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"War is a game, which, were their subjects wise,
Kings would not play at."—Cowper.

"Pity and need,
Make all flesh kin;—there is no caste in blood!"—
E. Arnold.

"War will never yield, but to the principles of Universal
Justice and Love; and these have no sure root, but in the
Religion of Jesus Christ!"—Channing.

Let Christendom be united by a "holy alliance"—of the
people.
"Then, let the bugles sound, to all the world, the
Truce of God,—for ever!"—Sumner.
PRESCRIPT.

"The work of Righteousness shall be Peace!"

The reader is requested, candidly to note the character and objects of this little book. It is not a sensational, socialistic, or political squib. It is, simply, an earnest plea, for practical Christian philanthropy. It rests its pleadings solely, on the power of truth. Its root ideas are—God for humanity, and humanity for God; and it urges admitted truth, and the logic of unquestionable facts, on human conscience and intelligence, in a fair claim of human rights.

The writer has no objects of personal or party interest, to serve. He is neither a sectary, nor a political partisan. Neither is he a literary aspirant, seeking the honours of martyrdom, at the hands of critics and reviewers,—though, of course, he is fairly accountable for his work. He makes no pretensions to original discovery, or profound research. But, he claims to have used faithfully, what he has stolen honestly, of the fruits of other men’s labours; and to have rifled literary treasure-houses, only to enrich his readers, and to divide the spoils, with all who may choose to share them. He does not deprecate criticism; and he is well aware that his performance is immensely poor, in relation to the grand ambition of its object. But he earnestly begs critics, and even uncritical readers, to be fair and faithful, not only to him, but also to Truth, and to themselves.
For the plan and structure of his treatise, as well as for the central Scriptural investigation (the kernel around which this little nut has grown), the writer must admit an undivided responsibility.

The conception and the execution, with whatever may be its faults and failures, are entirely his; and for all blemishes and defects, he unfeignedly pleads for indulgence and absolution.

But, for arguments and conclusions, and for the final aims and objects of his work, the writer cannot honestly offer any apology; or appeal to any amiable weakness.

He believes his positions to be impregnable; and he can only expect and desire an uncompromising testing of their strength.

Some parts of his composition may give offence; and doubtless, his treatment of one principal topic, will, at first sight, cause dissatisfaction, to some whom he would grieve to wound.

He can only urge the claims of conscience, and loyalty to conviction.

As an illustrious pleader, long ago, put it, the writer may humbly say for himself—"Amicus Plato; amicus Socrates; sed magis amica Veritas;" or, in the words of one, greater than Cicero—"Charity endureth all things"; and "rejoiceth with the Truth."

To every reader, he would frankly and respectfully say—"Give all due weight, to facts and arguments. Acquaint yourself fully, with the whole subject, here imperfectly discussed; and then,—unless you can do it honestly, heartily, and with a good conscience,—do not adopt, or join in,—"The Cry of Christendom."

"The nobler the truth or sentiment, the less imports the question of authorship." —EMERSON.
PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

The call for a second edition of "The Cry of Christendom," indicates a fitting opportunity for adding a few notes, in elucidation of some of its claims.

It also suggests the avowal of my responsibility, and the frank expression of my respectful attention to my critics and reviewers.

I am glad and thankful to find that while serious differences of opinion and judgment have been expressed, regarding some of my positions and conclusions, my spirit and motives have been in most cases fairly and generously appreciated.

I certainly have been actuated only by a conscientious love of Truth, without regard to any personal or sectarian interest. I have expressed my convictions without any abatement of affection and respect, for fellow-Christians and brother Ministers, some of whose tenets and distinctive observances I am constrained to deplore, as contrary to the mind of Christ. To withhold from brethren our deep and clear convictions of the revealed will of our Lord and Master, would be at once treason against Him, and the worst form of unfaithfulness to them. While none of us should dogmatise or domineer or dictate, or attempt to judge one another, we are all bound "in love to serve one another"; and there can be no more important service than
communicating to fellow-servants, such views of the Master's character and purposes as He may have permitted us to obtain.

With this conviction I have seriously endeavoured to discover the Divine intention, in the aggregate testimony and final development of Apostolic teaching and practice, in the revelation of Christianity, "for the obedience of faith, among all nations." I rest solely on a fair and thorough exegesis of holy Scripture.

If my views are not upheld by this sanction, let them be blown to the winds! Our Christian faith and practice should stand, not in the wisdom or fancy of men, but in the purpose and power of God. Of course my analysis of the Scripture testimony is imperfect, from its brevity, and may be regarded as defective, because it is so brief and sketchy. But it is complete in outline, and believed to be conclusive in evidence. On this point I appeal with honest confidence to the impartial judgment and most rigid criticism of Biblical scholars and expounders, in all the Churches.

Having taken this ground, without fear or favour of anybody of Christian professors, it is very gratifying to receive, from several quarters, frank and emphatic testimony to the "earnest and powerful pleadings for practical Christian philanthropy"—the devotion to "the interests of spiritual religion"—and "the large charity that breathes through the book."

Some have been good enough to declare that "it deserves the widest circulation,"—"that it is calculated to prove of permanent benefit to the Christian Church," &c.

Thankfully noting these spontaneous and cheering verdicts, not as compliments to me, but as sincere expressions of homage to the Truth—I must request my sympathisers to excuse the brevity of my acknowledgments, in view of the more serious obligation of replying to some of my hostile critics.
This is certainly the most unpleasant part of my task, though I try to obey the call of duty. My difficulty arises not from the array of opposing argument and exposition—but from their absence, and from the lamentable superabundance of empty assertions, and unfair suggestions, where only calm criticism and unprejudiced investigation should have a place.¹

In all that I have seen from my censors and opponents, I do not find a single instance of even an attempt at a thorough and sustained criticism or refutation of any one proposition or line of argument presented in my book. I shall therefore, without prejudice or discourtesy, dismiss some “reviews,” with very brief notice, in order to reserve space for others, which I regard with greater, though it may be painful, interest.

Before approaching the more critical questions in dispute, I may glance at a preliminary topic of public interest. Regarding my remarks on the condition of Christendom, and the sanctioned war policy of the “Christian Powers,” amidst general expressions of concurrence I find the objections of one opposing critic.

This writer (in a Belfast paper, the title of which I have not ascertained), after very fairly quoting and summarising some of my remarks, proceeds to oppose me, by referring to some of the beneficent movements and social reforms, of modern times. He points to Popular Education, Free Libraries, and “unwearying Christian effort” in the cause of benevolence, as if these things were the results and fruits of war, instead of being due to the labours and sacrifices of those who denounce the war policy, as unchristian. By a similar fallacy this writer meets some of my views, by urging the right of a peaceful nation to resist aggression. But this implies a misapprehension on the

¹ See Appendix, Note N.
part of my critic. There is not a sentence in my book denying the right of national defence, against military invasion or aggression. My plea is against the systematic and provocative preparations of rival neighbour nations, for invading each other's territories, each anticipating apprehended hostility, by being ready to be the first to take the field!

My chief censure was directed against the violation of Christianity, by clerical benedictions and religious services, in honour of war, and my special plea was, and is, for "a people's league of peace." This suggestion, which was regarded with strange disfavour, has recently, I am thankful to say, become the theme of earnest and eloquent advocacy by influential clergymen and respectable journalists, without eliciting any public opposition, or dissent.

One popular London newspaper has devoted several leading articles to it, and in a series of appeals, which I might have been suspected of having copied, but that mine were written nearly a year earlier, has boldly urged upon the great Powers "a policy of mutual disarmament," as the true "pledge for the pacification of Europe." The writer adds, "When such pacification is effected—and it will be some day—it will be done by people, not by kings." This may seem to be hard upon the kings; and I, for my part, cannot see why some of them should not share in the good work.

But this representative of public opinion, still more recently declared: "If wars are to be prevented, and mighty warlike organisations, which crush out so much human happiness and produce so much human woe, are to be abolished, or even materially diminished, it must be done by the common people everywhere cultivating a better understanding one with another, shaking hands with one another, and declaring that the men who make the quarrels shall be the only men to fight." "As
emperors and kings, bishops and priests, generals and
governors, statesmen and magistrates, will not join in this
work—this grandest of all work that can engage human atten-
tion—let the people, the common people, everywhere, who will
survive dynasties, resolve to begin the work, and it would soon
be accomplished."

Again it is declared: "We believe that the time will come—and come soon—when the peoples of Europe will demand that
their servants—Sovereigns and statesmen—shall not trifle in
the future with human happiness on battlefields as heretofore,
and insist that common sense and common humanity be
practically imported into international transactions."

It is not in London or in England alone these thoughts are
finding emphatic utterance.

The sentiment—like a pebble thrown into a pond—produces
ever widening circles of influence and conviction.

The new year brought us a very important message from
our French neighbours, on this subject.

Dr. de Presse, an influential Free Church Minister, and
a Member of the French Senate, has published in The Christian
World, his "detestation of war," and his advocacy of "arbitra-
tion, for the settlement of disputes."

While frankly asserting the right of defence against aggres-
sion, he solemnly denies the charge that "the French are thirst-
ing for revenge"; and adds—"I ardently desire to see Europe
emerging from the state of barbarism which makes it one large
military camp."

In confirmation of his own views the Doctor adds a pregnant
declaration of his fellow-Senator—M. Jules Simon. This
eminent French Statesman is reported as follows:—"The
fact is the European nations have stretched the cord to break-
ing-point, and further tension is impossible. The necessity of
outvying one another in the struggle for the development of military power has so heavily taxed the industry, trade and agriculture of the countries, that no further pressure can be tried. It has the further effect of sterilising the intellectual faculties of the people, by directing them all to the accumulation of brute force. This is the abnormal state of things; and in this case the normal condition is disarmament."

Surveying the situation, in relation to the remarks of his colleague, Dr. de P. urges "the simultaneous reduction of armies, in all countries, upon bases agreed on by a congress; and adds: "Disarmament can only be effective, as it leads on to a settled system of arbitration. May that peaceful day soon dawn"! Here we have an echo of the Angels' song of "Peace and goodwill," coming to us across the water.

Still more wonderful in some respects, and more unexpected, has been the international conference, of delegates from France, England and other nations, held in Berlin, at the instance of the Emperor, to promote common action for the benefit of the working classes, and in the interests of peaceful industry, and commercial relations.

With such hopeful responses in the air, I certainly cannot regret, or attempt to silence, "The Cry of Christendom" for a European Areopagus, and "a people's league of peace." I must rather urge that every Christian philanthropist should continue to plead and labour and pray for this, until the Divine promise is realised, when the nations "shall not learn war any more."

During the dreary and terrible past, when Popes and Poten
tates alternately aided and resisted one another, in trampling upon the prostrate peoples—in losing sight of God, men learned to doubt their own humanity; while consecrated assassins, and clerical sorcerers, blaspheming the name of Jesus, as soldiers of
the Cross, imbruted redeemed souls, in pretended furtherance of their salvation.

Poor, betrayed, and desolated Christendom has long and often had occasion to cry with the weeping Magdalene, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him."

May the nations soon rejoice to learn that the Christian era has truly come!

Amongst the unfavourable notices of my work, which have come into my hands, there is considerable diversity, not only as regards quantity and quality, but also, in the tone and temper of the writers.

The longest and the most unmitigated in hostility appeared in the Church Advocate, published in Dublin. The editor of that paper had the honourable fairness to publish my reply to his reviewer, and as my letter contained a sufficient presentation of extracts from the review, together with proposals for testing the value of its allegations, I copy a portion here, to illustrate the drift of the argument.

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'CHURCH ADVOCATE.'"

"Dear Sir,—Will you kindly give me space for a few remarks on the review of 'The Cry of Christendom' which recently appeared in your columns? I make this request in the name of Christian comity and honest criticism; but it is not my purpose to offer a defence of the distinctive conclusions put forward in this work, or to commit you to any endorsement of them. My claim is simply to review the reviewer; and I ask, as any reader of the book has a clear right to ask, for permission to test his representations of its character and objects, and his qualifications for helping others to understand and refute it."
"I think a Christian reviewer should act as a just judge, and give an author a fair trial, whether he agrees with him or not.

"With sincere regret I must honestly declare that in a long and wide experience of religious controversy—sometimes in contact with bitter and angry polemics—I have seldom, if ever, read anything more contrary to this rule than the strictures of your reviewer on 'The Cry of Christendom.

"He pays your readers a dense compliment when he attempts to class the author with 'Mr. Mathew Arnold,' and alleges that he 'confuses philanthropy with Christianity.' The author distinctly treats of the results of true Christianity as 'the fruits of faith,' according to the doctrine of Holy Scripture and Evangelical Protestantism; but, as the reviewer is so liberal in the dispensation of his anathemas, he must surely visit St. Paul with a sharp rebuke for designating Christianity as the philanthropy of God! (Titus iii. 4, Greek Text.)

"One of your reviewer's most weighty censures is that he has not found the name of the devil in 'The Cry of Christendom,' and he makes the reckless statement that the author 'ignores the power and presence of Satan.' As the author had to treat of the diabolical horrors of the sanctioned militarism of Christendom, and of the corrupt and debasing sacerdotalism which makes that unchristian system possible, he may have felt that more 'devil' would be superfluous. He repudiates all varieties of devil worship, and leaves the championship of Satan's supremacy unchallenged, in the hands of the reviewer, while he rejoices to believe, with St. John, that 'The Son of God was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil!' In this connection it is startling to note the reviewer's methods of distorting some of the author's statements. When professing to quote a passage, he takes care, in true Pusey fashion, as
illustrated in 'The Cry,' to omit the context, which would show his unfairness.

"In his second notice (August 1st) the reviewer exceeds himself in gross and grotesque misrepresentation. Instead of asking your readers to wade through the muddy pools of his wild exaggerations, I will invite him and them to stand on the solid ground of sober criticism, carefully to sift the evidence, and loyally recognise the claims of truth.

"In order to promote this desirable result, I beg leave, in good faith, to urge some inquiries for the consideration of your reviewer:—

"1st. Will he unite with me in respectfully requesting the honoured Provost of Trinity College to express his judgment (in view of his own able work on the Church of Rome alluded to in 'The Cry') as to whether the principles of exegesis and methods of proof adopted in 'The Cry of Christendom' are or are not in accordance with the general usage and practice of Biblical scholars and Protestant expositors, throughout the world? Will he do this?—or,

"2nd. Will he induce any two or more Fellows or Scholars of Trinity College, or Dublin clergymen or other persons of recognised respectability and competent scholarship, to endorse his allegations that 'The Cry of Christendom' 'sets aside the positive Scriptures of our Lord and His Apostles,' and that 'the personal Christ and the teaching of the New Testament are left out of the whole programme of the author' of that work? Can he persuade any sane man who is a Christian, and able to read, to sustain him in these charges?—or,

"3rd. Will he enter on a serious attempt to refute the exegetical analysis of the whole New Testament record, briefly presented in 'The Cry?' and will he commence this work by informing your readers how it happened that neither Peter nor
James nor Paul (Acts xi. 16; xiii. 47; xv. 2–17) could find in Matt. xxviii. 19, the divine ordinance for the perpetuity of baptism among Gentile Christians, as all modern Baptists and baptizers profess to do? If he can make a successful commencement here, he may go on to grapple with the whole of 'the Scripture testimony' on which 'The Cry of Christendom' rests its plea regarding the Sacraments.

"But the course he has been pursuing is unworthy the sacredness of the subject. Evasions and misrepresentations of the real scope and substance of a book, must convince thoughtful and candid readers that it is unanswered because its assailants find it to be unanswerable.—I am, Mr. Editor, in loyalty to truth, yours faithfully,

"THE AUTHOR OF 'THE CRY OF CHRISTENDOM.'"

(From the Church Advocate, Sept. 1st, 1889.)

These proposals—designated as "challenges" by some readers—were not accepted by "the reviewer."

My Hibernian critic has not been alone. Some curious literary gems have appeared on this side of the Channel, and on both sides of the Tweed. It will suffice to glance at a few.

One writer, who appropriates and dishonours the venerated name of North Britain, issued a coarse and flippant slander on "The Cry." The tone of this ebullition was so peculiar that a sober reader described it as the outcome of "sour temper and—" a potent excitor which I need not name, though I regret that our modern Athens should produce anything in the name of religious criticism, to which such a remark could possibly apply. From this angry scold I gather one distinct utterance deserving notice. He alleged of "The Cry": "It professes to show that a great part of the fabric of Anglican theology is based upon admitted error, but beyond a somewhat violent criticism of this doctrine, the work has little to offer to its readers."
To this I reply—1st. Every reader can see that out of two hundred pages dealing with the present condition of Christendom, the distinctive claims of all the Churches, the Scripture testimony, the writings of “the Fathers,” and a large variety of relative topics, less than ten pages are given to the position, “the Orders and the Sacraments of the Church of England.” 2nd. There is not in all these pages a single sentence or expression of “violent criticism,” or anything unfair or uncharitable towards professors of Anglican theology. 3rd. The strongest and saddest remarks concerning the English Established Church given in this section, are those of eminent Churchmen and Evangelical clergymen, including the most decidedly “Protestant” of all the Bishops, and all enthusiastically loyal to their Church!

I commend my Scotch reviewer, to the Shorter Catechism and the ninth Commandment.

It is a great relief to turn to a monitor of a more Christian spirit than the last, although I have to endure hardness, after the bestowment of affluous commendation.

The Christian Age first made me blush by expressions of cordial approval, and then covered me with a wet blanket of extinguishing reproof.

Having endorsed all that I urged against war, and what the writer is kind enough to describe as my “earnest, powerful pleadings for practical Christian philanthropy,” and able protests against “Sacramentarianism,” the Age turns a new leaf with me.

“In his views of the Lord’s Supper,” it is declared, “we have no sympathy. His accusations against Dr. Dale of Birmingham are, in our judgment, wholly groundless. Dr. Dale, we believe, is right, and the author of this book is wrong.”

This sounds oracular. But is it criticism? How many students of the New Testament record did the writer expect to convince,
and how many arguments and criticisms against Sacramentalism did he expect to annihilate by this dictum? And if in my "able protests against Sacramentalism" this critic is "one with" me, as he declares, then how can he make out that Dr. Dale is right and I am wrong? Again, I should like to ask him the exact force and purport of his description of my remarks as "accusations against Dr. Dale"?

"Accusations"! What does he mean? I shall not charge so amiable a writer with a wilful attempt at malignant suggestion. But if I do not complain of a breach of charity, I must protest against an abuse of the English language. My so-called "accusations" are simply quotations of Dr. Dale's own published words. Does this writer mean to allege that I have invented them? Has he read the book, which he professes to defend against my misrepresentations?

Dr. Dale—I may remark—is my highly esteemed brother minister and personal friend. I shall not attribute to him the follies and fallacies of his unbidden defenders. It is not by such process I expect him to answer for himself. But the more sincerely I admire and love him, the more earnestly I must desire that his eminent gifts and great influence may not be devoted to promoting the delusions of Patristic Mysticism.¹

It is very sad to find that our most serious attempts to discuss the most sacred subjects are liable to become occasions of "offence," by reason of the deplorable habit of disputants and dogmatists to evade cogent arguments, and endeavour to excite prejudice, instead of attempting disproof.

This depressing feeling weighs heavily on my heart, while I turn from the Christian Age, to the Sword and Trowel. I am very unwilling to believe that the remarks on my little book,
which appeared in this periodical in July last, came from the hand of my long-loved friend, the reputed Editor.

