jewish and Christian churches are editions of the same, it operates with equal force against the cause of my adversary. Our great high priest having offered a sacrifice once for all, ascended on high, and led captivity captive, has left the two other orders of priests and levites on earth according to his ancient prediction quoted and applied by saint Clement to the two orders of ecclesiastical officers. This ridiculous pallel between the Jewish and Christian priesthood, was never known or thought of, 'till the pride and ambition began to swell the doctors of the church who wished to succeed to the emoluments of the Jewish priests. “ This notion (says Mosheem) was propagated, with industry, some time after the reign of Adrian, when the second destruction of Jerusalem had extinguished, among the Jews, all hopes of seeing their Government restored to its former lustre, and their country arising from its ruins. It is, indeed, highly probable, that they who first introduced this absurd comparison of offices so entirely distinct, did it rather through ignorance and error, than through artifice or design. The notion, however, once introduced its natural effects, & these effects were pernicious. The errors which it gave rise to, were many; & one of its immediate consequences was, the establishing a greater difference between the Christian pastors and their flock, than the genius of the gospel seems to admit (Ec. Hist. vol. I p. 147.) The mist with which my antagonist darkens and disgraces St. Jerome's sentiments, to conceal the inconsistency of his remarks on St. Clement is thus dispelled by the masterly hand of bishop Stillingfleet: ‘ Jerome spends a great part of his epistle, to prove that a bishop and a presbyter are the same. Is it imaginable, that a

man, who had been proving all along the superiority of a bishop above a deacon, because of his identity with a bishop in the Apostles time, should, at the same time, say, that a bishop was above a presbyter by the Apostles instruction, and so directly overthrown all he had been saying before? The plain meaning of Jerome then, is no more ~~her~~ this; as Aaron and his sons, in the order of priesthood, were above the Levites, under the law; so the bishops and presbyters, in the order of the Evangelical priesthood, are above the deacons, under the gospel. The comparison runs not between Aaron and his sons under the law, and bishops and presbyters under the gospel; but between Aaron and his sons as one part, and the Levites as the other; so, under the gospel, bishops and presbyters make one part of the comparison, and the other part under the gospel is that of deacons.—The opposition is between the same power of order which is alike in bishops and presbyters, to that of deacons which stood in competition with them—the scope and drift of Irenee's epistle, was to chastize one who made deacons superior to presbyters." My opponent, by sophistry equally ridiculous and disingenuous, endeavours to wave the force of Polycarp's positive testimony against his desperate cause, by observing that upon the same principle we would reject one of St. Peter's epistles, because Polycarp refers to one and not to the other. If I were to quote Goldsmith's history of England and not Hume's, it might be deemed absurd to infer that there is no such history as Hume's; but if I were enumerating the histories of England and describing their respective merits, a silence in that respect would lead the reader to infer, rather, that no such history existed,—or that I was ignorant of it—apply this to the subject in hand. Polycarp was enumerating and describing officers of the Church, (Chap. v. & vi) and prescribing the duty of the people to them; but throughout the whole there is no mention made of a venerable bishop. Now sir, we must suppose that there was no such venerable person as a bishop, or if there was, he must have been so perfectly silent for the sake of becoming per-

fectly venerable, that Polycarp never had the honour of knowing him—either alternative is fatal to my opponent, and demonstrates the futility of his Protean equivocation, that Polycarp's silence is at least no contradiction. His next authority is Pius, bishop of Rome, generally supposed to be sixth or seventh from Clement. If the testimony of Pius were as clear as day in favour of three orders of Church officers, it could afford no support whatever to the doctrine of my adversary; for, I have already produced in this, but more fully in a former article, the most indubitable testimony from Clement who proceeded Pius—testimony which my opponent has not even questioned or criticised that there were but two orders: and if Pius who wrote some time afterwards, “may be reasonably appealed to by an advocate of episcopacy,” it demonstrates, Mr. Editor, what I have already remarked, that a change in Church government actually did take place after the death of the Apostles; and that episcopacy, about the age of which I am now speaking, began in many of the churches or in other words that the privileges of the presbyters began to be abridged. The testimony of Pius clearly illustrates and establishes these remarks. He says, in writing to the bishop of Vienna, ‘let the presbyters and deacons reverence them not as their superior but as the minister of Christ.’ This clearly shows that the respect paid to a bishop was not founded on any superior spiritual authority that he was supposed to possess, but upon his age and wisdom and diligence ‘as a minister of Christ’—would such language have been used in the third century? or would it be said to a presbyter, now a days, the ‘reverence the bishop not as your superior, but as Christ’s minister? Ah! no sir—a presbyter dare not address a bishop at this enlightened period, without prefacing his sermonem profundem, with—‘My Lord.’ However sir, this & similar distinctions were unknown until ‘that venerable’ period of ‘venerable antiquity’ arrived in which my adversary acknowledges he derived the ‘venerable’ offices of arch

bishop, dean, arch deacon, rector vicar, curate and a long string of etcetera.*

With regard to Tertullian, without producing numberless instances to show the correctness of my 'pedantry' as well as my interpretation, I will merely ask him which is the most classical and correct to render *Joanem auctorem*, John the author, or, 'John, one of its authors?'