They are unworthy of him. I would gladly learn that they are due to a scrap writer or scissors-boy employed in the office, for providing short notices and selections, when editorial articles or critical reviews, cannot find space.

But, as the name of "Mr. Spurgeon" has been quoted against me, in connection with these remarks, I must of course admit his sanction, while with most sincere personal regard I frankly canvass them, as his.

The opening sentence in this notice, led me to doubt its being Mr. Spurgeon's. It is as follows: "Our author's protest against Popery and Sacramentarianism leads him so far that he discards both Baptism and the Lord's Supper." I affirm in reply that this judgment must have been delivered without any critical examination of my book. It is an offhand way of dismissing the question, rather than a discriminating analysis of my arguments.

I venture to think that no intelligent and unprejudiced reader could peruse my pages, and then account for my conclusions regarding the Sacraments, as the writer of this notice attempts to do.

The tone and structure of the work, directly disprove such a judgment. My brief examination of the Romish and other Sacramental theories, is as distinct from my analysis of the Scripture testimony regarding Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as it could be if it had been a separate treatise. And my conclusion as to the aggregate of the Scripture testimony (historically confirmed by the early Patristic evidence) is as independent of the previous argument, as though "Popery and Sacramentarianism" had never been invented. If my good brother Spurgeon, or any other "Christian critic," will undertake to refute
my views regarding "Baptism and the Lord's Supper," he shall have my candid and serious attention. But he must accomplish his purpose by other means than raising a false alarm, about overdoing, or going too far, in a "protest against Popery," &c.

I invite criticism and proof, on the Scripture evidence.¹ The brief notice of the Sacramental systems of Christendom, presented in my book, was designed to awaken interest in the Scripture testimony, as the only proper way of testing those systems.

"The protest against Popery," of which my critic speaks, has been a familiar subject for over fifty years of public ministry, during which I have had frequent discussion with eminent Roman Catholics, including a noble Oxford pervert, specially appointed as English champion of the Papacy, by the late Pope; and I am thankful to say that in all this experience, I have not known an instance of angry excitement or breach of good feeling, as the result of free and fair discussion.

But my recent publication has resulted from investigation of Scripture, altogether apart from the Romish controversy, or any other controversy, and was decided on, ultimately, in consequence of the propagation of unscriptural notions amongst Protestant Nonconformists. So much explanation, to counteract misapprehension of facts. My Sword and Trowel critic, declares that he does not "see any force in the arguments by which" I support my views.

Had he read through my analysis of the New Testament record, when he wrote this? If so I need only reply—"None so blind as those who will not see!"

Again, he says, "It seems impossible to erase these two in-

¹ Appendix, Note P.
structive rites, from the teaching and example of our Lord and His Apostles."

It is to be hoped that he would not do anything so foolish and profane, even if he could.

It may also be suggested that such an attempt could not avail for much in the present case; as "The Cry of Christendom" prominently states (p. 75), "it must be distinctly affirmed that Baptism and the Lord's Supper were certainly observed, with the sanction of our Lord and His Apostles."

Our friend must have thought it important to declare against erasure; but possibly the question of interpolation would be more germane to our discussion, though this does not seem to have occurred to him.

The reviewer's final blow (more "sword" than "trowel")—the killing coup de grace—was delivered in an orthodox innuendo.

"We dare not," he declares, "be wiser than what is written."

Of course not!

We dare not; but of course this is what "our Author" must be accused of.

Did the writer intend to insinuate that I had disregarded the Scripture record, and spun a theory out of my own fancy?

That would be, indeed, a down-grade style of religious controversy, of which I should like to think Mr. Spurgeon incapable.

But whoever may be accountable, we are bound, in the interests of Truth, to test this grand Evangelical "non possumus."

Here is strong, open, common ground, on which Reviewer and Author may, in good faith, cheerfully come to close quarters. "Dare not be wiser than what is written"! Let us see.

I point out (pp. 79-85) that neither Peter nor James nor
Paul, could find in the famous commission (Matt. xxviii. 19) the ordinance of Baptism, as a permanent institution for all Gentile converts, which modern Baptists and baptizers profess to discover there; 1 and that Peter, when on his defence regarding his forward movement, did not remember this commission, though he did remember other "words of the Lord Jesus," which pointed the other way.

Now here, surely, the folly of being "wise above what is written," may be alleged by the Baptists against the Apostles, or by the Apostles against the Baptists, but, not by either party, against me.

I have neither added nor suppressed, nor attempted to explain away anything in the record; and if Baptists and baptizers hold that a certain portion of holy Scripture ought to teach what Apostles agreed in intimating that it does not teach, then without any disrespect to the Baptists and baptizers I am constrained to take sides with the Apostles, as the more competent judges.

Further:—In this connection I have noted that the council or conference at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 28) did not include the Sacraments, amongst the "necessary things" enjoined on Gentile converts.

Will Sacramentarians allege that they were enjoined, or that they were not deemed as "necessary," as abstinence from

---

1 An esteemed friend, a man of bright intelligence and respectable scholarship, on being asked, as a baptizer, to account for this, promptly replied (as doubtless many others would do, on the first brush of the question), "Oh, the commission was not yet on record!"

Of course, the obvious reply was that Peter and James must have heard it; and that Peter remembered other "words of the Lord Jesus," which were not yet on record.

Thus the proof, against the baptisinal claim, is rendered direct and conclusive.
“things strangled,” &c? Or how will they acquit the Apostles of culpable oversight or fatal error, in this omission?

Again—at the formation of the first Church of the Gentiles—when the name of “Christians,” had its origin; and in connection with the subsequent history and the extensive mission of that Church, there is no record of baptism or any other Sacrament.

In Peter’s provision for the well-being of the Church after his decease, the Sacraments are as conspicuous by their absence as are the Papacy and the confessional (2 Peter i. 15). In Paul’s Apostolical succession, set forth to decide “how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God” (1 Tim. iii. 15), and in all his writing and teaching as “the Apostle of the Gentiles,” the Sacraments find no place, when in the nature of things, by logical and moral necessity, they must have been mentioned, if it had been in his mission to ordain them.

When we go with Paul to Rome and study the record of his two years’ labour there, or when we follow him to Galatia and Ephesus, and from Jerusalem round about to Illyricum—if we ask him, again and again—“Where are the Sacraments?”—while echo answers “Where!”—he answers, “Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the Gospel.”

I now take leave to ask my kind critic, who is it that attempts to “be wiser than what is written”? Do not Sacramentarians\(^1\) require a supplement to the New Testament?

\(^1\) It is important to note an ambiguity in some criticisms, arising from the modern use of the word “Sacramentarian.”

In the era of the Reformation controversy, this word (sometimes written “Sacramentary”) was applied to those who maintained what is now designated the “Evangelical” view of the Sacrament, in its mnemonic and spiritual significance. It described “those who reject the doctrine of the real presence, as taught in the Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches.”

But now it is applied to all those (including modern Anglicans) who hold these extreme views.
Luke and Peter and Paul and James and John are not enough for them. These writers have left out what they should have supplied, for the Sacramental Code.¹

Peter—though he had a hangover after Jewish ordinances—yet agreed with the others, in deciding that "no such thing" should be enjoined upon "the Gentiles who believe" (Acts xxi. 25).

Paul—who should have formulated the rites and ceremonies, to which "the Gentiles were to be made obedient in word and deed"—has not a word about them, unless they were included in the "divers washings and carnal ordinances," which he repudiates and condemns.

The whole New Testament record, regarding the spread of the Gospel throughout the heathen world, affords no more information about baptistries and fonts, consecrated elements, and communion services, than it does concerning holy water, priests' orders, and transubstantiation.

The silence regarding "the two ordinances," is as significant, suggestive, and conclusive as the most explicit pronouncement for their exclusion could be.

The Apostolical Paraleipomena, would make a welcome volume, for ritualistic zealots. It would unfold the art of what my Baptist critic aptly designates as "religious witchcraft." But such a volume could be introduced in Ecclesiastical literature, only as "the Sacramentarian Apocrypha"; and until it appears, I

Modern controversialists have, in fact, made this word a pervert, and reversed its early confession.

Thus one of my critics heartily endorses my protests against "Sacramentarianism," while strongly protesting against my "views of the Lord's Supper." Whether my views be right or wrong, it is important to guard against confusion and ambiguity.

¹ Appendix, Note Q.
may reiterate my demand—*On which side is the attempt made “to be wiser than what is written”?*

Seriously, and in all Christian affection, I urge my critic to study the New Testament, before offering his reply.

[Here I must crave the indulgence of my readers, while I insert a few lines of apologetic egotism. I do so, in good faith, in order to prevent misunderstanding, and “to let brotherly love continue.”]

It is a new thing for me to find myself in disputation with a Baptist brother. During a long term of public Ministry, both as a Congregational Pastor, and as a representative of home and foreign Missionary Societies and other Christian Institutions, while enjoying the privilege of pleasant co-operation with ministers and members of different denominations, I have had more opportunities of *free and neighbourly service*, with Baptists, than with any other body, or perhaps more than with all others put together. It has been so, during my whole public life. Even before my ordination to the Ministry (which was performed just fifty-one years ago, by five or six bishops, of the New Testament order, and several assistants), while only a college “student,” I was required, on an emergency, to take part in a special anniversary service, with Baptist friends.

The incident in some way affected my future course, and has had its counterpart in each of my successive spheres of labour.

My good brother Spurgeon paid his first visit to Brighton, over thirty years ago, to preach in my pulpit at Queen Square, for a neighbouring Baptist minister, who, on a special occasion, desired the use of a larger building than his own, for “the young popular preacher,” whom it was my privilege to introduce, and to assist in the public service.

Both before and since I came to hold the views advanced in my “Cry,” I have freely worked with and for Baptist friends.
without disregarding their conscientious convictions or compromising my own.

Happily there is broad and sacred ground on which we can stand together; and without raising any question of difference, I could find full scope for urging the *Scriptural views of spiritual communion*, which I rejoice to know that my Baptist brethren sincerely cherish.

My abandonment of the practice of baptism with water, does not alienate me from those who baptise in water, or from any who may either choose or refuse to be either sprinkled or dipped.

I am, in fact, "of the same mind" toward Christian brethren and fellow-workers, as I have always been. Without contention, and in love of Truth, I shall be ready to give an answer, if they desire to question me, concerning anything I have recently written; and—either with or without such reference—to help and serve them, in the Ministry, if I can.

In this latitudinarianism of brotherly love, I desire neither to wound conscience, nor to be "wise above what is written." And if "the Unity of the Spirit" be broken—by the grace of God—the act shall not be mine.]

Of course I desire to commend to others what I think I have discovered of the Divine will in Christianity.

My sacred friendship for those from whom I am compelled to differ, and my grateful appreciation of their noble service in time past, to Evangelical Truth and religious liberty, make me all the more anxious for their future usefulness and spiritual prosperity.

I desire for them nothing worse and nothing less than a full participation in the Apostolic ministry.

But, can any of them imagine the Apostle Paul, as willing to be known and designated as "a Baptist minister"? Should not his successors, as teachers of the Gentiles, participate and
.perpetuate his mission—"not to baptize; but to preach the Gospel"?

Was not this, evidently, Paul's conception of the will and ordinance of Christ? And if not through him, how and whence have modern ministers, in Gentile nations, derived their Sacramental patents?

It is one of the sad facts of present-day Christendom, that many "faithful ministers of Jesus Christ"—some of them "able ministers of the New Testament"—so far wilfully forfeit their high calling and misrepresent their mission to the intelligence of mankind, as to make themselves known as Baptists—dippers; or sprinklers; as if their Gospel were a mystic system of hydropathy.

Surely they do not intend to teach that a cleric's dipping in a baptistry, or sprinkling from a font, can be any more sacred, spiritual, religious, than the similar performance of a bather or a laundress.

Why then do they disguise their own purpose and puzzle the people, by continuing to appropriate a ridiculous and misleading title?

Their supreme desire is to preach the Gospel; to expound holy Scripture; to unfold and enforce the lessons, the privileges and duties of the Christian life. Doubtless some of them would be willing to suffer even unto death, in the service of Christ and for the salvation of souls.

Yet with a strange infatuation to names and forms, which some of them find to be sadly injurious and effectual hindrances to their Christian work, they keep up, as of sacred obligation, the legacy of a past age of bitter sectarian conflict, and so far, alas! merge their Christianity in conscientious loyalty to a modern tradition!

As ministers and messengers of Christ to the nations, they
announce themselves as water-workers! They claim to be Performers in Water, leaving it to human imagination to conjecture what is performed.

Some early Sacramentarians led scoffing infidels to rail at them for imitating the Pagans, and to designate Jesus Christ, as the great Magician, who introduced new mysteries.

The warning has been recorded through the centuries; and it is needed even now.

A word for the "Cry of Christendom" comes down through the ages:—"Thus saith the Lord, Take ye away the stumbling-blocks out of the way of my people."

It will be a blessed day for the Christian Church, in all nations, when the myriad of earnest, loving souls, who now mar their own work, as Evangelists—by instituting and administering carnal ordinances—shall be led so clearly to apprehend "the dispensation of the Spirit," and the nature of the human soul, as to renounce and repudiate, for ever, all pretence and imitation of Sacramental Magic.¹

I must offer a few remarks on another notice, which I desire distinctly to exclude from the number of hostile criticisms. It would be very ungrateful of me to omit this discrimination, though I have one complaint to make.

It seems to be a rule with religious reviewers, first to cheer and praise an author, and then to administer a humbling draught, lest he should be puffed up by his fleshly mind. Perhaps this is both wise and kind.

My reviewer in the *Methodist Magazine* of December last, tried to observe this rule; but almost failed through generous emotion; as he had so many good words to say that he did not keep sufficient space for the necessary drawback.

¹ Appendix, Note 8.
The writer kindly describes one part of "The Cry," as "the most powerful and useful part"; declares the remarks in another place to be "both generous and just"—other portions as "very striking"—"very weighty," &c.

He observes that "the perilous proximity of Dr. Dale's doctrine of the Lord's Supper—as given in his manual—to that of Canon Liddon, is shown by the near parallelism of their phraseology." To this statement I certainly cannot object.

My one ground of complaint is, not that the writer comes at length, to what he regards as "the weak part of the book"; but that he has said so little about it.

He affirms that "the weak part is that in which the Quaker contention is maintained"; but he does not add a word, to enable me to discover wherein the weakness consists. Of course reviewers cannot be fairly expected to write treatises for reviews; but it is terribly disappointing, to receive only bare unexplained sentences of dismissal, when honestly anxious to be thoroughly criticised. This is my ungracious complaint here. The gentle censure, is not made effective, by exposition, evidence, argument, or proof.

I regret that so generous a critic should make the rather indecorous sling at "the Quaker contention," and I must add that in this he has simply guessed a mistake.

I have not maintained or adopted any "Quaker contention." I had never read any work, on the distinctive principles of the Society of Friends, when my work was prepared for the press. Although I have had a friendly acquaintance with Friends, yet I never had even a conversation with any of them on these subjects, until after I had uttered my "Cry."

This may have arisen from their delicate courtesy, toward an ordained Sacramentarian Minister; or it may be regarded as evidence of their unaggressive, unproselytising quietism.
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Be that as it may, I have to add, that in any "Quaker" works, which I have recently seen, I have not found any discussion on lines similar to those adopted in my work; or any sustained exposition, which I could have appropriated, had I been disposed to do so.

I have been as free from all sectarian considerations in this instance, as formerly in compiling a "Primer of New Testament Church Principles," which has been widely used by Baptists and Congregationalists.

My analysis of the New Testament record, is as independent and completely my own, as though a "Quaker contention" had never been heard of; and my "appeal to all the Churches," is addressed to Methodists, Independents, and all who habitually preach and "reason out of the Scriptures" as Paul did (Acts xvii. 2), rather than to the more undemonstrative and non-resistant "people called Quakers."

But it is no dishonour to be classed with the Society of Friends. If I can be correctly so distinguished, in consequence of my book, I may certainly be glad and thankful to find myself in such good company.

If, indeed, my conclusions—drawn from holy Scripture—harmonise with their distinctive principles, I may hope to be a welcome witness to their responsibility, or a thorn in their side, to stimulate them to zealous and faithful witness-bearing for Christ.

It will not be the first time in their history, should they be honoured to take first rank in "the noble army of martyrs," against the forces of dominant superstition and sectarianism.

This were a consummation, devoutly to be wished.

I thankfully take the hint of my unknown Methodist friend, and close these friendly skirmishes, by expressing the fervent hope that we may soon have a true revival of Christ's Chris-
tianity in all the Churches, and that "the Friends" may be led to assert their hereditary right, and take their proper place, in awaking and educating a true Christian sentiment of antagonism to all the exploits and pretences of materialising anti-christian Sacerdotalism.

The first edition of "The Cry" was issued anonymously, not from any cowardly unfaithfulness to conviction, but for reasons which I hope my readers will approve.

I did not consult any brother ministers, because those with whom I have been most closely associated as a Congrega-tionalist—though they do not often demonstrate, as Sacramen-tarians—yet are generally understood to hold to the two "ordinances"—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. I felt that it would be unfair to involve my theme in any question of personal friendship, or to ask for an opinion, which I could not adopt if it were against my going to press.

I therefore decided to put my little work before the public, in a way that would keep criticism and discussion, strictly on their proper lines, without any reference to denominational or personal considerations.

I expected to find out, in this way, how far Congregationalists and other Nonconformists must be classed as Sacramen-tarians.

In this, and on other points, I have been somewhat dis-appointed, by what has been described as "a conspiracy of silence."

But as I have now to come to words with my critics, I must accept my responsibility, without assuming any further dis-guise; and desiring only to be regarded by earnest Christians all round, as a "fellow-helper to the Truth."

Alexander King.
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"The Lord will be a refuge for the oppressed;
A refuge, in times of trouble."

"He also, will hear their cry:
And will save them."

When wilt thou save the people?
Oh, God of mercy—When!
Not dynasties, but nations;
Not thrones or crowns, but men!
THE

CRY OF CHRISTENDOM.

CHAPTER I.

CHRISTENDOM AND CHRISTIANITY.

"Lift up a standard for the people."

"The poor have rights;
And power, in all its pride, is less than justice."

He has been justly styled "a noble Roman"—who, long ago, exclaimed "I am a Man! Nothing concerning humanity do I consider foreign to me."1 Saint Augustine is said to have related that the audience who listened to this philanthropic utterance, responded, so that the theatre re-echoed their applause.

Every true man must sympathize with that response; and every true Christian will emphasize the accord; because religion inspires the truest enthusiasm of humanity.

1 "Homo sum! humani nihil a me alienum puto."—Ter.
THE CRY OF CHRISTENDOM.

The Christian revelation, alone, enables man to form an adequate conception of man; and to realize human aspirations and human wants, the humiliation and the dignity of the race, in his individual consciousness and life.

If the Roman poet whose sentiment we have appropriated, were living in our time, with what fervent aspiration might he repeat his noble words, contemplating

THE PRESENT CONDITION OF CHRISTENDOM,

and its relations to the world of mankind!

Here, if anywhere, we may behold, in vivid light, the grand and awful attributes of our common human kinship, under the influence and responsibilities of Christian civilization.

God is making Christendom the University of a larger world than the ancients knew; and while science and art and enterprise are drawing students from all tribes and peoples, to throng our porches and scan our curriculum, the ghosts of the dead centuries are gathering round our modern life, to admonish us of our probation, and to warn us of our doom.

What we are, we are, not for ourselves alone, but for "light and leading," or for misleading and betrayal, and curse and woe unutterable, to countless millions of our fellow-men.

Our high position in the world, and our influence among the nations outside Christendom, involve results
and obligations, of which we cannot divest ourselves by indifference and neglect.

The philosophy of history is a revelation of Divine Providence and Government to humanity, and of humanity to itself.

Its most interesting chapter, for us, is the one we have now opened, and its first lesson is that we are all, individually, in vital union with the aggregate life of Christendom. Our subject, therefore, includes our destiny and ourselves.

INQUIRY AND PROOF.

Can we ascertain how far Christendom is really Christian? Or how may it be demonstrated that Christendom demonstrates the Divine origin of Christianity?

These are solemnly important inquiries, demanding the serious consideration of all honest men, and our line of investigation will be clear to every candid reader.

In order to the right conduct of the inquiry, it is essential to ascertain the distinctive attributes and claims of

---

1 Every student of Universal History knows something of the centuries of social and national development which raised old Europe to pre-eminence and power, and by which the older civilizations were drawn from their African and Asiatic homes to minister to her greatness.

The responsibility of modern Christian Europe must be measured by the vastness of the treasures of which she has so long enjoyed the use and stewardship.
ORIGINAL CHRISTIANITY.

Christianity was originally revealed to men as a Gospel of Peace. In the glowing morning of its mission it shone upon the nations with heavenly light; proclaimed itself as "the kindness and philanthropy of God;" and promised to promote "peace on earth, and goodwill amongst men."

All its lessons, precepts, promises, tended to the formation of a human brotherhood of souls, delivered from spiritual bondage; turned from darkness to light; reconciled to God, through His beloved Son, the Mediator and Divine Elder Brother of our race; and thus made children of God, and dealt with as fellow-heirs of all the blessings of an eternal inheritance of righteousness and peace.

That such was the claim and character of primitive Christianity has been attested by the most unimpeachable witnesses; from the secular historians of Pagan Rome, to the astute and hostile critics of modern times. Even those who argue—from perversions and abuses—against its Divine origin, and whose power to assail it has been nurtured by some of its benign influences, are constrained to do homage to its pristine purity and superhuman virtue.

The very fanaticism of some of the early Christians embodied the most wonderful moral heroism ever known amongst men. The martyr frenzy that sometimes courted death, was but a distorted evidence of the power of faith in the future life.
THE CHRISTIAN NATIONS.

The untutored followers of the despised Nazarene attained to a glorious victory, over self and the world, which heathen philosophy could not produce.

They loved their enemies, and conquered by suffering. They were invincible through patient continuance in well-doing and the “charity” that “endureth all things.”

The proud unbelief of Jews and Greeks, and the persecuting hostility of Imperial Paganism, were vanquished, not by human policy or prowess, but “by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left.”

The Christendom of our times presents, in many ways, a sad and humbling contrast to this living picture of living, primitive Christianity. Let us look at

THE CHRISTIAN NATIONS,
our own and others. What are the distinctive features of modern Christian civilization, as exhibited in national habits, and in the principal enterprises of national life?

In the exercise of calm, Christian, common sense, let us consider our prevalent national policies, our most expensive national enterprises, our commerce, our armaments, our alliances, our attitude and influence toward other portions of mankind, regarded as outside the pale of Christendom.
Let us seriously contemplate these subjects in the light of Divine Christianity, and try to associate the other Christian nations with ourselves, in a sober review of our common history, and a just estimate of our position in the world.

Can we do this, and not be smitten with shame and horror? Can we continue the study, and continue to pride ourselves upon a self-righteous participation in systematic wrong-doing—deliberate, persistent, aggravated sin?

The unveiled vision is appalling!

The leading nations of Europe, even when in friendly alliance, are pitted against one another, in eager competition, on all the lines of avarice and ambition, in pursuit of wealth and power.

When balancing their several interests, by intriguing diplomacy, professing amicable relations, and pledging one another to keep the peace of the world, they are but Rivals in the Art of War!

The Toiling Populations, who produce the national wealth, are, for the most part, ground down under enormous burdens of taxation, in hopeless poverty and debasing ignorance, while the produce of their labour is squandered in exploits, inventions, and preparations for slaying their fellow-men.

The pomp and glitter of State pageantry, and even the awful sanctions of religion, are freely and ingeniously employed, to disguise the brutality of war, and
CHRISTIAN MILITARISM.

to confer the highest honours that can be bestowed by “Christian” sovereigns, “Christian” parliaments, and admiring “Christian” peoples, upon trained and professional men-killers, who are ready to risk their own lives in efforts to kill others, who have done them no wrong.

Yet these people, all round, call Jesus “Lord,” and do not protest or blush when He is named “the Prince of Peace!”

CHRISTIAN MILITARISM.

An appalling manifestation of the war mania now dominant in Europe, has recently been placed before the public from official sources. From this it appears that, “during the past eighteen years, the armies of the Continental Powers have assumed proportions such as were never dreamed of, at any era, in the previous history of the world.”

The present military preparations of Germany, France, Russia, Austria, Italy, Turkey and the Balkan Provinces, are given; showing in the aggregate: “War strength, 10,480,000 men; Second reserves, 8,335,000; Final reserves, 9,195,000. Of these, about 2,800,000 are now actually with the colours.”

“Over 28 millions of Europeans, all in the prime of manhood, are liable to expose their lives in the next great war. More than two-thirds of these are at present engaged in civil pursuits; but war might drag every one of them from the office, the field, and the workshop; and thus, at a few hours’ notice, the commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests
of half Europe might be paralysed, by the withdrawal of all the best and most active workers."

The annual cost of these armies exceeds £120,000,000. The preparations for the great war, that is still to come, have cost over £1,500,000,000 sterling.

Details are given, showing that one and another of these "Christian" Powers could bring to the frontier, or place on the territory of its neighbour, within three days, 200,000 or 230,000 fighting men; at the end of a week, 700,000 or 750,000; and so the "peace footing" of Christendom is explained. Surely "it is no exaggeration to speak of Europe as an armed camp." And the world is regarding it in this light.¹

¹ The ears of Christendom might well tingle at the moral verdict of observant heathens. In his "Gifford Lectures," at the Glasgow University (as recently reported), Professor Max Müller made a statement to the following effect:—

A representative Japanese statesman had asked him to suggest, or recommend, "a new religion" for the Japanese people, who are rapidly adopting Western civilization, and require a new religion with it. He added, emphatically, "It must not be Christianity," as it is too political a religion for Japan. The Japanese people and their rulers have learned from the intrigues of Jesuitism, and from the exploits and encroachment of Protestant Powers in commercial treaties and otherwise, to judge and reject the religion of Christendom!

The Professor could not plead for Christianity, while "Europe is an armed camp," and we seem, in some respects, to be living "before, rather than after, the opening of the Christian era."

Professor Max Müller appropriately added: "Christendom requires not a new religion, but a renewed religion."

How solemnly we are admonished to labour and pray for a revival of true Christianity!
CHRISTIAN MILITARISM.

Even in England the fever spreads. "More ships, more guns, more money," are called for, as if we were expecting the Continental Powers to invade us, while they are arming to the teeth against one another.

This is the most striking aspect of our Christian civilization, presented for the education of the nations; and they are more than ever ready to learn. Disciples of Mahomet, of Confucius, and of Buddha, are forward to interrogate our Christianity, about the processes by which it has produced our Christendom.

Every Christian conscience must tremble to think what may be the result of these inquiries. True, these strangers may learn some things about our superiority in economic and material operations; in arts of government and commercial enterprise. But it is fearfully possible that their principal discovery may be that "the powers" of Christendom are powers of avarice and aggression; a pre-eminence of brute force, and unequalled ambition, for the subjugation of their fellow-men.

Do they not know, moreover, that this red-handed Christendom—while armed for fratricidal conflict—raises a shrill of horror, at the tribal quarrels and slave-catching raids of African savages; and sends philanthropists, missionaries, and soldiers, to win "the dark continent," for Christian civilization!

Who can wonder if apostles of peace are laughed at, and our boasted zeal for human progress and human rights is sometimes regarded as a sham philanthropy,
to throw a disguise of respectability over schemes of selfish ambition?

A revival of the Divine life and moral heroism of Christianity, is necessary, to rescue us from complicity, in centuries of crime, against the outraged and long-suffering people, whose cry ascends to God for retribution and release.

Can a Christian contemplate the condition of Christendom with complacency? Can any one hear unmoved, the wail of the oppressed nations, and then blaspheme humanity, by venturing to say, with the Roman poet, "I am a Man!"

Europe stands as in the shade of a volcano; and readers of the daily newspapers learn that a trivial incident, or a petty infraction of frontier regulations, may precipitate a bloody conflict between "the leading Powers."

SUFFERING PEOPLE AND HELPLESS CHURCHES.

The conscript millions of armed men and their weeping wives and children, who tremble for the call to the battlefield, have heard of a Christianity which prophesied—"Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." But alas! that Christian promise is not fulfilled to them. The divided and incriminated Churches of our time are powerless to prevent the dreaded explosion.

When prelates, priests, and parsons have blessed the banners of bloodshed, and invoked the God of battles, they are not competent to act as ministers of
SUFFERING PEOPLE AND HELPLESS CHURCHES.

peace. If any of them attempt a perfunctory criticism of any gross atrocity, or egregious blunder, in the routine of a nation's butchering business, the military leaders may retort with cynical scorn, "Physician, heal thyself." "First cast the beam out of thine own eye!" 1

1 At this most inopportune juncture, a formidable pronouncement has been issued against the hopes and efforts of the friends of peace.

A Pope, who was thought to be wise and prudent, succeeded one whose extravagant pretensions and fatal blunders were believed to have afforded lessons of salutary warning. The new Pontiff abstained at first from all attempts to republish and execute his predecessor's famous anti-liberal syllabus.

He became famous by a conciliating diplomacy, and instead of denouncing Protestant rulers as arch-heretics, who inherited from wretches, whom his predecessors of blessed memory had anathematized and deposed, in centuries gone by, but still remembered, he became their most gracious and gratified friend and contemporary celebrity, in the interchange of compliments and felicitations, which led some to imagine that he meant to invite their co-operation in some grand enterprise of peace and goodwill.

Alas! for human hopes. The Pope desires to be a King! As has recently been stated in a public print, "he asks for an independent temporal sovereignty, which he must know could not be secured for him without revolution, rebellion, and bloodshed." This last of the Popes wishes for a royal court and an army and their uses, as Vicar of Jesus Christ!

As officially urged on 2000 Italian priests, lately presented to "his Holiness," they are to agitate for the temporal power of the Papacy, in order "to spread the flame of truth, and the better to bind the hearts of Italians to Christ and the Pope." Whether these gentlemen are "spreading the flame" of treason, and testing the patience of the Italian Government, it is not for us to inquire. But this ill-advised Papal movement is like going over to the enemy on the eve of a great battle. It is made terribly plain to the afflicted and overburdened nations, that they are not to have the Pope's aid in seeking to reverse or reform the mad war policy that threatens to desolate some of them, and to impose overwhelming burdens on them all.

Some long-lived abuses refuse to be reformed.
The fashionable crowds who have been entertained by the *Te Deum*, for victory and slaughter, will applaud the champions of national honour, and while comedy and tragedy are thus alternated, at the national expense, the groaning industrious masses have to bear the burden, to pay their taxes, and to shed their blood.

"One murder marks th' assassin's odious name;
But millions damn the hero into fame!"

This is the lamentable result, the outward and visible sign, of our decrepit Christian civilization, on the eve of the last decade of the nineteenth century of the era of grace.

Will not God hear the cry of Christendom? Oh, for a revival of divine Christianity! Wherefore should the heathen say, "Where is now their God?"

When we turn from the reeking shambles of military glory, to study more decorous or less revolting expressions of our fashionable sentiments, the question arises, ever and anon—"Is there in Christendom any ruling and abiding recognition of God?"

PAST AND PRESENT.

Has the religion that rescued humanity from moral chaos in the olden time lost its power? Or have the Christian nations forfeited their faith?

Where is the Christianity that turned Greece from her classic mythology, that rescued barbarians from
savageism, and won Imperial Rome, from idolatry and ferocity, through the ministry of martyrs, of fishermen and artisans, and by implanting a noble manhood in the life of slaves?

Has that Christianity forsaken our civilization, or proved ineffectual to rule our modern life?

Doubtless there are fruits of faith and evidences of intelligent and honest piety to be seen amongst us, for which we should be thankful, and by which even observant heathens might be edified.

Noble and glorious instances of Christian heroism and self-sacrificing devotion to principle, frequently flash out from the darkness of our conventional firmament, and shed a dazzling light upon the high places of ecclesiastical formalism and fashionable frivolity. In many places, thank God! both among the high-born, and in the unrecorded ways of the children of ill-paid toil, a true Evangel and living Eucharist of humble piety and practical goodness bear witness for God, and prove that He has not forsaken us.

But in busy public life, in social customs, in national policy and international relations, Christian principle is not allowed to rule.

Christianity is fashionably and formally recognized, while its spirit and its practical precepts are habitually ignored.

Multitudes of the people, of all ranks and classes, manifest a practical alienation from the Gospel;
while some of them, alas! openly reject and defiantly blaspheme it!¹

It must be confessed with shame and sorrow that Christendom is, in many respects, unchristian. Here is

A DARK PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED.

How may we account for the contrast which we have noticed and deplored? Can we trace the process by which Christendom as it is, has become the representative or result of the original Christianity? And is there an available philosophy of facts, to decide the question whether this modern Christendom is the lawful heir to the Divine Founder of our faith, and the real

¹ Not only in Protestant countries, where abuses of religious liberty sometimes manifest themselves in absolute irreligion, but within the Roman enclosures, also, startling evidences of the utter loss of power by the Church indicate the decay of all religious sentiment.

Several of the Roman Catholic bishops in their replies to the late Pope's proposal regarding the decree on the Immaculate Conception lament "the loss of souls," and describe "numbers both in Germany and Italy (about France it was superfluous to speak), who call themselves Catholic Christians, but have in fact either cast off all faith in God, or have abandoned themselves to absolute religious indifferentism."

"There is," they remark, "a sufficient number of Catholics in Europe, but, alas! perhaps the greater part do not from the heart believe even the articles of faith necessary to salvation."

With a faithfulness and solemn earnestness, which ought to have awakened inquiry and arrested the progress of fatuity, they demanded—"What avails it to establish that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived without spot, when it is not believed that Jesus is the Son of God?"

The condition of the nations, once styled "most Catholic" and "most Christian," sadly demonstrates the absence of true living Christianity.
A DARK PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED.

Inheritance of humanity, from the ministry of Jesus Christ?

Let us study, and inquire, and judge, in a Christian spirit. If we would serve and help our fellow-men whom we believe to be in error or suffering wrong, we must regard them with true sympathy and with a frank recognition of their rights.

Our Christian philanthropy must not be a proud Pharisaic pity, that might soon become aversion or contempt, but a sincere goodwill, which may grow into a Christlike charity, the likeness and offspring of His love to us.

Estrangement from Christ, is the deep, sad, fruitful cause of the manifold evils of Christendom; and those evils cannot be cured until He is recognized and trusted, loved and obeyed, as the all-sufficient friend and Saviour, consoler and guide of human souls. The alienation of the masses of the people from the Churches and their ministry, is the most alarming fact of modern history. To ascertain the occasion and reasons of this alienation should be the anxious desire of all who profess the Christian name. An honest effort in this direction would herald a Divine Eirenikon to allay the strifes and heal the wounds of Christendom.

All the Churches, Eastern, Western, Roman and Reformed, should seriously and penitently help one another in this holy work, instead of lavishing their resources in building a modern Babel, on the foundation which was laid by Christ, for the Temple of Universal Peace.
Why have the Christian nations so generally turned their backs upon their several Churches? Are the Churches in any way chargeable with the guilt of destroying souls, for whom Christ died? How have they lost touch with the needy, erring, burdened, anxious, suffering multitudes, whom they should and might be helping, teaching and tending, for the Shepherd and Bishop of souls?

If they commune with the loving Christ themselves, do they not know that He is still "moved with compassion towards those who faint and are scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd?" And do not their own hearts sometimes echo His loving call, urging them to go forth in His name, to seek and save the wanderers for Him? Alas! the time for seeking and saving may be very short. A time of reckoning is drawing near, and all the Churches should awake and be ready. They have long been occupying a position of stewardship, for which they must give account.

The blessed Founder of our faith, who ordained His Church to be "the light of the world," solemnly said to her, in the day of her espousals, and is now, again, by His Spirit and by His Providence repeating the appeal, "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" When He indicated the saving mission of all His true disciples, by saying, "Ye are the salt of the earth," how solemnly He expounded and applied the illustration!

"If the salt hath lost its savour, wherewith shall it
be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men.” And again, the voices of many nations murmur and mutter the terrible prophecy, that as in former days, so it may be again, and the neglected, betrayed, unsaved and exasperated people, may prove Christ to be still the faithful and true witness, by fulfilling His word, and executing His awful threat, upon false and unfaithful Churches, bearing, but dishonouring, His blessed name! These are alarming possibilities, which demand our most serious contemplation.

Let us reverently inquire—

**HOW MAY THE SAVOUR BE LOST?**

Have we any guide or satisfactory record, to enable us to understand wherein and whereby Christendom has, in any sense, “lost” the original “savour,” the purifying and saving virtue of Divine Christianity? Alas! we have. Even in the age and presence of inspired apostles, defection had begun. Some had made shipwreck of faith, and departed from the simplicity and spirituality of Christian worship.

This declension continued even in the martyr age; and in the reaction that followed in a time of prosperity and power, the floodgates of corruption opened upon the favoured, but morally enfeebled, Church.

When a Roman Emperor, claiming to rule “the world,” became a Christian, or made himself head and patron of the Christian clergy, the deteriorating process, already begun by an insidious influx of
Paganism, soon progressed with fatal rapidity. The simple model of the synagogue did not suit for an Imperial Institution. "The Church" must become more respectable, and even be, in some respects, august. It must be assimilated to the Empire.

Hence, patriarchs, archbishops, and a regulated grade of officers, and their distinctive prerogatives; like the Emperor's representatives in the government of provinces, and subjugated nations.

**PROCESS OF DETERIORATION.**

Under Imperial patronage, ambitious bishops soon learned to be intolerant dogmatists, and ruthless persecutors.

Some of them not only became warriors, but even, on occasion, successfully resisted, defeated, and humiliated, the kings and rulers who had set them up.

When the seat of Empire was removed to Constantinople, the Bishop of Rome became a sort of substitute for the absent Emperor; and in process of time, the rulers and people of the "Christian" nations, by diplomacy and intrigues in the interest of "the Church," and by the influence of successive groups of rival, ambitious, and fighting popes, were plunged into disgraceful and desolating wars.

In this state of things, what place was left for the Gospel of peace? How could the degraded and suffering nations learn, from intolerant, anathematizing, and persecuting Christian teachers, that Christianity is from the God of love?
PROTESTING AND IMITATING.

A large amount of the remnant and result of this light and life of the dark ages, is still with us.