This I only remark, Mr. Editor, to show what 'gross darkness might cover the people,' had not a dissenter certain balances in which he can weigh a Greek or a Latin sentence, as well as an Episcopalian classic and find him wanting.

I have now examined my opponent's Ecclesiastical authorities in support of Episcopacy, and is there found the slightest evidence, even from the fathers that Episcopacy is essential or that it was established in the days of the Apostles?—The whole foundation on which my antagonist supports the tottering fabric of his boasted Episcopacy, is this—that a distinction is made between bishops and presbyters, by authors who flourished A. D. 150 or 200, and then infers, therefore, this distinction must have been made by Christ and his apostles, and therefore it is essential to the Church, and therefore, without it, all is gone. 'Should a wise man utter vain knowledge, and fill his belly with the East wind?' But, Sir, I have now fully shown that his authority is derived not only from an insufficient source, but also, that it does not establish the point he is endeavouring to support. However, sir, the only safe conclusion we can come to on this point is

I will ask Mr. Editor, what authority, from the word of God, has any man, or any body of men, to add to the appointments of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, these different grades of Ecclesiastical offices? the wisdom of inspiration it seems was not adequate to the task of devising and establishing institutions for the effectual government of the church. The wisdom of the dark ages—my opponent's "venerable antiquity"—must be called into the aid of Jesus Christ; and by its papistical inventions, officers are appointed who rule over the divinely instituted delegates of heaven, with the authority of an Eastern Nabob. According to this doctrine the political cry of "expedience" might add institutions and officers ad infinitum in the church of Christ; but all this will go down with our adversaries for "Apostolic authority and practice."

that of Chillingworth, that, 'there is no sufficient certainty, but of the Scripture only, for any considerate man to build upon.' I shall therefore turn to the apostles, who are the best expositors of their own institutions, and the most competent witnesses of their own conduct. My adversary's reference to Timothy's ordination is not to the point, for he ought in the first place to have shown that it was not to the office of deacon that Paul appointed Timothy, when he laid his hands on him; and in the next place he ought to have made it appear that St. Paul presided over the Presbytery which ordained Timothy; but granting at present (rather than to enter into the discussion of these points in this paper) that Paul was present when the Presbytery laid their hands on Timothy, it establishes nothing in favor of episcopacy; for I have already proved, what my opponent has not attempted to disprove, that the pastoral office of the apostles was identified with that of elder; and as a further evidence of this, I observe, that St. Paul, though he was endowed with miraculous qualificationis and powers which could not be claimed by any successor, was consecrated to his pastoral office by a body of ministers, denominated 'prophets and teachers,' who, though they could not have been bishops, in the modern acceptation of the term, were doubtless authorised pastors of the church; otherwise, St. Paul never would have consented to be ordained by them, (see Acts xiii. 1. &c.) and that he felt himself possessed of an authority which he had not before, is obvious from the circumstance of his immediately entering on the work,—a work in which we do not learn that he performed before—of establishing the churches wherever success attended his ministry.

Timothy could be vested with no higher degree of spiritual authority than those by whom he was ordained possessed, and therefore he was only an Elder. It is worthy of remark, that the fancied 'golden utterance' of Chrysostom, is fatal to the doctrine of my adversary, and establishes what I have all along maintained, viz: that those who were called Presbyters in the days of the apostles,

were afterwards termed Bishops. Those whom St. Paul styles the Presbytery, are denominated by Chrysostum a 'Synod of bishops.'

This also proves what Stillingfleet says, that 'in the beginning of Christ's religion, a bishop and a Presbyter were not two offices, but one had the same office. I beg to remind my adversary that I never quoted Dr. Whitby, to prove that the office of an Evangelist, was not successive; but to show that Titus was not a stationary officer of the Church. This being done, my point is gained. I shall not therefore lengthen the present communication by explaining and proving in what respects the office of an Evangelist was temporary; but will merely ask if we are to have successors to those extraordinary Missionaries, why have we not our apostles, and Evangelists, and Prophets, and Governments, and tongues, and interpreters, and miracles, and discerners of spirits, as well as first Churches? Notwithstanding Mr. Editor my adversary's sentiments have been fully refuted, he is determined to contend that the terms bishop, and Presbyter are distinct, when we regard the application of their meaning. What reasons does he give for contending? He contends. But wherefore does he 'contend?' He contends sir, because he contends 'what an admirable display of training up' by a classical—what am I saying?—by an Episcopal critic. The only argument now to be examined, and that with which I shall conclude the present article is taken from the apocalypse. His argument that the Angels were diocesan bishops is built upon the supposition, that vast numbers of Pagans had been converted to christianity, throughout the whole of Proconsulst Asia. Granted sir, but does St. John address his epistles to all the christians of Asia? or to the seven principal churches (ecclesia congregations) of seven principal cities which it is supposed St. John had visited and planted the Gospel in. This opinion seems to be strengthened by the circumstance, that the order in which he addresses the churches, is the same as their geographical situation, would render it most convenient for him to visit, and as these places were the