Modern Christendom has not profited, as it ought and might have done, from the lessons and warnings of eventful centuries of its history. When awakened and chastised by the providential discipline of intolerant Mahometanism; and again, when quickened and enriched by the revival of learning, in the reaction from the heroic fanaticism of the crusades, Europe soon perverted and abused her privileges, and eventually frustrated the beneficent efforts of her noblest sons, by enslaving intellect and conscience, to clerical prerogative and dogmatic intolerance.

PROTESTING AND IMITATING.

The Protestant Reformation arose as the forlorn hope of the nations; the only resource of humanity, for the conservation of liberty and religion. It was the Divine Magna Charta, raised over the moral wreck of Christendom, to guarantee the life and rights of the rescued peoples.

But the evil spirit of intolerance, the educated and religious barbarism of the age, survived. The charter of constitutional freedom soon became the shield and shelter of wayward fancies and ambitions, which, in some cases, produced schismatical and embittered alienation, and led to the imitation and reconstruction of the usurpation, which had been overthrown.

Thus it has come to pass that Christendom exhibits, not unity in the faith and philanthropy of the Gospel
of peace; but isolation and diversity of hostile self-asserting sects.

In how many ways, alas! has the "Saviour" been lost!

GROUND OF AGREEMENT DISREGARDED.

This lamentable state of things is all the more culpable, because there is common ground for agreement, and co-operation, which remains unoccupied.

Here is an important fact, which might be written in letters of gold, if we could also record its legitimate results. Let the truth, however, be noted and remembered.

There is throughout Christendom a general assent to the claims of Christianity. We do not allege that a plebiscite of the nations would prove a majority of the populations to be Christians. But we do affirm that all sects and sections of the divided churches, agree in holding the fundamental facts and principal doctrines of a common faith.

We emphasize this position; because we hold it to be an important witness for God in the world, and a living element of hope for the future. We adduce one important illustration.

It is instructive to note that all the main elements and principal doctrines of Christianity, are held, and held in the same position of primary importance, in the religious systems of Roman Catholics and Protestants.¹

¹ See Appendix, Note A.
THE BEING AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD are, in the faith of both, the foundation of historical Christianity.

As believers in Revelation, they both maintain that Holy Scripture contains the word and will of God; and it is especially important to remember that, in the New Testament canon, they have the same books, under the names of the same writers; and, even in matters of practical convenience and detail, they can refer by chapter and verse, to the recognized divine standard, to prove their harmony in the faith of "the common Salvation."

In both of their accepted versions of Holy Scripture, this source of knowledge and foundation of faith is set forth with equal plainness and solemnity, in such declarations as those of the inspired apostles Peter and Paul. "The word of the Lord endureth for ever; and this is the word which by the Gospel hath been preached unto you."¹ Holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost.² And "All Scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work."³

So also concerning the distinct claim of the Apostles, that their teaching was by "the ministration of the Spirit of God,"⁴ under whose sanction they solemnly enjoined, "If any one, or even an

¹ Peter i. 25.  ² Peter i. 21.  ³ 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.  ⁴ 2 Cor. iii. 8.
angel from heaven, preach another gospel, let him be anathema!” ¹ Here, then, is broad, strong ground of common truth, on which Christian charity and common sense might soon effect a true re-union of Christendom.

But, alas! intolerant dogmatism and sectarian pride continue to prevail, against Christ’s rule of love and the manifested will of God.²

The separate churches might soon find that they all believe in common all that the primitive churches believed, or were required to believe, as Christians,

¹ Gal. i. 8.
² It is instructive and humiliating, to observe how upright, conscientious men may deceive and blindfold themselves while holding palpable contradictions.

The public have recently been informed that CARDINAL LAVIGERIE, in conveying a gold medal, from the Pope, to Cardinal Manning, expressed a high appreciation of the good effects of Protestantism, with a strange misapprehension of the distinctive claims of Romanism. His Italian Eminence is reported as saying to his English Eminence, “Your English Protestants have preserved the faith of their fathers, in all the great doctrines of Christianity. They believe in the Holy Trinity, in our Lord’s incarnation, in His redemption. They love and respect the law of God.” This is very remarkable testimony. We could wish that it were as true of all English Protestants, as it is frank and just in regard to the Protestant faith.

But, the Cardinal adds, “Prejudice alone keeps them apart from the ancient Church.”

Poor innocent man! He forgot the enormous amount of error and imposture, superstition and intolerance, by which the Papal system makes it impossible for English Protestants to accept it. He forgot that what he calls “the ancient Church” imposes upon its votaries fictions and fables contrary to the ancient Catholic faith; that new dogmas have been invented for it, even in our own times; and that it is, in fact, the newest religion in Christendom.
and even more. But this does not bring about the
unity which it did produce in the apostolic churches,
because some claim to have dominion over the faith of
others, which inspired Apostles repudiated, and insist
on adding novelties and non-essentials, which the
Apostles never taught, and of which original Chris-
tianity knew nothing.

In the meantime, hopeful changes have been
inviting Christian effort. It is cheering to behold
streaks of light upon the dark horizon. There are
good omens in some of the popular movements and
religious developments of our times; which should
encourage labour of love, and inspire the patience of
hope.

The world seems to be preparing, in a thousand
ways, for more practical international relations than
have ever yet been known; and if the churches be
faithful to the signs of the times and the movements
of Providence, a parliament of the peoples may soon
presage a veritable and beneficent human brotherhood,
in a league of universal peace.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Humanizing influences and liberal sympathies are
operating on every hand. In several of the churches
a spirit of true Catholicity is manifesting itself, in
works of wise benevolence; Christian charity is over-
leaping the fences of sectarianism, and forgetting the
arts of proselytism, in efforts to win souls. Outside
the churches, also, many cheering tokens of honest popular virtue and true manhood appear, to encourage and aid all faithful workers for the elevation of the people.

As popular intelligence increases, a wise and righteous public opinion may become powerful enough to influence the councils of the nations, and resist the dominant war policy which now crushes and curses our civilization.

When the working classes in all industrial pursuits shall intelligently realize that it is their duty to feed and clothe and educate their children, instead of devoting the fruits of their labours to send their neighbours to foreign lands, to kill the parents of other children, then the rulers of the nations will soon learn that it is wise policy to cultivate the arts of peace. Here is a wide and inviting field of labour for the divided churches. Why do they not unite in loving obedience to the Divine Master, and work together to sow the good seed and to reap the harvest for HIM?

The strifes and jealousies of Christians occupy, alas! too large a portion of church history. In the track of that withering monsoon is to be found the moral desolation of Christendom.

Weakened by continued divisions, they may look upon the desolation in despair.

GOOD WORK AND WORKERS.

Strong in union, and in love to Christ and truth and the souls of men, they might, as “labourers to-
gether with God," have the joy of turning the howling waste into a garden of the Lord.

Amongst the "free" and unpriested churches, and on the part of many intelligent and large-hearted members of the dominant and intolerant sects, a true spirit of Catholicity is frequently manifested, demonstrating that conscientious differences in opinion and régime, need not hinder the exercise of brotherly love and mutual respect, amongst earnest Christian workers. But the love of pre-eminence and the spirit of priest-craft render true unity impossible, and impose upon lovers of peace, a duty of controversy for the maintenance of Christian rights.

"If ye bite and devour one another," urged the great Apostle, "take heed that ye be not devoured one of another" (Gal. v. 15). How can it be explained—it cannot be explained away—that this homely, simple, solemn lesson has been so far practically lost to our Christianity?

HOPE DEFERRED.

Laudable and promising efforts to mitigate the evil and to effect reconciliation, have been made from time to time by eminent men on all sides; but they have been thwarted and defeated, through the influence of intolerant, implacable, unreasonable sectarianism.¹

¹ Dr. Pusey has left on record the interesting correspondence, formerly carried on between eminent Continental Roman Catholics and dignitaries of the English Church, for effecting a re-union of divided Christendom.

The celebrated Du Pin and the doctors of the Sorbonne—Cardinal
THE USE OF FAILURE.

The salutary warning from past failure, may inspire hope in seeking future success, by finding the right way.

The right way is open, and flooded with heavenly light. All through the centuries the Divine Law of Christian fellowship has remained unrepealed.

Over the vestibule of our era it stands and shines, so that all may read—

"ONE IS YOUR MASTER, EVEN CHRIST, AND ALL YE ARE BRETHREN."

Under this supreme law, runs the Apostolic canon, addressed to the Church of Christ in Rome, soon after the dispensation of grace ordained the spiritual brotherhood, making men of all nations "all one in Christ," as the household of faith.

This Catholic ordinance enjoins on all the "beloved of God."

de Noailles, and several other representative Roman Catholics, on the one side, with Archbishop Wake and many Protestants on the other side—were anxious for this, and made a remarkable progress in formulating a plan of agreement. But, alas! these efforts came to nought, as did similar proposals revived by Dr. Pusey himself, in concert with Cardinal Wiseman. They failed, as all such attempts must fail. They failed, because the promoters aimed at an impossible reconciliation, between the manifold contradictions and definitions of their several sectarian systems.

They stopped short at the fences of modern creed-making, and did not attempt to clear those sectarian bounds, or to meet on the sacred open ground of true Catholic antiquity, where alone Christian unity can be realized, in spiritual worship and the faith of the Gospel.
"Mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them" (Rom. xvi. 17).

Let us mark it well. The first step toward true unity, is to learn that the real schismatics are those who cause schisms, and that usurpation over fellow-Christians is rebellion against Christ.¹

Only by returning and abiding loyalty to Him, can

¹ Disastrous confusion and misapprehension have been caused by a loose and misleading application of early ecclesiastical forms of expression to modern conceptions, quite at variance with ancient usage. Candid and well-informed writers, English and continental, have recently placed the results of learned investigation on these subjects within the reach of all general readers, so that continued misconception is without excuse.

"The Catholic Church" of the early Fathers, was the brotherly fellowship of all distinct local churches, regarded as "Catholic," by holding the scriptural faith of "the common salvation."

Early departures of individuals from the scripture rule are distinctly noted, and even in the Apostles' times there were men of the "Diotrephes" type "desiring to have pre-eminence." But the Apostolic rule was recognised and vindicated, by eminent men in times of most fatal encroachment upon the liberties of the churches. When Victor of Rome adopted the prelatic usurpation from the Ebionites, he was stoutly resisted by St. Hippolytus, Bishop of the port of Rome, whose writings have been a principal source of modern enlightenment on ancient ecclesiology.

The famous Cyprian of Carthage, who developed the sacerdotal hierarchy which subsequently ruled Christendom, was himself made a bishop by clamorous decision of the multitude, against the judgment of the Presbyters, thus remarkably illustrating the extreme "Vox populi Vox Dei" sentiment of that transition age.

Much light, from the "philosophoumena" of Hippolytus and other sources, may be found in Bunsen's Hippolytus, and the reader is specially recommended to peruse the discriminating and instructive work of Dr. de Pressense of Paris, entitled "The Early Years of Christianity" (English Edition, Hodder and Stoughton, London).
the divided churches be re-united, and prepared for the mission of mercy, to bring peace and salvation to the people.

For this, the cry of Christendom ascends to Heaven. The long-suffering of God, and the hopes of the nations, wait for the Churches of Christ, to herald the Divine Eirenikon!

"Blind people that have eyes, and deaf people that have ears."

Alas! the call is not heard; or, if heard, is not regarded. The leading churches, or their leaders, are not yet ready.

They have not yet had enough of their own ways, or tasted sufficiently of the bitter fruit of their own doings.

As Israel of old came to the borders of Canaan, but "could not enter in because of unbelief," and had therefore to lose a generation wandering in the wilderness, so the greater Churches of modern Christendom forfeit their high privilege, and postpone the joy of the nations.

Instead of uniting, as they might, could, and should do, in loving service to God and humanity, they are busy, or at ease, with their separate "interests" within their own enclosures. They trim their fences, more diligently than they cultivate their fields. The great human world around them, which they do not save for Christ, and turn to God, and lead in the paths of peace, has to know them, to distinguish
and designate them, chiefly by the badges of sectarian peculiarities, the rival claims of clerical prerogative, and the curiosities of ceremonial routine, which separate them from one another, and from the glorious realities of their high calling.
In the midst of the burdened and suffering people, and in sight of the hostile camps of Christendom, "Churches" calling themselves "Christian," devote their energies—not to evoke and educate and proclaim a righteous public sentiment, and an effectual protest against the demoniac policy of War; but to build up and glorify their several sectarian systems of clerical orders and ceremonial performance.

We must contemplate them on their own ground, and briefly investigate their respective claims.
CHAPTER II.

BRIEF SKETCH OF THE DISTINCTIVE CLAIMS AND ORDINANCES OF THE DIVIDED CHURCHES.

"By love serve one another."

"By manifestation of the truth . . . . to every man's conscience, in the sight of God."

"We all, good sirs, have err'd! Men may—I find—be honest, though they differ."

The several Churches are distinguished and designated according to their polity and ceremonial observances, as administered by clerical officials, and by the doctrines held and taught in this behalf.

Their principal ceremonies are distinguished as Sacraments; and while a notable diversity exists, as to the nature and number of these, a chief place is assigned, in both the Roman and the Greek Churches, to two of them, namely, Baptism and the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper; and these two are also observed, with some differences of doctrine and ritual, by most of the reformed or Protestant Churches.

The clerical or ministerial function is, in most cases, mainly estimated, in relation to the doctrine of the Sacraments held in each community.

An intelligent and comprehensive estimate of the
condition of Christendom, would, therefore, demand a discriminating notice of the sacramental systems of the divided Churches.

But we must aim at great brevity, and content ourselves with examining only the principal theories of some of the larger and representative communities, with which we are in closest contact, without including the Eastern Churches, or the several smaller bodies of the reformed or free Churches, nearer home.

It is, however, essential to remember that the aggregate of these sacramental systems, constitutes, to a large extent, THE RELIGION, the inner life and supreme moral force, in moulding the character of Christendom, today.

Here, of course, the first place must be assigned to—

THE SACERDOTAL AND SACRAMENTAL CLAIMS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

The Council of Trent taught that the Sacraments "confer grace by the act performed" (ex opere operato); and that "through them, all true justice (justification?) either begins; or being begun, is increased; or being lost, is repaired." Further, "the holy synod" decreed that "three" of the seven Sacraments, all alleged to have been "instituted by Christ"—namely, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders—imprint on the soul a character; that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign; on account of which they are not to be repeated."

This is more fully stated in regard to the priesthood. "In the Sacrament of Orders, a character is imprinted,
THE ROMAN CREED.

which can neither be effaced nor taken away.” “If any one shall say that there is not in the New Testament, a visible and external priesthood; or that there is not a power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of Christ, and of remitting and retaining sins—let him be anathema!” “In the divine sacrifice which is performed in the Mass, that same Christ is contained and immolated, in a bloodless manner, who once offered Himself, in a bloody manner, on the altar of the cross.” “The victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests, who then offered Himself on the cross, the manner alone of offering being different.” (Session 7, canons 8 and 9; sess. 22, ch. 2 and 4, and canon 1.)

THE ROMAN CREED.

For general use, these decisions are summed up, in the CREED OF POPE PIUS FOURTH, which requires every devout Roman Catholic to declare—“I most steadfastly admit and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and other constitutions and observances of the Holy Roman Church. I likewise admit the Holy Scripture, according to that sense, which our Holy Mother Church hath held and doth hold; nor will I ever understand or interpret it, except according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

“I also receive and admit all the received and approved ceremonies, in the solemn administration of the Sacraments, and all and everything which has been defined in the holy synod of Trent.
"I profess likewise that in the Mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there takes place a conversion of the entire substance of the bread into the body, and of the entire substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also confess that under one kind alone, Christ is taken, whole and entire, and a true Sacrament." This is, distinctly and unquestionably, the Roman Catholic faith.\(^1\)

We may here remark on a special decision, regarding Baptism, which does not apply to the Eucharist.

**Baptism by Heretics,**

Before the modern theories of the Sacraments were fully formulated, it was held by some of the most

\(^1\) The working of the system is dependent, mainly, on auricular confession, of which apostolic teaching and practice afford neither precept nor example.

In the Epistle of James (v. 16) we read, "Confess your faults (or sins) to one another," and the note in the Douay Testament says, "that is, to the priests of the Church." But according to this rule of interpretation "forgive one another" would mean "forgive the priests," and this reciprocity of absolution, however good in itself, would not harmonize with the judicial character of the priest, who is in the confessional, "in the place of God." Of the manifold dangers and fearful evils incident to the confessional, St. Alphonsus Liguori and other eminent Roman Catholic authorities have written fully. But it remains as essential to the very existence of the Church of Rome.
EXCLUSIVE FUNCTIONS OF PRIESTS.

eminent "fathers,"—notably by the famous Cyprian and others,—that the baptism of heretics was not valid, and therefore, that in such cases baptism by the orthodox should follow. But when the notion prevailed of grace being infused, and a character being imprinted on the soul in baptism, then it was thought necessary to recognize the act, even when performed by heretics.

Accordingly we have, amongst the many decrees of the Tridentine fathers, the following:—"If any one shall say that the baptism which is given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church doeth, is not true baptism; let him be anathema." (Canon 4th, touching Baptism.)

We are not informed how the intention of the heretics is to be ascertained, or why they are heretics, if they are intentionally in agreement with "the Church."

But it is very noteworthy, that here, a solemn recognition is given to the performance of avowed heretics; which is not conceded, regarding the other great Sacrament, to the most learned and holy fellow-Christians, lay or clerical, of other communities, or even to devout and consistent laymen of the Church of Rome.

EXCLUSIVE FUNCTIONS OF PRIESTS.

The administration of the Eucharist, the giving of absolution in the confessional, and the offering of the sacrifice of the Mass, are all in the exclusive power and prerogative of the priesthood.
To these important points, therefore, we shall confine our remaining remarks in this section.

The "priest," in the Church of Rome, is represented to be an official sacrificer, and something more. He not only professes to offer to God "a real propitiatory sacrifice," but also assumes to make or prepare "the victim," by converting the elements into the real and personal Christ.

This is a unique faculty in the history of priesthoods. The Levitical priests, or high priests, from Aaron downward, claimed no such power; and there is no intimation of their ever having performed or attempted anything analogous to transubstantiation.

Neither do we find a similar profession or claim in any record of any heathen priesthood. The nearest resemblance is, perhaps, to be found in the mythological elevation of ancient heroes, to the company of the gods; or in the apotheoses of emperors, in the decadence of the priesthood of pagan Rome. No Christian will claim relationship to these pretences.

**Words and Their Meaning.**

But, how are we to understand the sacerdotal claim? The familiar word "priest," is simply a contraction or corruption of "presbyter," and properly means "elder."

It does not accurately designate an official sacrificer. The Latin "sacerdos," or the Greek ἵερες (hierëus), is the proper term for this; and the latter is never...
employed in the New Testament, as an official designation of Christian ministers.

They are "elders," "bishops" (overseers), "pastors, teachers," &c., but in no instance are they described as official sacrificers.

**DOCTRINE OF ST. PETER.**

Even the apostles were not "priests," in this sense; and there is no record of their ever having assumed the titles or functions of sacerdotalism. "The elders among you, I exhort, who also am an elder," wrote the Apostle Peter (not "hierus," but "presbuteros," 1 Pet. v. 1), and according to the same apostle, the Christian people constitute "a holy priesthood" (hierateuma hagion) "to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. ii. 5).

These "spiritual sacrifices" are not sacraments, but personal holiness; praise and thanksgiving to God; and good works toward mankind (Rom. xii. 1; Heb. xiii. 15, 16).

In this spiritual priesthood the apostles participated, not ex officio, but by being partakers of "like precious faith," with the humblest of the dispersed laity, to whom the apostle wrote (1 Pet. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1).

**CHRIST AS A LAYMAN.**

Moreover, it should be noted here, that our Lord Himself did not either adopt or appoint an official priesthood. In relation to the Jewish hierarchy, Christ was simply an unordained layman. He never took part in the ceremonial with the priests. He came,
according to the flesh, of the tribe of Judah, "of whom no man gave attendance at the altar," and "Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood" (Heb. vii. 13, 14).

CHRIST'S PRIESTHOOD.

From this the apostle proceeds to show that, "if He were on earth, He would not be a priest," but that His priesthood is carried on in the heavens; even the "unchangeable" (untransferable) "priesthood," in which He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him; seeing "He ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Heb. vii. 24, 25, viii. 4).

The Scripture testimony is clear and full, to every candid reader, that our blessed Lord brought the official priesthood of Judaism to an end, by the dispensation of the Spirit, and did not appoint any official priesthood in its place. He, Himself, is the only high priest in Christianity; reconciling us to God, by the offering of Himself, once for all. Any mockery or imitation of this all-efficacious priesthood, is built upon the ambiguous, or mistaken, or dishonest use (or misuse) of a word, the true signification of which, is fatal to all such pretensions.

ROMAN CATHOLIC WORSHIP.

Anxious to guard against exaggeration and mistake, and sincerely repudiating the spirit and tactics of sectarian controversy, we desire to ascertain how the sacerdotal and sacramental theory is actually applied, in Roman Catholic worship.
Admitting and admiring, as we do, unfeignedly, the devoutness of Roman Catholics, which we have frequently observed and felt, we yet remember that Christianity is a "reasonable service" (Rom. xii. 1), and that an inspired apostle teaches us to "pray with the spirit," and to "pray with the understanding also." (1 Cor. xiv. 15.)

We, therefore, with all seriousness, and in true Christian charity, inquire, how do devout and intelligent Roman Catholics understand the definitions and decrees of their own Church, which we have been quoting; and we urge our inquiry, not in relation to controversy, but as regards the worship of God.

We shall not consult any Protestant expositor, or canvass any hostile criticism.

We shall, in spirit, enter a Roman Catholic place of worship, not to scoff or cavil, but to learn.

We look into the sacristy, and approach the altar; and, in order to understand what takes place, we study a certified copy ("accuratissima Editio, 1875") of the Roman Missal.

In order to avoid any doubtful questions relating to minor or secondary observances, we arrange to attend only on a solemn occasion, at a full sacramental service to witness the celebration of the Mass.

On every point of interest, we consult, not any in competent informant, but the authorized exposition of
the Missal; and here we press our anxious inquiries in relation to the solemn service.

Our guide-book informs us in various connections, and reiterates the statement, that "the Sacrament is made;" that "he (the officiating priest) makes the Sacrament." He pronounces the words of consecration, after which we are assured that the "wonderful and singular conversion" has taken place. But there is some explanation needed regarding the efficacy of the words used in consecration, and the potential action of the priest in using them.

HOW IS THE SACRAMENT MADE?

Is the virtue in the words? So it would appear, from the strict rule against any one changing the form of consecration, as by "change of the words," it is declared, "he would not make the Sacrament." If the efficacy or efficiency be in the words, may not any devout Christian, in the exercise of a true faith, and trusting the Divine power and grace, repeat the consecrating words, and thus "make the Sacrament"? "Ah no!" exclaims the oracle. "The sacerdotal order of the celebrant" is indispensable. The Sacrament can be made by none but a duly ordained priest.

THE WORDS OF CONSECRATION.

Well, then, if the Sacrament must be made by a priest, can the priest not make the Sacrament by using his own words, to express his own purpose? Certainly not; for the consecrating formula is an appropriation
of the words of institution, used by the Lord Jesus Himself. But did the Lord command His words to be appropriated? Are not the words of institution, "Do this in remembrance of Me"? Repeating Christ's own words is not obeying His command to "do" what He and the apostles were doing, when He spoke.

And further, it may be remarked,—the priest does not repeat the words of Christ. Does he not make the Sacrament with the use of a Latin formula? and does he not know that Jesus did not speak Latin? Does he say words believed to be equivalent to the words spoken by the Lord Jesus, and understood to signify the same thing?

MEANING OF CHRIST'S WORDS.

Then the whole importance is in this significance; and the mind of Christ is to be found, not in the mere words or sounds, but in the meaning of what He said. If the priest says "Hoc est corpus meum" (or, "This is my body"), he speaks literally of and for himself, and if he proceeds with the formula and says, "Do this in remembrance of me," if he thus "makes and ordains a sacrament," it is a sacrament of himself, and he is putting himself in the place of Christ, and incurring the guilt of blasphemy. Jesus Christ did not say, "Any Roman priest, in repeating My words, shall have the power to turn a bit of bread into Me;" and nothing short of this, can sustain the Roman theory. If Jesus Christ, in saying these or similar words, over eighteen hundred and fifty years ago, thereby turned a piece of bread into Himself, it surely does not follow,
that any one else—priest or potentate—to the end of time, shall be able, by saying these or similar words, to turn a piece of bread or a wafer into Jesus Christ. Here are formidable initial difficulties, which official assumptions cannot remove.

It is of course quite in harmony with the spirit of the system, that the reality and efficacy of the Romish Mass, is made to rest entirely with the officiating priest. His position is indeed an awful one! It is fairly astounding to learn that the official guide-book mentions so many causes and occasions of failure and defect, as to involve the whole subject in the most painful and bewildering uncertainty.

It is at least consistent with the assumed possibilities of the case, that the Missal enjoins as follows:

**DIRECTIONS OF THE MISSAL.**

"The priest, about to celebrate Mass, must take the utmost care that there be no defect, in any of the things that are requisite for the making the Sacrament of the Eucharist."

This is followed by an appalling catalogue, with the intimation that a defect in any of these, namely, "the due matter, the form with intention," and "the sacerdotal order of the celebrant" *nullifies the Sacrament*. We cannot attempt a full investigation of all that is here specified, and it is not necessary to do so.
THE PRIEST'S PERILS.

FAILURES IN CONSECRATION.

Many of the statements and instructions presented, would seem to most of our readers simply incredible. Some of them appear minute and trivial, beneath the dignity of the subject, and other some are positively shocking, disgusting, and unfit to be repeated.

In some cases of omission or alteration it is alleged, the celebrant "would not make the Sacrament," while in others "he would make the Sacrament, it is true, but he would sin most grievously."

If the bread be not wheaten, or if it be unduly mixed with any other sort of grain, or if it be otherwise corrupted, "there is no Sacrament;" and, "if it be made with rose-water or any other distilled water, it is doubtful whether there is a Sacrament."

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

"Defects may occur, if the celebration be made in a place not sacred, or on an altar not consecrated, or not covered with three altar cloths; if any of the sacerdotal vestments be omitted," &c.

The priest celebrant himself is placed under severe restrictions.

THE PRIEST'S PERILS.

"If he has broken his fast, by taking only water, or any food or drink, even by way of medicine, and in ever so small a quantity, he cannot communicate or celebrate."

Instructions are given, concerning a fly or a spider,
falling into the chalice; concerning a drop falling out of the chalice; and even concerning the possibility of the priest becoming ill, during celebration. It is, in this last case, further provided, that “the species” (elements), after being consecrated and adored, may become “corrupted;” and then they are to be thrown into the sacrarium, and burned.1

“Become corrupted,” and finally to be “burned;” after having been changed into the very person of Christ!²

EXPLANATION WANTED.

Here we are solemnly constrained to appeal. Who can solve our difficulties? Is any explanation possible?

If only the species, or appearance, remained, after consecration, what is it, that the priest swallows; and that is involved in his stomach sickness; is to be

1 “Si sacerdos evomat Eucharistiam, si species integrae appareant, reverenter sumantur, nisi nauseae fiat; tunc enim species consecratae caute separatur, et in aliquo loco sacro reponantur, donec corrumpantur; et postea in sacrarium projiciantur. Quod si species non appareant, comburatur vomitus, et cineres in sacrarium mittantur.” (Missale Romanum—De defectibus celebratione Missarum occurrentibus, 14, 7p. 39.)

2 “If any one shall say that in the sacred and holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood,—the species only of bread and wine remaining,—which conversion the Catholic Church calls transsubstantiation, let him be anathema!” (Canon 2, Council of Trent, session 13, under the Sovereign Pontiff Julius Third, October, A.D. 1551.)
carefully separated, and again swallowed; or laid by until corrupted; and finally, to be burned?

Can all this be affirmed and done, with "only the species"!—and is all this, in proof of the "wonderful and singular conversion," alleged above?

This most painful subject, and the harassing position of the priest, as here presented, must be contemplated in connection with the Trent canons, which dominate in the instructions and injunctions of the Missal.

THE COUNCIL AND THE MISSAL.

"The holy synod declares all those doctrines to be false, and utterly alien from the truth of the Gospel, which perniciously extend the ministry of the keys, to any other men soever, besides bishops and priests. . . . . It also teaches that even priests who are held in deadly sins, through the virtue of the Holy Ghost bestowed in ordination, exercise the function of remitting sins, as the ministers of Christ, and that they think erroneously who contend that this power exists not in bad priests. . . . . It is not a bare ministry only, whether of announcing the Gospel, or of declaring that sins are remitted; but is after the manner of a judicial act, which by sentence is pronounced by the priest, as by a judge." (Sess. 14, ch. 6.)

We venture to hope that no devout Roman Catholic, in our day, would knowingly confess to a celibate debauchee, or accept absolution from men, invested with "priests' orders," but "held in deadly sin."

Yet again the Trent Fathers consistently, decreed
that the intention of any one of these profligates, to make a valid Sacrament, carries with it the act of God.

"If any shall say that a minister, being in deadly sin, provided that he performs all the essentials which belong to the performance or conferring of the Sacraments—neither performs nor confers the Sacrament—let him be anathema." (Sess. 7, canon 12.)

IMMORAL PRIESTS AND VALID SACRAMENTS.

Much of the time and attention of the Trent Council had to be devoted to the reformation of the clergy, as suggested above. But why should this shocking state of things be legislated for, and recognized, in a permanent provision for the worship of God? Taking this in relation to the above from the Missal, we have to inquire how shall communicants estimate Sacraments, which may be rendered ineffectual by an informality or an oversight; but are quite valid, as means of grace, when administered by immoral or "bad priests," if only the rules and forms be observed? Can a Christian conscience accept this, as the will of God?

Further, and with shuddering horror, we demand what becomes of our Lord’s "soul and divinity," said to be "contained" in the consecrated "host," when it becomes "corrupted"? Is Christ’s Divine nature, at the bidding of a wretch, living in mortal sin, and who cannot prevent the corruption of the host, which he has held up, to be adored? When that which is declared to be "the whole Christ," becomes corrupt, or is reduced
PRIESTLY INTENTION.

to ashes,—where is the Divine miracle of transsubstan-
tiation?

We must not pursue these distressing topics; but how deplorable it is to contemplate the millions of Christendom, to whom this appalling system is pre-

ten, as the revealed will of God!

Yet another phase of the subject, remains to be noticed, in the doctrine of

PRIESTLY INTENTION.

That there should be honest purpose and serious desire to do right, in every part of Christian service, is, of course, an important truth. But this is not the thought now before us.

The Council of Trent decreed, "If any shall say that in ministers, while they form and give the Sacra-
ments, intention is not required, at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema." Sess. 7, Canon 11.

Instead of evidence,—Anathema! That is Rome's way.

But have we any explanation? The Missal puts it that "If any one does not intend to make the Sacra-
ment, but to do something delusively; or if any of the hosts escape his notice, when he intends to consecrate only those which he sees, &c., in these cases he does not consecrate; inasmuch as intention is essential." Who can estimate the consequences of the rule here stated? It applies to all cases of sacramental administration, and a defect in one case, may invalidate all that follows.
THE CRY OF CHRISTENDOM.

If the officiating priest should do everything required, at any particular celebration, yet if he has not been intentionally ordained, baptized, &c., his performances are null, and this may go backward, to the beginning!

But apart from this, it is well known that priests have frequently abandoned Rome, after many years' service at the altar; and some of them have given the world the history of their long-continued and harassing doubts, perplexities and final unbelief in the Mass, before they could make up their minds to come out.

Surely, men cannot, in such circumstances, intend to do, what they do not care to do, or what they know they cannot do. Yet in every such case, the ceremony has been performed; the host has been elevated, for adoration, and the people have fallen down and worshipped it.

IMPOSSIBILITY AND COLLAPSE.

How can a devout Roman Catholic ever know, whether he has not offered worship to a bit of paste; or if he has ever received any true sacraments,—which he is taught to believe necessary to salvation?—We ask any kind, honest, intelligent, Roman Catholic, whether he knows any way of explanation, that can afford peace and assurance on this subject. Every such person must admit the impossibility; for even Cardinal Bellarmine declared—"No one can be certain, with the certainty of faith, that he has a true Sacrament; since the Sacrament is not formed without the intention of the minister; and no one can see the intention of another."
Such is the state of things, in relation to Rome's Sacraments; according to Rome's own testimony.

And this is the supreme achievement, and most sacred and efficacious work, of those who claim to be, exclusively of all others— the divinely appointed agents of mercy, for the Salvation of mankind!

Debased and unchristian Christendom, exhibits today, the deplorable results, of this shocking misrepresentation of God.

We have now to consider, very briefly,

THE ORDERS AND SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

This branch of our subject might be quickly disposed of, if we had only to inquire about the constitution of the English national church, as its formation or reformation, was attempted, in the 16th century.

RULERS AND REFORMERS.

The reformers generally designed a heavy pruning of the Roman vine.— But the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns, with their Parliaments and commissions, retained, by authority, much that the reformers would have cut off.

Thus it is that English clergymen of the present day, mournfully plead, that many things in their church, are due, not to her own authority, or to the inculcation of her Christian teachers; but to the arbitrary will of despotic rulers.
HENRY THE EIGHTH, ENGLISH POPE.

This is remarkably exemplified, in connexion with our present subject. Henry the Eighth, who obtained from the Pope, the title of "defender of the faith," for vindicating the Roman Sacraments, against Luther,—afterwards, when in rebellion against the Pope, enforced the Pope's views and his own, by ordering that any persons who should speak or write against the doctrine of the Mass, should be burned.

Seven years after allegiance to the Pope had been renounced, and England had been legislatively declared free from Rome, this self-made Pope of England decreed, that Englishmen must accept his religion, whether they agreed with him or not!

Transubstantiation, clerical celibacy, auricular confession, &c., were constituted the national faith, by the royal will and the penalty of death. So dominating and effectual was this dictation, that even in the reaction and reformation, under Edward the Sixth, the utmost concession that could be obtained in this matter, was that "the body of the Lord was to be received under both kinds,—namely, bread and wine."

Under Elizabeth, this coercion became most rigorous. Protestant, only so far as might promote her own supremacy—the Queen was a model despot in religion; and ruled the Church and the clergy, with a rod of iron.¹

¹ A great living statesman, is represented as maintaining that
ELIZABETH'S CHURCH.

She desired, not reformation, but compromise and conciliation, for her own ends.—She therefore, decided all religious questions, in this interest; and rejected every proposal of Bishops and convocation, that did not accord with her own sweet will.—This applied to everything in the national Church; from doctrines and definitions, down to ritual and vestments; and even individual deportment.

Her own commissioners, (for instance) left it optional, to communicants, to stand or kneel. The Queen, wishing to keep up the imitation of the Romish worship of the host,—decided that they must kneel; and, accordingly, loyal Anglicans continue to kneel, to this day; obeying the Queen's mandate, in opposition to every intimation of scripture, and every dictate of common sense!

The present sacramental system of the English church, has, therefore, a remarkable history and parentage; and in its administration we find some startling and anomalous results.

Queen Elizabeth "had a larger share in moulding the Established Church, than any other human being."

Perhaps this eloquent eulogist might have been still more comprehensive in his phraseology, and said—"any other being, human or Divine." It is pointed out, by a public journalist, that her Majesty "had no regard for the Church, as a divine Institution," and a favourite contemporary English historian is quoted—alleging that "No woman ever lived, who was so totally destitute of the sentiment of religion."

This appears a strange qualification, for the head of a system of Ecclesiastical reform. Yet there are Englishmen, who can glory in "Elizabeth's Church."
Protestanism and Romanism, have been bound together, in the system, from its commencement.—When despotism and statecraft ruled, by clerical instruments of their will, the deplorable spectacle of unprincipled officialism, produced the most pernicious influence.

A living bishop declares, of the men who thus became the active agents of the national faith,—"Their religion was the merest form; and scarcely deserved to be called Christianity at all."

"Most of them were pitiful turncoats, without a conscience, and were ready to change sides in religion at word of command; as, in fact—they did, no less than four times;—under Henry; then under Edward the Sixth, again under Mary; and finally under Elizabeth."¹

Another English clergyman, remarks on the fact that the clergy who held office under Mary, retained their places, without a qualm, under Elizabeth; and adds—"So the pulpits became filled with men, perjured for bread."²

Still later, after a great national revolution,—a restored monarchy, of profligacy and intolerance, drove out of the Church, thousands who kept a conscience, and reduced it to its lowest condition of social and moral degradation; while completing the order of its offices and ritual.

After the deadening and deteriorating effects of this

¹ Bishop Ryle's, "What we Owe to the Reformation," p. 4.
state of things, an Evangelical revival, followed by a re-action, in favour of Ante-reformation Catholicism, rent the Church into hostile factions, which, an eminent Churchman declares—"no ingenuity of explanation can ever avail to reconcile; and, in the nature of things, no method of pacification, can be applied."

It cannot be easy, in these circumstances, to state, with certainty, what is the sacramental system of the Anglican State establishment.

The formularies, to which all parties subscribe, retain a close assimilation to the Roman; but the several parties explain them, in their own way.

The baptismal regeneration, of the rubric, on which the Church catechism teaches every child to say—"In my baptism, I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of heaven;" is explained away, by some, who plead the sole authority of holy Scripture, as stated in the sixth article.

In like manner, the hostile schools, apply different rules of interpretation, regarding the prescribed doctrine of the Eucharist.

The catechism teaches that "the body and blood of Christ, are verily, and indeed, taken and received, by the faithful, in the Lord's Supper."

One section, or portions of two sections, of the clergy, and their respective followers, take this language as intending only a symbolic commemoration, or simply

---

1 I. Taylor's "Ancient Christianity and the Oxford Tracts."
mnemonic observance. Other parties,—one of which has recently made a very close approach, or virtual return to Rome,—earnestly contend for the literal interpretation, in the most absolute sense of the real personal presence of Christ, in the sacrament, as the result of a sacerdotal consecration of the elements.

CONFUSION, WORSE CONFOUNDED.

The confusion thus produced, is further intensified, by a necessary result of the royal supremacy.

Priests' orders are conferred in Episcopal ordination. But bishops are made, only by nomination of the Sovereign, or of the Prime Minister, for the time being.

This domination of the Lay element, is repugnant to all strict sacramentarians; and raises a damaging question, about the transmission of Episcopal grace, by the hands of rival politicians.

But a fiercer and more fatal source of contention, arises out of rival claims to sacerdotal "orders."