principal scene of his labours, previous to his banishment it would be natural for him to feel a particular concern for those churches which he had planted ; and being inspired to write on subjects which are of universal concern to the church in every age, he directed his epistles to the pastors (angels) whom he had appointed in these respective cities, and in these epistles, gave such warnings and instruction as their peculiar circumstances required. Another consideration which induces us to believe that the angels mentioned by St. John, were not diocesan bishops is the small distance between the cities in which they resided.— Their distance, at the utmost, was not an hundred miles distant from each other, and some of them approached as near as twenty or thirty miles. Is the diocese of a modern diocesan confined within the limits so narrow ? Behold a modern bishop presides over a diocese not twenty miles in extent,—but more than a thousand—and that too in a country professedly altogether christian.

But sir, I have no objection for argument sake to accede to the supposition of my adversary, that the angels whom St. John addresses were Presidents, in the Presbyteries which might be formed in these several cities. But this by no means proves, or authorises us to infer, that these were an order of men above Presbyters. For we have no account that the apostles ordained any higher order of Church officers than Elders in every city, and ‘as the colation of orders did not run from the power of jurisdiction, but from the power of order ;’ (Stillingfleet) the Presidents need not be, and were not in their spiritual order above Presbyters. The propriety of these remarks, together with several observations, I heretofore made, concerning the rise of Episcopacy, is clearly illustrated, and not a little confirmed by the following extract from Dr. Mosheim :—

‘ The rulers of the primitive Church were called either Presbyters or bishops, which two titles are, in the New Testament, undoubtedly applied to the same order of men.

Three or four of these Presbyters or bishops, men of remarkable piety and wisdom, ruled their small congre-

gations in perfect harmony, nor did they stand in need of any president or superior to maintain concord and order where no dissussions were known. But the number of Bishops or Presbyters & Deacons increasing with that of the Churches, and the sacred work of the ministry growing more painful and weighty by a number of additional duties, these new circumstances required new regulations. It was then judged necessary that one man of distinguished gravity and wisdom should preside in the council of Presbyters, in order to distribute among his colleagues their several tasks, and to be a centre of union to the whole society. This person was, at first, styled the Angel of the Church to which he belonged, but was afterwards distinguished by the name of Presbyter or Inspector. Let none, however, confound the Bishops of this primitive and golden period of the Church with those of whom we read in the following ages. For, though they were both distinguished by the same name, yet they differed extremely in many respects. A bishop, during the first and second century, was a person who had the care of one christian assembly, which, at that time, was generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly he acted not so much with the authority of a master, as with the zeal and diligence of a servant. He instructed the people, performed the several parts of divine worship, attended the sick, and inspected the circumstances and supplies of the poor. He charged the Presbyters, indeed with the performance of those duties and services, which the multitude of his engagements rendered it impossible for him to fulfil; but had not the power to decide or enact any thing without the consent of the Presbyters and people. And, though the episcopal office was both labourious and singularly dangerous, yet its revenues were extremely small, since the Church had no certain income, but depended upon the gifts or oblations of the multitude, which were, no doubt, inconsiderable, and were, moreover, to be divided between the bishops, presbyters, Deacons and poor.' (Hist. Vol. I. p. 92, 93.)

Mr. Editor, I did intend, in the conclusion of this article, to demonstrate, from the early history of the church, the truth of Archbishop Usher's observation, that presbyters alone successively ordained bishops ;²—but the long trespass I have already made upon your laudable indulgence, obliges me to defer it till a future period (if expedient) and draw the present communication to a close.

As to the wonderful discovery which my adversary has made that 'he knows his man,' I have only to say, that notwithstanding I have heard a very singular noise for some months, I have not yet been able, with certainty, to 'know my man.' He may be a Scotch—'man,' or he may be an English 'man;' he may be learned—'man,' or he may be a clergy—'man.' However, he appears to be a very confident—'man,' and, some times, a very angry—'man.' I wish him much joy in every alternative.'—For my own part, 'the atrocious crime of being the young man, I neither palliate nor deny; but content myself with' the comfortable reflection that, by the grace of God, I have not yet hesitated 'to repel the aggressor, whoever might support him,' and vindicate the innocent, whoever might assail them; and though my slender talents and the want of a little more 'training up,' have prevented me from doing that justice to both sides which they deserve, and which many of my brother dissenters could have done, yet I have 'done (as Young says) the best my circumstance allow'd,' and, will therefore conclude with the humble saying of the poet ;—

Fungor vice cotis, acutum

Reddere quae ferrum valet, exors ipsa secandi.*

Your obliged Servt.

THE REVIEWER.

Feb. 27, 1827.

*Not that I dare to age or strength pretend,
But only boast myself to be the gospel's friend:
To whet them both to act, and, like the hone,
Live others edge, though I myself have none.