While the Church of England recognizes and accepts Romish orders, the Church of Rome repudiates the Anglican claim; alleging that the English schism is—

*de facto and de jure—destitute alike, of valid orders, and real Sacraments.*

A FALSE POSITION.

The disorganizing effect of this dispute, is made all the more embarrassing, by many indications, that the most active and proselytising portion of the English
clergy, regard Rome's claims as superior to their own.

Some of this class, after long posturing, as "English priests"—finally proceed to the logical issue; and become zealous promoters of the Roman "Catholic revival," for the conversion of England, to the confessional and the Mass; and finally to "the Roman obedience."¹

The Anglican system is discovered to be only a blurred copy of the Romish; and its most appropriate function is regarded as pointing backward, to its original.²

---

¹ Amongst the most noted instances of this, may be mentioned the two Cardinals, Newman and Manning.—The gentle spirit of the former, mitigates the bitterness of his proselytism; but the latter is implacable in his wrath against the Church of England, which he charged (to the great grief of tender-hearted Dr. Pusey) with being, not the great bulwark against infidelity in England,—as had been alleged,—but "the cause and spring of the existence of unbelief;" by propagating error, concerning sacraments, &c.

A former contemporary of Dr. Manning, in the Oxford movement, declared himself to have been first, for several years, an Evangelical; then induced to adopt Dr. Pusey's views; and finally, led or forced, logically, by the Anglican theory, to find refuge and repose in the Church of Rome.

This illustrious convert, after special preparation in Rome, returned, by appointment of the Pope, with patent and indulgences, to prosecute a singular mission, for the conversion of British Protestants. Having become famous, as a champion of the Papacy, he finally achieved his great victory—and obtained the right to future silence, by boldly repudiating, as a Protestant misstatement, the notion of Papal Infallibility; which was shortly afterwards, decreed and proclaimed to be, and to have been, from the beginning, a fundamental doctrine of the Catholic faith.

Thus the Anglican schism, illustrates the Papal Unity.—Semper eadem!

² The Supreme Court decided that the Roman custom of standing before the communion table, with the face toward it, and the back
This perilous state of things in the English church,—with all its uncertainty, and conflicting claims about Sacraments and orders,—indicates most impressively, the necessity for a thorough work of reformation, and the revival of Christianity in Christendom.

ANGlicANiSM AT WORK.

A leading liberal Literary Review, in recently noticing the issue of an able work on Romanism, by the Regius professor of Divinity, in Dublin University, commenced a highly favourable criticism, by remarking,—"Happily, the controversy with Rome, is not active, on this side St. George's Channel." This would probably prove a very gratifying statement, to Cardinal Manning and his co-labourers. But, it is a strange sign of the times, that cultured literary Englishmen can contem-

... to the people, is contrary to the law of the Church. Canon Liddon decided to break the law; alleging the custom to be important "as connected with the maintenance of Eucharistic truth."

In the Church of Rome it is taught "from the Institution of Pope Vigilius, that the priest at the altar, ought to pray toward the East." The custom arose from the mistranslation of Zechariah vi. 12, rendered,—

"The man whose name is the East" (instead of "the branch"); and again from Luke i. 78—"The East from on high hath visited us."

On these high grounds of lucid demonstration, of Christ's presence, Anglican "priests" make it essential to face the "altar."—

In harmony with this notion, an eminent writer of the school pleads,—"If we may reverently say it (using an illustration which is applied by the Church to a subject, if possible still more awful than this),—"As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man; and as God and man is one Christ; so, the consecrated bread and wine, and the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, are one Sacrament." (Keble on Eucharistic Adoration.) Surely the assumptions of Sacerdotalism, can no farther go!
plate with complacency, the unchallenged progress of "the re-conquest of England," for the Papacy. "Happily," there are some who prefer Light and liberty; though the fashion is for "strong delusions," and indifference!

Here we must glance at

THE APPEAL TO THE FATHERS,

on which, both Roman and Anglican advocates, rest their respective claims. A few remarks will suffice for our present purpose.—It is almost superfluous to point out the vagueness and futility of this appeal. Even those who urge it, disclose a disturbing consciousness of its inconclusiveness and absurdity.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF "THE UNANIMOUS CONSENT."

Cardinal Wiseman, who followed Dr. Challoner and many others, in lauding the Patristic oracles, demonstrated their "unanimous consent," by adducing most unequivocal instances of divergence and contradiction.

Dr. Challoner, in his famous work, "the Catholic Christian instructed," alleged—"We find that the holy Fathers have always explained these words" (of the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel) "as spoken of the Sacrament."

Cardinal Wiseman, in his "Lectures on the Eucharist," as distinctly affirmed—"Many Catholic Divines, following the footsteps of some amongst the Fathers,—denied that this discourse in John, 6th chapter, related to the blessed Eucharist! And then the Cardinal proceeded further
to illustrate the boasted unanimity, by setting up himself, as a new light expositor, and proposing a method of interpreting that same portion of Scripture, which he announced as "different from the rule adopted by most Catholics."

OFFICIAL CONTRADICTIONS.

The highest official authority in the Church of Rome, the same Council of Trent that imposed on Roman Catholics, the terrible pledge, never to interpret or understand holy Scripture, except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, clearly demonstrated that there is no such unanimous consent, to be obtained.¹

¹ An illustration of how Rome fails to fulfil her own conditions, may be found in the address of Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, Missouri, intended as a speech at the Vatican Council, 1870, but published instead, afterwards at Naples.

Alluding to the above rule (the Archbishop doubts "whether this consent is ever unanimous"), he proceeds to consider the words "Thou art Peter," &c.

"In the excellent little work, printed in manuscript type, and given to the Fathers, nearly two months since, we find five different interpretations of this passage, of which the first asserts (I quote its words) that the Church is founded upon Peter, and this is followed by seventeen Fathers. The second interpretation supposes the Church to be built upon all the Apostles, of whom Peter was merely the representative. Eight Fathers hold this view. The third interpretation asserts that the rock upon which the Church is built, is to be understood of the faith which Peter had confessed—the profession (namely) by which we believe Christ to be the Son of the living God, which (they say) is the eternal and immovable foundation of the Church. And this interpretation is more solemn than any, and is followed by forty-four Fathers. The fourth interpretation assigns the rock to the person of Christ Himself, and this numbers sixteen Fathers and Doctors. The fifth interpretation understands, under the name of the rock, all those faithful believers
On the teaching of this Scripture, in the 6th chapter of St. John, the Council decreed, (21st Session, ch. i.)—
“Neither is it rightly inferred, from that discourse, however, according to the various interpretations, of holy Fathers and doctors, it may be understood,—that the communion of both species, was enjoined by our Lord.”

St. Alphonsus Liguori, in his exposition of the Council, further elucidates the unanimity, by setting forth—“the great diversity of interpretations, which the holy Fathers and Catholic commentators, have given of the same texts.”

A very slight acquaintance with the extant fragments of the multitudinous compositions of the eminent men commonly designated “Fathers,” is sufficient to convince any one, of their absolute incompetence to dictate our articles of faith, or to settle the questions of our modern controversies.

PATRISTIC VARIETIES.

Some of them were wise, learned, and holy men, and left on record, not only eloquent and imperishable “Apo-

In Christ as the Son of God, who constitute the living stones of which the Church is built. From this it follows that no argument whatever for the proof of the Primacy, can be derived from the words, ‘Upon this rock will I build My Church,’ or at least only one, which has the slenderest probability. . . . . If, then, we ought to follow the greater number of Fathers in this matter, we must hold for certain, that by the Rock we ought to understand, not Peter as professing the faith, but the faith, as professed by St. Peter.”

This statement, from the pen of a Roman Catholic Archbishop, may be taken, as plainly indicating the weight and value of the Trent decisions, for the present age; especially in the case of men who breathe the air of civilization and constitutional freedom.
logies” and able defences of Christianity, against early heresies, but also very explicit testimony, against the Romish and Anglican Sacramentism. Others occupied themselves, with vague speculations and rhetorical allegorizing, on themes altogether foreign to our present habits of thought, and methods of exegesis; while the majority held and taught, crudities and errors unmentionable; and were more “unanimous” on subjects, which neither Romanists nor Anglicans nor Protestants now believe, than they were, concerning the disputed doctrines, on which they are vainly invoked.

---

1 “Acknowledge things written in the inspired Book, as figures; and therefore, as spiritual and not as carnal persons, examine and understand the words. There is also in the New Testament, a ‘letter’ which kills him who does not understand spiritually. For, if according to the letter, thou followest the very thing which is said, ‘Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,’ (John vi. 53) this letter kills.” (Origen, hom. 7).

They did eat, in the holy Scriptures, the bread which came down from heaven.” (Jerome, Comm. lib. 2).

“Why prepare thy teeth and stomach? Believe and thou hast eaten.” “Care must be taken lest thou understand figurative language literally. . . . “The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.” . . . “Except ye eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you.” He seems to command a disgraceful thing or a crime; therefore it is figurative; commanding us to communicate in the passion of the Lord, and sweetly and profitably, to treasure up in our memory, that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us.” . . . “The faithful perceive the body of Christ, if they neglect not to be the body of Christ. Let them become the body of Christ, if they would live by the spirit of Christ.” . . . “If you wish to understand the body of Christ, then hear the Apostle, saying to the faithful, ‘Ye are the body of Christ, and His members.’” (Augustine, quoted by Bede and Bertram. Dr. Harrison v. Dr. Pusey, vol. i. p. 227, vol. ii. pp. 115, 175.)

2 See Appendix, Note B.
The eminent De la Hogue—in his *Tractatus de Ecclesia*, which has long been used as a text-book for the College of Maynouth—explicitly inculcates—"That any should be called by this venerable name (of Father) it is not required that he should not have erred in any point; since in this band, an honourable place is held by St. Justin." Justin taught the sublime philosophy, of the Amours of Angels\(^1\) with women; and led an almost "unanimous consent," of semi-pagan Fathers, in maintaining this absurdity, in defence of Christianity!

De la Hogue proceeds to record that "St. Irenæus patronized the errors of the Millenarians; St. Cyprian maintained that baptism administered by heretics, was to be repeated.—Yea, also Origen and Tertullian, who

---

\(^1\) This horrible notion entered into their comments on Scripture, and their system of morals and ascetic chastity.

We are gravely informed that "these seduced angels set Samson an example, by letting out their secrets, to their mistresses; so that what the chaste angels wished to reserve to the coming of the Lord, had been already made known, by the philosophers." And yet the same interpreter, says, "the Greeks stole their knowledge from the writings of Moses and the prophets."

Again—"The saints, as angels upon earth, must not imitate the angels from heaven, who, seduced by women, imparted their secrets to the uninitiated"!


The vagaries of some of the Fathers, would seem incredible. But we must remember that their minds had been saturated in the abominations of Pagan mythology, from which they mingled elements of false philosophy, with their crude and defective Christianity.
erred in so many points, were constantly reckoned among the Fathers."¹

This may suffice, as a specimen of Patristic studies. Are devout Roman Catholics, in our day, to extract

¹ "It is due to these eminent men, that their writings be judged, from their own point of view, and not from ours. Biblical interpretation was but little known in their days. Many of them could read no portion of the original Scriptures. The Greek Fathers could, of course, read the Greek Testament; and the Old Testament, by means of an imperfect Greek translation. The Latin Fathers were in a worse position, having only a corrupt and defective Latin version of the Septuagint. Extraordinary statements, in relation to the Lord's Supper, are founded upon absurd renderings, in the old Italic version."

"Some of the best of the Fathers—from ignorance of Hebrew—often made many curious mistakes." One remarkable instance is noted. Supposing the word "Pascha" to be from the Greek Πασχα— they explained it as meaning passion,—"suffering," whereas it is direct from the Hebrew, and its proper rendering is "Passover."—Jerome, (who was almost the only Hebrew scholar amongst them— says it was thus misunderstood, by most of the Fathers" (Dr. Harrison v. Dr. Pusey, vol. i. pp. 16–24).

Other, similar, and still more surprising instances of ignorance and misapprehension are recorded; along with a lamentable habit of random, fanciful, and inaccurate statement, by way of exposition of Scripture; and enforcing pious sentiments, by aid of most frivolous conceits.

Even the names of God and Jesus Christ, are introduced in this way, under a strange misunderstanding of the meaning of the words; as shown at length, in Daille's "Right Use of the Fathers;" and in Bennett's "Theology of the Early Christian Church," pp. 24–35.

The most eminent of all the Fathers, St. Augustine (bishop in an African village), is the only one whom we know to have published retractions.—Jerome remarked on Origen's extravagant allegorizing, and confessed that he was addicted to the same practice himself, at first; but abandoned it when he became wiser.—Whether other Fathers followed these good examples or not, it is certain that they had ample occasion to do so.—

"As allegory enables the initiated, to fetch anything out of anything, it empowered Clement to bring the doctrine of the Father and the Son, out of the verses of Euripides; the Mosaic revelation.
from this bewildering Babel, a safe and indispensable rule for understanding the word of God?

The great Anglican leader, the devout and zealous

DR. PUSEY,

followed Cardinal Wiseman, in building his Sacramental theories on Patristic testimony. But his labours in this connection, have been effectually counterworked by other Episcopal clergymen, held in wide repute, as ornaments of the English Church.

Where the Cardinal and his colleagues found Transubstantiation, in the writings of the Fathers, Dr. Pusey discovered "the real presence"; and he claimed to have proved this doctrine to have been sustained "by the unbroken voice of Catholic antiquity."

DR. PUSEY'S FOLLOWERS.

As "the Fathers" afford scope for the study of a lifetime, it can fall to but very few persons, to be able to judge personally, on the whole controversy. We may therefore suppose that the majority of Dr. Pusey's followers should be ready to say, on this subject, with Mr. Keble, of "The Christian Year":—"I do not

from the Epicurean philosophy; and the creation, from Homer's "Iliad." That Plato should have been made a Nicene theologian, will appear, to many moderns, quite natural and just. Clement finds the Lord's day, foretold in the tenth book of Plato's "Republic;" and Tertullian makes the Prince of Tyre, mentioned by Ezekiel, to mean the "Devil"! (Bennett's "Theology of the Early Christian Church," pp. 368-72.) See also Appendix, Note C.
profess to have demonstrated” the doctrine of the real presence to have been the faith of the Catholic Church, but I accept it, as “demonstrated by Dr. Pusey.”

The demonstration, however, is not accepted. Many of the doctor’s contemporaries and fellow “priests of the Church of England,” took issue with him, and claimed the Fathers, as really maintaining the Evangelical or Protestant doctrine, though habitually clothing it in ambiguous rhetorical oratory.

DR. PUSEY’S OPPONENTS.

Dean Goode, Dr. Harrison, and many others, have placed their researches before the world, and demanded a verdict against Dr. Pusey.

Dr. Harrison especially, encountered Dr. Pusey on his own ground. He followed him in all his Patristic investigations; re-translated the passages quoted by him, correcting alleged errors and mistranslations, adding the context of passages, where it had been omitted, in order to make the Fathers speak Dr. Pusey’s sentiments; and arraying an overwhelming amount of evidence, to prove that Dr. Pusey had misapprehended or misrepresented the real teaching of the Fathers.¹

DR. HARRISON’S POSITION.

Having accepted Dr. Pusey’s challenge, and repeatedly invited and solicited, an answer to his refutation,—which neither Dr. Pusey nor any of his followers

¹ See Appendix, Note D.
attempted to give,—Dr. Harrison certainly held the field on this question, and his works remain to the English Church, as an effectual antidote to the Patristic sacerdotal sacramentism, of Dr. Pusey and the Anglican school.

It is sadly apparent, that the movement which caused all this weary controversy, over the uncertain utterances of incompetent teachers, betrays a sense of the fatal absence of the required evidence, in the plain record of Holy Scripture.

In discussing the modern Papal assumptions, and the admissions of eminent Roman Catholic writers, regarding the false documents, which constitute the Papal title-deeds, Dr. Pusey pointedly remarked, that while the forgery of "the decretals," was admitted by all, the system built on the forgery, remains!

What shall we now say, of Dr. Pusey's own Sacramental system, built on misrepresentation of the teaching of the Fathers?

The Pusey pile has been completely demolished. Not one stone of it remains upon another, after the operation of Dr. Harrison's inexorable battering-rams, and dislocating, desecrating, critical crowbars. The overthrow is as final as the most relentless "Delenda est Carthago"! Yet the Pusey-Patristic Sacramentism remains. Its author was the prophet and founder of a sect. Many bishops and other dignitaries, with thousands of the lower orders of the clergy, received the oracle at his lips; and have continued to teach what he taught them; though none of them have ventured to
meet and answer Dr. Harrison's refutation of their master's Patristic theory.

PRESERVING THE RUINS.

Archdeacon Denison, Mr. Bennett, Canon Liddon, and all Dr. Pusey's older disciples, adopted his "Witnesses of Antiquity"; proclaimed him as their teacher, "to whom the whole Church would implicitly bow"; as, by his influence "she dwells confidently in the strength of her faith" (in his doctrine of the real presence); and accordingly they taught that "in the Sacraments Christ communicates Himself"; and that there is a Divine personality in the Eucharist, to which the highest form of worship is to be offered. This is now taught by many, in the English Church; in opposition to the doctrinal articles of that Church; and solely in consequence of Dr. Pusey's assertions of Patristic authority, which have been clearly proved to be erroneous and false.¹

¹ Dr. Pusey and several of his Episcopal followers, followed Cardinal Wiseman and other Romanists, in claiming the authority of the Fathers for interpreting our Lord's words, "Lo, I am with you always," &c., as the special heritage of Bishops, as successors of the Apostles. On this Dr. Harrison, remarks as follows:—

"Strange to say, these Doctors interpret this text, not as from old, it has been interpreted; but as from a very recent date. They reject its ancient meaning, as unanimously expounded and received by ancient Christendom, and they propound a new one in its place." . . . . "The consensus of all antiquity shows that the text in question is never applied particularly, to such as Pope, Bishop, or Presbyter; exclusively of 'saints,' 'believers,' or Christians, in general; but is applied indiscriminately, to all." A long list of Fathers, of the first six centuries, is given, including Cyprian, Origen, Athanasius, Jerome, Augustine, and others, to sustain this position. Even
NONCONFORMIST SACRAMENTARIANS.

"One built up a wall," exclaimed the prophet, "and lo, others daubed it with untempered mortar. Say unto them that daub it, that it shall fall"! (Ezek. xiii. 10, 11.)

Before closing this chapter, we must hold brief conference with some

PROTESTANT NONCONFORMISTS.

In sketching prevalent Sacramental theories, the Free Churches, or Nonconformists, should not be over-

Paschasius, the original sponsor for Dr. Pusey’s doctrine of "the real presence," in the ninth century, re-echoed "the interpretation of all antiquity," by saying "this text gives great confidence, to all who believe in Christ; for He did not promise this, to His disciples, only; but to all Christians." So much, for modern antiquity! Again, Dr. Harrison, alleges,—

"The act of consecration, according to the teaching of the Fathers, was the act of all communicants, and not the exclusive prerogative of any order of clergymen. We learn this, very distinctly, from Justin Martyr, who teaches that the consecration was effected by thanksgiving. . . . Speaking of himself as a layman, he says, 'the whole people express their assent.' 'The bread and the cup which Christ gave us, to do in remembrance,' &c. 'We are the true high priestly race of God, as God Himself bears witness.' 'God accepts sacrifices only through His priests.' 'Prayers and thanksgivings offered by worthy men, are the only perfect sacrifices, and well pleasing to God.' 'Such alone, Christians have undertaken to do.'

"'This is the earliest and most important testimony of antiquity, respecting the ritual of the Lord's Supper; and it is abundantly confirmed by subsequent witnesses.'

'According to Tertullian, and early antiquity, 'the distinction between clergy and laity, is of post-Apostolic origin, and human arrangement. All Christian laymen are 'priests'; and every Christian layman has an inherent right to preach the Gospel, to expound the Scriptures in the Church; and to administer Baptism, and the Lord's Supper" ("Dr. Pusey's Challenge Answered," vol. i. pp. 7-9, and 515-19).
looked; and we have a remarkable testimony, from what might have been considered an unlikely quarter.

MYSTICAL DISSERTERS.

Some of the foremost Evangelicals, who used to glory in maintaining "the dissidence of dissent" and "the protestantism of the Protestant religion," have recently become identified with pronounced sacramentism, in its most mystical form.

In a manual of Church Principles, issued by one of the most prominent bodies of English Dissenters, it is formally affirmed, reiterated and enforced, that in the Lord's Supper, "Christ communicates to the Church, whatever is represented by the bread and the wine." This statement is amplified and illustrated, as follows: "We do not merely contemplate the symbols, and get from them, whatever instruction, they are fitted to convey. The Sacrament is not a spectacle or picture lesson; it is an Act." Again, it is urged—"When Christ gives us bread, and says, "this is my body," it is not a mere dramatic ceremony, deriving all its worth from its didactic meaning, or its impressive power, His body is actually given." Not only so, but "He gives us his own eternal life. He gives us this, in giving us the symbol of his broken body"!  

2 In similar phraseology—Canon Liddon says,—"The deepest mystery rests in the truth, that in them Christ communicates Himself, not only spiritually, but in His glorified corporeity."

Mr. Keble also declares, "The presence of that bread and wine,
This must prove astounding, to some old-fashioned Congregationalists. It is frankly confessed that "this view of the Sacrament, was not held by the most authoritative representatives of the body in the last two generations."

NEW DEPARTURE.

We must, therefore, suppose that this "new departure" or "change of front," has been deliberately adopted, by present leaders, as their deliverance, on "the present truth."

At all events, it clearly indicates disapproval and abandonment, of the simple commemorative or mnemonic character of the ordinance, formerly held by Evangelical Nonconformists, and other English Protestants.¹

is to us, a sure token of the presence of Christ's body and blood."

Another disciple of Dr. Pusey, carries these notions to their logical issue. Mr. Cobb says, "I fearlessly assert that when once the mind grasps the idea of 'the real objective presence,' aright, it asserts for itself, then and there, the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation; and it cannot deny it, without flatly contradicting reason." ("Dr. Pusey's Challenge Answered," pp. 471, 662-7.)

Exactly so! The question is simply, between Scriptural Christianity, and the full-blown absurdity of the Roman sacrifice of the Mass.

¹ Some clever Anglican propagandists, having educated the people into full faith in Sacerdotalism, try to persuade them to be satisfied with the English homespun, without going to the big foreign manufactory,—and they plead that, in this way, they are keeping their disciples from Rome. But, their more advanced and logical pupils pass on, to obtain the superior article; and then flout and despise their former teachers, as bungling imitators, whose wares are unfinished, and destitute of the genuine trademark.

Honest Nonconformists, who are not narrow sectaries, will yet
THE CRY OF CHRISTENDOM.

The distinguished author of this new manual, has a reputation, not only for intelligence of a high order, but also for a certain style of strong-mindedness, or robust intellectuality, and common sense, which some people regard as almost unclerical. His peculiar views have not grown out of officialism or priestly assumptions. Yet his statements savour of the most extreme Patristic mysticism; and resemble the transcendental rhetoric of Cyprian or Clement, rather than a Protestant exposition of New Testament doctrine.

We need not pursue this line of remark, any farther, here. Our summary shows sufficiently, the extent and prevalence of the Sacramental systems of modern Christendom.

THE AYES HAVE IT!

However difficult it may be, accurately to classify all the Christian denominations, in this connection (which is not essential to our purpose), we have sufficient data, for a definite conclusion. It is unquestionable, that the great majority—even all the majorities—of professed Christians, are, in a sense, Sacramentarians. However variously they differ from one another, they, or their clerical leaders and representatives, all agree in holding, as Christian faith, that in, or by, or with, the consecrated elements of bread and wine, in the Lord's Supper, there is im-

hope, in the common interests of humanity, that Congregationalists may not follow the example of the Ritualists; or attempt to dress themselves, in the old clothes of Patristic mysticism.
parted to communicants, a spiritual, mystical, supernatural, or indefinable, divine grace, or power, or something; peculiar to this Sacrament; and to be regarded, and described, as the person, or actual divine and bodily "presence" of the Lord Jesus Christ.

This may be fairly regarded, as the grand demonstration, of the discordant agreement, of divided Christendom.
"Your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men; but, in the power of God."

"Wherefore, be not unwise; but, understanding what the will of the Lord is."

"It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is Truth."

"A man, protesting against error, is on the way, towards uniting himself, with all men who believe in truth."

"Truth, crush'd to earth, shall rise again; Th' eternal years of God, are hers. But Error, wounded, writhes in pain; And dies, among his worshippers."
CHAPTER III.

SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY REGARDING THE SACRAMENTS.

"How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?"

"Truth, in the end, shall shine, divinely clear;
But, sad the darkness, till those times appear."

In discussing the claims and ordinances of the Churches, our principal inquiry must be, "What saith the Scripture?" "How reapest thou?"

It is, therefore, very important, to enter, in the right spirit, upon a full, earnest, and intelligent, investigation of the divine record.

Much unprofitable controversy has been sustained, by a partial and inadequate reference to portions of Scripture, wrenched from their true scope, and forced into foreign service.

But, the more rational and reverent course is, simply to seek the meaning which the words employed in any instance, were intended to convey. In order to this, it is important to discover the relations of different portions of Scripture, to each other; and on some questions it is essential to endeavour to follow historical sequence and chronological order.

In the study of the New Testament it is also
helpful, to apprehend clearly the relations of Christianity to Judaism, and to be informed regarding the general state of the Roman "world," at the opening of the Gospel era. We should, moreover, study and investigate, in order to learn.

The tendency to rest in hereditary beliefs, betrays many persons into a grievous abuse of the beneficent conservatism, by which one generation inherits the privileges and acquirements of another.

However much it may be deplored, it must, alas! be freely admitted, that many orthodox professors can

1 "The Roman Empire, in the first century, extended not only over the whole civilized world, but almost over the known world. Beyond it, little was known, besides the Germanic tribes, in the North, and the Parthians in the East. In the western half of that great Empire, the language and customs of the Romans had become prevalent, but in the eastern part, Greek cultivation asserted that superiority it had obtained, since Alexander's conquests; and under the Emperors it penetrated more and more even into Rome. At the time of Christ, it was not easy to find a country in the whole Roman Empire, in which the Jews did not dwell.

"They had obtained many privileges, and Judaism had been introduced in many ways, among the heathen; at the same time, intercourse with the pagans could not exist, without exerting some influence upon the Jews.

"A philosophical mode of treating their religion, was developed, especially in Alexandria, from the study of the Grecian philosophy; and among the heathen generally, philosophical scepticism had attacked not only the popular religions, but the general truths of religion.

"Under the Emperors, the national Deities,—who were obliged to divide their honours with the most miserable of men,—sank, by degrees still lower, in the faith of the people." (Gieseler's "Ecclesiastical History," vol. i. pp. 20-30 et seq. See also Neander's "Planting of the Christian Church;" and Burton's Bampton Lecture, on Gnosticism.)

See also Note F, in Appendix.
assign no better reason for their religious observances, than heathens and Mahometans can do, when they follow the ways of their forefathers.

But, on the other hand, free inquiry should not be confounded with irreverent scepticism or conceited self-will. We plead for the truest deference to Divine authority; and would discard traditionary glosses, in order to the more intelligent and obedient acceptance of Divine truth.

In reference to the subject now before us, personal experience forces the belief that a thorough investigation of the evidence, must awaken in many minds, a feeling of strange surprise, issuing in a clear and joyful conviction of the Divine simplicity, and spiritual beauty and power, of Scriptural Christianity.

On a general view of

THE NEW TESTAMENT RECORD,

it must be distinctly affirmed, that Baptism and the Lord's Supper, were certainly observed, with the sanction of our Lord and His Apostles.

The aggregate testimony of Scripture clearly shows that both these observances arose naturally, out of previously existing customs; and were designed to express, at once, a relation to them and a departure from them.

The ablutions and "divers washings" of the Levitical ceremonial, had familiarized the Jewish mind, with the general subject of

BAPTISM;

and imparted a national education, regarding its
significance. The frequent bathing and sprinkling in connection with sacrifice and worship, as well as the constant liability to ceremonial defilement, and consequent need of purification, must have brought the religious idea, into recognition in daily life.

Devout Israelites would readily apply the words of the prophets about sprinkling, and cleansing, and a new heart, and the work of God's Spirit in producing reformation; when any earnest teacher addressed them, in the name of the Lord.

Hence it was that when the austere revivalist appeared amongst them in the spirit of Elias, crying "Prepare the way of the Lord"; "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand"! all ranks and classes thronged to hear him; and many "were baptized by him, in the Jordan, confessing their sins."

It had already become a usage to baptize proselytes; multitudes of whom, as also of devout "Greeks" and "honourable women," habitually frequented the synagogues. The use of the Greek version of the Old Testament, and the prevalence of Greek literature and civilization, had produced habits of intercourse, and an interchange of sentiments, between Jews and Gentiles, the extent and importance of which, are not duly estimated.²

---

¹ Ezek. xxxvi. 25.
² This prevalence of the Greek literature and educational influence, became very decided, in connection with Christianity.

The early Church Councils were all Greek; and, as Dean Milman has shown, "for most of the first three centuries, the Western Churches were, so to speak, Greek religious colonies. Their lan-
It is well known, moreover, that "ablutions were common in most ancient nations in connection with prayers and sacrifices, or as expiatory of sin. There is a natural connection in the mind, between the thought of physical and that of spiritual pollution. In warm countries this connection is probably closer than in colder climates, and hence the frequency of ablution in the religious rites throughout the East."¹

This state of things, outside the pale of Judaism, doubtless greatly facilitated the practice of baptizing proselytes; and afterwards, the same conditions, favoured the prevalence of baptism, among Christians. Though "Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples"; yet the usual practice prevailed amongst His followers; and soon after He entered on His public ministry it was rumoured that "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John."

There is no intimation that He enjoined this practice, or that it originated from His teaching. John had adopted a rite already in general use, and our Lord submitted to John's baptism, though, in His case, it could not have been "to repentance."

He thus gave His public sanction to John, as His own forerunner; and afterwards He preached, as John

¹ Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible,"—Article on Baptism.
did; allowing His followers to adopt the general usage: while the distinction of His baptism,—as emphatically announced by John, (in contrast with His own), was—"He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire."

**Usage and Meaning.**

Our chief concern is to inquire concerning the general practice and the designed perpetuity of the ceremony.

Where Gentiles or Jewish proselytes, professed faith in Christ, while in contact or intercourse with Jewish Christians, they naturally adopted the usual observance. Sometimes the converts proposed their own baptism; and on other occasions it was proposed for them, and performed by others.

It does not appear that the Apostles usually administered the rite. As it was a familiar custom, they generally left to others, the required performance.

In the famous case of Cornelius and his company, Peter appealed to the Jewish believers present, to give their recognition of fellowship, in the usual way, to those whom God had already acknowledged, by the gift of His Spirit. "And he commanded them to be baptized, in the name of the Lord," not to make them Christians, or to impart spiritual blessing; but to recognize them as fellow-believers. Such appears to have been the usual course, on the accession of Gentile converts, to what was generally regarded as a Jewish sect; and this natural result of the continued intercourse of the
Christian Jews, with their brethren of the Synagogue, had a wide and long-continued influence.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

The main question, as to the designed perpetuity and universality of the rite, is, by many, regarded as settled, by the terms of the apostolic commission, as recorded in Matt. xxviii. 19. To this, therefore, we must devote serious and discriminating attention.¹

Two things, of special interest, should here be carefully noted. First, there are peculiar qualifications, connected with these words, which prevent their universal application; and seem to limit them to the Apostolic Ministry. "These signs shall follow them that believe"; namely, the supernatural gifts; by which the special mission of the Apostles was attested. The commission cannot hold, beyond these limits. Secondly, we must try here, as in other instances, to ascertain how the Apostles understood our Lord's words. Just as we find the true meaning of "the keys of the kingdom of Heaven," the "binding and loosing," and the "remission of sins," assigned by our Lord to Peter

¹Note. "All the nations of ch. xxiv. 9-14 (τὰ ἔθνη, as above) by whom the Apostles were to be "hated and delivered up to the synagogues," (Mark xiii. 9-10; Luke xxii. 12) were surely not "all the nations," of the heathen world.

The usus loquendi, and the bearing of special facts, are important aids to interpretation.

Dr. Burton, in his Bampton Lectures on Gnosticism (as quoted in Kitto's "Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature"), points out that "during fourteen years after our Lord's ascension, the ministry of the Apostles had not passed the confines of Judea."
and the other Apostles,—by studying the records of their ministry; so we should do, in the case now before us.

Did they understand and apply these words, as they have been understood and applied by modern Christians?

DESIGN OF THE COMMISSION.

If this commission was for the evangelizing and baptizing of Gentiles of all nations, how did it come to pass that Peter required a vision, and special revelation, to induce him to go to Cesarea, to preach Christ to those whom he had hitherto regarded as "unclean"? How can we account for his not having long ago, learned from this commission, that by the ordinance of his Divine Master, it was "lawful for a Jew to keep company or come to one of another nation"? Without this, how could the commission be executed?

There is good ground for concluding that our Lord had in view the final testimony of the Apostles, to their own fellow-countrymen; in reference to which he had formerly said, "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come." (Matt. x. 23.)

In Acts i. 8, it is, "Ye shall be my witnesses, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the land." (τῆς γῆς; as in Luke xxii. 23, εἰπεῖ τῆς γῆς, with ἐντῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, "upon the land," and "to this people.") The same form of expression is
employed, in Luke iv. 25, as in Matt. xxvii. 45; Mark xv. 33, and Luke xxi. 23, and xxiii. 44—for "on the land," "over the whole land;" that is, obviously, the land of Palestine.

We find the same use, in Acts vii. 3, 4, and xiii. 17, 19, to describe a country, as the native land, or proper dwelling-place of a people. The land of Canaan had been possessed by "seven nations"; and when they were destroyed "their land" became "an inheritance" for the people of Israel. Henceforth it is designated as "the land of Judæa"; "the land of Israel"; &c. (Matt. ii. 6, 20, 21, and ix. 26; John iii. 22, &c.), and to this region, the primary mission of the Apostles was directed.

It would seem that Peter's contemporaries, the scattered members of the Jerusalem Church, at first, considered themselves restricted, by this home-missionary ordinance. Although they were fired with heroic zeal, while exiled by persecution, so that they "travelled as far as Phenice and Cyprus and Antioch," preaching the faith for which they suffered; yet, we read, they preached the word, "to none, but unto the Jews only." This spirit pervaded the whole society.

HOW PETER UNDERSTOOD IT.

We may further remark that neither the glorious event at Cesarea, nor his own subsequent review of the occurrence, appears to have recalled this commission, to Peter's mind. Had he forgotten it? But the Lord had promised that His Spirit should bring all
things to the remembrance of the Apostles, which He had taught them. Was this promise fulfilled in Peter's experience? If so, the commission did not apply.

He distinctly records his own exercise of memory on the occasion; "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

Peter's explanation and defence, instead of looking to the commission, for the perpetuity of the Sacrament, distinctly points the other way.

If baptizing with water, was to be a permanent distinction of Christians, where was the contrast between the baptism of Christ, and that of John?

The whole scope and tenor of the discussion and conclusion, arising out of this transaction, indicate clearly, that the Apostles did not entertain the notion that this commission inculcates the permanent and universal observance of baptism with water, amongst Gentile converts.

In his address at Cesarea, Peter mentioned the Lord's charge, "to preach to the people." But he had hitherto limited the application to "the word which God sent to the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ."

Now, he was learning, for the first time, that "God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of Him."

This is the grand Catholicity of the Christian dis-
pensation, which Peter and his fellow-labourers have, henceforth, to recognize and proclaim!

MISTAKE AND CORRECTION.

The misapprehension that has prevailed on this subject, has exerted a marvellous influence, on many devout and intelligent minds.

The persuasion that the ordinance of water baptism, as a permanent Christian institution for all the world, rested upon the apostolic commission, in Matt. xxviii. 19, led even so candid and acute a commentator, as the late Dean Alford, to “hold with Ebrard, Steer, De Wette, and others,—that the Apostles never had any doubt whatever, about admitting Gentiles;—only whether they should not be circumcised first.” (Greek Test., note on Matt. xxviii. 19.) But are not the repeated notices of the case, contrary to this conclusion? The first rumour of the occurrence at Cesarea, as reported in Acts xi. 1, was that, “the Apostles and brethren in Judæa, heard that the Gentiles also, had received the word of God.” The excitement against Peter, at the assembly in Jerusalem, on account of this occurrence, was allayed by his report, of the part which God had taken in it; and when the grumblers were silenced, the assembly glorified God, saying, “then, to the Gentiles also, hath God granted repentance unto life”: (Acts xi. 18.)

Again, we find the event described, by Paul and Barnabas and their companions, as “the conversion of the Gentiles”; and, without a word about circumcision
or any other rite, this announcement caused great joy to all the brethren” (ch. xv. 3.)

At the conference subsequently held in Jerusalem, regarding the attempt to enforce circumcision, on the church in Antioch,—Peter described the occurrence at Cesarea, by again recording God's action in it. "God made choice among us, that the Gentiles, by my mouth, should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe." And on the same occasion James described the same transaction, as God's "visiting the Gentiles, to take out of them, a people for His name" (ch. xv. 7-14.)

It had already been announced that "God had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles"; their conversion being regarded, as a joyful instance of the use of "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," by the preaching of the word!

It was this glorious and unlooked-for extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, that caused such agitation and dissension, on the part of the pharisaic sect, in the Jewish Church, and filled the more instructed and spiritually-minded, with adoring joy.

APOSTLES' EVIDENCE.

Further—Neither James nor Paul appears to have understood Matt. xxviii. 19 as having direct reference to the heathen world. In his explanation and vindication of the proceeding of Peter, already noticed, James backed up the argument, for the rights of the Gentile brethren, not by reference to this commission,—as an ordinance of Christ, settling the question,—but
by an inferential interpretation of "the words of the prophets." (Amos ix. 11.) Paul, also, justified the resolve, "Lo! we turn to the Gentiles," (Acts xiii. 47) by a quotation from Isaiah, (ch. xlix. 6), when we may suppose that he would have preferred these words of Christ, if he had understood them to apply to the case.

It would seem, then, that this commission, so generally relied on by modern interpreters, was not believed by the Apostles, to apply to the Gentile world. It therefore fails to prove an ordinance of Christ, for baptism with water, as a permanent Sacrament of the Universal Church.

Our brief examination of the Acts of the Apostles, has brought us to the formation of

THE FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCH, OF THE GENTILES.

Here we are very emphatically taught that Christ's Christianity is administered by the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, who works by divers ministries, "dividing to every man, severally as he will."

In the great development of the Christian Society, out of which CHRISTENDOM sprung,—the Spirit's instruments were a few nameless laymen.¹ We are

¹ It is very instructive to find the Spirit and Providence of God, signally dispensing with officialism, in the propagation of Christianity.

The chief honours, in the ministry of the early extension of the Gospel, had already been conferred on Stephen and Philip, two of the seven deacons or helpers, appointed to administer the temporal affairs of the Church, in behalf of the poor widows. These men had
distinctly informed that "all the members of the Church at Jerusalem, were scattered abroad, except the Apostles" (Acts viii. 1). Some of these fugitives, without any orders, and while their brethren were moving on the old lines, "preaching to none but Jews only," were led by the Spirit, and impelled to a grand

no ordination as preachers. Their office was rather "to serve tables"; yet their preaching was as truly effectual and owned of God, as that of any of the Apostles.

We may believe that Paul himself received his first lessons in preparation for the Apostleship, when he knew it not, while, in his frenzy of pharisaic zeal, he was promoting Stephen's martyrdom.

The martyr, to whose death he consented, lived again in the Apostle; and the preaching of Stephen is re-echoed and developed, in the ministry of Paul.

So, in after times, the rule of the Divine procedure appears to have been, to use, on a large scale, the ministry of humble private disciples; and the Gospel was published, and churches were formed in many places, without even a visit, or personal co-operation in any way, by an Apostle.

Who founded the famous Church at Rome?

Some of the unrecorded laymen, doubtless, who, as "sojourners from Rome," had been in Jerusalem, on the great day of Pentecost; and carried the seeds of the spiritual husbandry with them, on their return home.

This church was built up mainly, by the fruits of Paul's labours in various places, being drawn to the metropolis; and so bringing fresh accessions of living stones, to the edification of the spiritual temple. (Rom. i. and xvi.).

The pretence about "the See of Peter," and the myth of "the great Roman Church, founded by SS. Peter and Paul, are simply stupid or cunningly devised fables." (2 Peter i. 16.)

The truth of the matter is, rather, that "in Rome, the Gospel made its way, for five and twenty years, with nothing but the zeal of individuals to spread it"; these individuals being the untitled Laity. (See Burton's Bampton Lectures, on Gnosticism).

Before any Apostle had visited them, the members of this church, in the city of the Cæsars, had so fully apprehended and illustrated their Christian calling, that their "faith was proclaimed throughout the world." (Rom. i. 8).
venture, of common sense, and outburst of Christian philanthropy. "They spake unto the Greeks \(^1\) also, preaching the Lord Jesus."

We read that "the hand of the Lord was with them." We may reverently respond, "Aye! and the heart of the Lord was with them also"; for their's was a Christlike exploit!—"and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord."

Thus, the first Gentile Church originated; "and the disciples were called Christians, first in Antioch."

At the foundation of this Church; in connection with the subsequent labours of the unordained laymen, who founded it; and in its growth and progress, "even for a whole year," during which Paul and Barnabas "met with the Church, and taught much people," and "much people was added unto the Lord"; we find not a word about baptism!

**Early missionary labours.**

Furthermore, this independent Church of the Gentiles, was soon honoured to initiate an important mission. By a special divine communication, without any reference to the Church at Jerusalem, they sent forth Barnabas and Paul, on a grand missionary tour, to Seleucia, and thence to and through the island of

\(^1\) Not "Grecians" (Hellenists), as in ch. vi. 1, "Grecian Jews," as distinguished from "Hebrews"; but Gentile Greeks. The deviation from the practice of their brethren, who preached to "Jews only" (v. 19), is the emphatic point in the record. It was "a new departure," of highest import.
Cyprus; to Perga, to Antioch, in Pisidia; to Iconium, to Lystra and Derbe, and the region round about; returning through Pisidia to Pamphylia, Perga, and Attalia; and "thence they sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been committed to the grace of God, for the work which they had fulfilled." (Acts xiv. 26.)

In the history of this remarkable missionary journey,—which is, in some respects, the most interesting and suggestive on record,—we have reports of marvellous adventures, miracles, and preaching in various circumstances, amongst various peoples. We read of "multitudes" being "gathered together, to hear the word of God"; that the missionaries proclaimed the word of God, in the synagogues, of the Jews; that they "made many disciples," and "appointed elders in every Church"; that "a great multitude both of Jews and of Greeks believed"; that "the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost"; but not a word about baptism.

**Suggestive Silence.**

The Holy Spirit had called them; sent them forth and directed them in "their work; and they had fulfilled it," without a single case of administering the rite!

The conclusion is obvious. The first Gentile Church has no record of having received or propagated any "doctrine of baptism," but that of the "one baptism," of the Spirit. And to this agree the decisive words of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. (1 Cor. i. 17.)
A Hebrew of the Hebrews, always earnest in prayer to God, for the salvation of his kinsmen according to the flesh, and always ready to be all things to all men, that they might be saved,—Paul adopted, on all fitting occasions, the usages already recognized.

He baptized a few persons, amongst the mixed communities, in the usual way. He knew not exactly how many. That was a matter of comparative insignificance;—only, as the practice was becoming an occasion of evil,—he thanked God, that they had been but few.

Regarding his own commission, for the heathen nations, he has no hesitation or uncertainty. His declaration is distinct and emphatic,—"CHRIST SENT ME, NOT TO BAPTIZE; BUT TO PREACH THE GOSPEL."

It would seem to be an obvious inference, that He, by whom Paul was "sent," intended to send, not baptism, but the Gospel, to the heathen world. This is confirmed, by the whole subsequent record.¹

¹ It is instructive to note the facts of the first Apostolic labours, in Europe. Our great Christendom had a very humble birth. The model Church of Europe, which Paul afterwards regarded as his "JOY AND CROWN" (Phil. i. 5; iv. 1), at first consisted of two families, that of Lydia the dyer, and that of a Roman jailer, (Acts xvi.). But it was, soon after, complete, according to the Apostolic pattern, consisting of "saints in Christ Jesus," holding "fellowship in the Gospel," by the ministry of its own "bishops and deacons," without any other directors, under Christ; and without any sacerdotal "mysteries."

The "man of Macedonia," who had appeared in vision to the Apostle, saying "come over and help us," represented the collective presence of all the nations of the West; and confessed that heathenism had arrived at the end of its resources; and asked the Christian messenger, to help the men of Europe, in their desperate
We have now to examine briefly, the New Testament evidence, regarding the ordinance of the Eucharist, or

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

A few general remarks may here be helpful.

It is not necessary to enter upon any minute criticism, about various readings, the sources of the testimony in the four Gospels, or the comparative value of different manuscripts and versions.

The well-known and accepted evidence, is sufficient for our purpose. It is apparent to every reader that the Gospels were not compiled, according to the manner of modern bookmaking. They are fragmentary records, rather than systematic histories. We have not successive dates, or any regular chronological index. Of course, nothing corresponding to our usual modern title-page, name of author, with time and place of publication, can be looked for. We do not even possess a single original document, of any of them. The oldest

need." Accordingly, we read, in the sacred record,—"We sought to go forth into Macedonia; concluding that God called us, to preach the Gospel to them." (Acts xvi. 10.)

Ultimately, "from this base of operations the Apostle proceeded, on his great missionary tour, for the Evangelization of European Greece; and by these labours Christianity triumphed; when the whole organization of the Roman Empire, from the omnipotent decrees of the Imperial city, down to the torturing stocks, in the lowest cell of the remotest prison, was arrayed against the Gospel of Christ" (Baumgarten's "Apostolic History," vol. ii. pp. 3-12 et seq.).

The vision of the man of Macedonia, and the wonderful works of God, in connection with it, may inspire the cry of Christendom, even now, for a revival of Apostolic Christianity.
manuscripts or parts of MSS. known to moderns, are believed not to date, earlier than the fourth or fifth century; though there are versions, from earlier MSS.

But it is certain that the four Gospels were well known and in general use, in the Churches, before the beginning of the second century; and extracts and references, in the works of the earliest Ecclesiastical writers, abundantly attest their acceptance and recognized authority, amongst all the Christian communities.

This is one of the principal uses, if not the most important use, of the writings of the early Fathers; and we offer this brief statement of the case, here, in order at once to mark the historical value of some of these writings; and to correct the confusion and misapprehension, which so generally prevail concerning them.

**THE CANON OF OUR NEW TESTAMENT**

was not made "by authority," or devised by any ruling council. It grew, from the spontaneous, independent, but gradual and discriminating acceptance, of the Churches; guarded by a vigilant rivalry, and even by the jealous hostility of heretical separatists, and Jewish and heathen adversaries.

We have only, therefore, to exercise due care, with regard to the text and a correct rendering, to enable us to feel assured that we are in communion with the original writers; and "thoroughly furnished" with
adequate means of ascertaining the true scope and purport of their testimony.¹

The four "Evangelists" (as they have been designated) evidently wrote independently, and, in all probability—at least the first three—without any knowledge of one another's performances. The idea of concerted action, and of one Gospel being prepared as a supplement or sequel to the others, is quite untenable.

Luke's is the most of a regular history; according to his announced purpose, Luke i. 1-3; and perhaps, from his education and professional habits. As "the beloved physician," friend and travelling companion of the Apostle Paul, his position was peculiar.

LUKE AND PAUL.

From his first appearance with Paul, (indicated by the familiar "we," in his narrative, in the book of the Acts,) he seems to have accompanied him frequently, though with several intervals of separation. Finally, when the great Apostle was awaiting his martyrdom, and "ready to be offered," the loving friend was near

¹ The reader may find much interesting information and helpful discussion, on these and kindred topics—the results of learned investigation and patient research, in such works as Horne's "Introduction to the Bible;" Dr. Davidson's "Introduction to the New Testament;" Dean Alford's "Prolegomena" to his Greek Testament; and Dr. Tischendorf's valuable little work, entitled—"When were our Gospels Written?"

"The Oxford Bible for Teachers," also, gives a rich summary of instructive notes, and various important aids to students of holy Scripture.
and from his Roman prison, Paul wrote, "only Luke is with me." (2 Tim. iv. 11.)

The intervals of separation, just mentioned, sufficiently account for the omission of several important portions of Paul's labours, from Luke's record (Gal. i. 17, &c., and ii. 1, 4, 7, &c.), and suggest the probability, that on these occasions they were severally occupied, in connection with portions of the invaluable writings, which have come to us from their hands.

Although "many" similar accounts had previously been compiled (Luke i. 1, 2), yet Luke's Gospel may have been the first written, of the four which are in our Canon. He broke off the record of the Acts, two years after his arrival in Rome with Paul, "the prisoner of Jesus Christ, for the Gentiles."

At the beginning of this book, he refers to his Gospel, as "the former treatise," which was probably already well known.

He also supplies several particulars, in connection with our Lord's resurrection, and His intercourse with His disciples, additional to the record in the Gospel, and which he had, doubtless, learned, in the interval, from some of those who had been "eye-witnesses," according to his rule.

RELATIVE DATES.

The date of the conclusion of the Acts, is well ascertained, from the previous events in the history of:
Paul, to be in A.D. 63,² two whole years after the arrival in Rome.

When we remember that the publishing or circulation of a book, in those times, was by copying, and distributing, by private messengers, to other private persons, a letter or manuscript, of which the outside world knew nothing, we may reasonably suppose that the Gospel, to which Luke thus alludes, must have been written some years previously.

We may, perhaps, fix it at A.D. 58, before the departure from Philippi, (Acts xx. 6) for Paul's last visit to Jerusalem.

After the conclusion of the book of the Acts, we have nothing from Luke, about Paul's labours or his own. We can, therefore, judge of occurrences during the Apostle's brief term of liberty, and his final imprisonment, only from allusions in his later Epistles.

Doubtless the distinctive character of Luke's Gospel, results mainly, from his wide experience, in travel and labour with Paul.

It is, as we may say, coloured, or flavoured, by sympathy and intercourse, with the converted Pharisee, "the Apostle of the Gentiles."

---

² A.D. 63. The reader will, of course, remember that the method of chronological computation, by the Christian era, was not then in use, and that there is no chronological index given in the New Testament. The dates assigned to particular occurrences in the history and work of the Apostles, have, therefore, to be made out, by careful comparison of different parts of the record, and by the aid of contemporaneous events, in Jewish, Greek, and Roman history.
FRAGMENTARY RECORDS.

This connection is very notable, in relation to the mention of

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

It is only in Paul's account, (1 Cor. xi. 20) that this designation is employed. Probably this was the first report written; as Paul wrote this Epistle from Ephesus, (ch. xvi. 8), where he abode two years, (Acts xix. 10) before starting for Jerusalem—via Macedonia, &c. (Acts xx.)—in A.D. 58, as already noticed.

Be this as it may, the resemblance between this account and Luke's, is very striking. It may also be remarked here, that only these two give any intimation, regarding any intended future observance. Matthew, who alone, of these writers, was present at the last Passover, with our Lord, does not record any direction for a commemorative observance, or repetition of the feast.

Neither does Mark, who is thought to have been instructed by Peter, as he appears to have been discipled by him. (1 Peter v. 14.)

CHARACTER OF RECORD.

The fragmentary and divergent accounts of all, clearly indicate, that a precise record of a permanent divine ordinance, was not intended.

They do not even report any distinctive name, as given, to describe a new Institution. Their language is altogether different from that employed on the
introduction of laws and ordinances of Divine appointment, with which they were familiar.

Not only do they manifest great diversity of apprehension and memory, regarding the order and connection of events, on the occasion; but still more, a remarkable absence of any proof, that they had all learned, one great fact, about a new, distinctive, and most sacred ordinance of the new faith; to be observed by all future disciples of their Master, in all nations, through all generations, to the end of the world!

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE PASSOVER.

Of all the discourses and wonderful words, uttered by our Lord on this impressive occasion, they severally recall different expressions.

Luke alone, of the Evangelists, mentions that He said, "Do this" (or "keep," or observe this) in remembrance of me." What were they doing, when He said, "Do this"?\(^1\) (τούτο ποιήσετε). They were eating. They were at "supper"; occupied—not with a mystery, but with a meal. They were united in a solemn, joyful commemorative feast, in celebration of a great deliverance, which God had, in a former age, wrought for their fathers. This feast was historical, and well understood. Of course, they had no conception of anything like transubstantiation, or a modern Sacrament; and they did not express any surprise at the

---

\(^1\) τούτο τὸ πάσχα. Our Lord's words in Matt. xxvi. 18—"I will keep the Passover," are in strict accordance with the familiar usage of the Septuagint version.
Master's words. When He "took bread," or a loaf or cake in His hands, and broke it, and handed it to them, saying, "This is my body," they did not imagine that He invited them to eat Himself, while He was alive, looking at them and talking with them, at the head of the supper-table.

Neither could they suppose, that He spoke literally or uttered a wilful falsehood, when He said, "This cup is the new covenant, in my blood, even that which is poured out for you"; while they knew that His blood, was then, as formerly, coursing through His veins. It is almost superfluous, to point out that such monstrous absurdities are not suggested by

CHRIST'S OWN WORDS.

The context, and all the circumstances, clearly indicate that our Lord intended simply to enjoin, that at future feasts, they should think of Him. The Passover, which they had just observed, would on future occasions, as often as they might be permitted to keep it, remind them of their loving absent Lord; and especially of His death and blood-shedding in their behalf; in reference to which He had said, "With desire, I have desired to eat this Passover with you, before I suffer."

Whenever they might meet together, as His followers, especially when eating and drinking in loving fellowship, they would devoutly and loyally remember Him, as "our Passover, sacrificed for us"; and sweetly treasure up in their hearts (as Augustine said) the precious memory that He loved them, and gave Himself for them.
But this parting command, thus addressed to the Apostles, in their peculiar circumstances, with explicit limitation to their future opportunities of keeping the Passover, and without any directions for perpetuity, or for transferrence, in any way to others, cannot fairly be regarded, as ordaining a Sacrament, of perpetual obligation upon all Christians, to the end of time.¹

As with regard to baptism, so on our present subject, we should carefully study the subsequent history of the teaching and practice of the Apostles, as indicating how they understood the Master’s words.

A DISTINCTIVE FEATURE.

Here it is important to note a distinctive fact, that has been too frequently forgotten; and is even ignored, in some critical disquisitions, on our present subject.

The feast of bread and wine, formed no part of the

¹ It is essential to ascertain the primary significance of a passage, before attempting to make any practical application of it; and the two things should not be confounded, or one of them put in place of the other.

We are plainly taught, how to use “whatsoever things were written aforetime for our learning”: not by ignoring their historical character; but by discovering in them, lessons for ourselves.

We should discriminate regarding things recorded, as addressed by our Lord to His Apostles, remembering that some of them were special, and cannot apply to us.

He said to them, “Heal the sick”; “Raise the dead”; “Cast out devils” (demons); “Salute no man by the way”; and again, “Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.”

These and similar utterances, deserve our reverent attention; but we must not assume that they apply to us; or feel at liberty to make any arbitrary or fanciful use of them.
original ordinance of the Passover; and we have no record of the time or occasion of its introduction.

It appears to have arisen out of the gradual incorporation of the observance, or of a more simple commemoration, with the family meal, or other social feast; and it was afterwards adopted, in connection with the synagogue worship.

Moreover, as the synagogue itself did not originate in Levitical ordinances, but grew out of the social requirements of the people, we have here a remarkable proof of the free working of the religious life, under the old dispensation.

God did not, even then, leave the human spirit in bondage, under Law. He reserved to Himself, the special ministry of Prophets and Providences; and the agency of the Divine Spirit was manifested, both in connection with the ceremonial ordinances, and independently of them.

THE SYNAGOGUE MODEL.

In the synagogue there was no offering of sacrifices; and no function of an official priesthood; and as the personal ministry of our Lord, was largely identified with it, and the Christian Church, in its first formation, grew out of it, it is interesting to learn that a feast of

---

1 Even in the equivalent use of names, we may find an instructive illustration of this. While the synagogue was yet used, and before a Christian Church was organized, our Lord enjoined—"Tell it to the Church" (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ), and, nearly twenty years after, the Apostle James instructed Christians about persons coming into their
bread and wine, constituted a part of the synagogue service.

"It was a Jewish custom to end the Sabbath with a feast, in which they did homage to it, as to a parting king. The feast was held in the synagogue. A cup of wine, over which a special blessing had been spoken, was handed round."

"It is obvious that so long as the Apostles and their followers fraternized with their brethren of the stock of Abraham, this would come to correspond with their (δείπνον) "Supper," and be held on "the first day of the week." ¹ We may safely conclude that the spiritual affinity which gathered other festival observances around the ancient usage, in celebrating the Passover, was fully recognized by our Lord; and that in sanctioning the keeping of the feast, according to the custom of His time, He anticipated the final change and passing away, of all these rudiments of outward observance, on the establishment "of the new covenant," under "the ministration of the Spirit."

The simple service of the Synagogue, which was weekly,—and not the annual ceremonial of the Temple,—was evidently the type and model of the "Supper," to be observed by the Apostles.

This was neither a sacrifice nor a mystery; but a

¹ Smith's "Bible Dictionary," Article, Synagogue. See also Jahn and Coleman's "Christian Antiquities."
fellowship feast, of the most familiar character, though of sacred and beneficent import.

A clear perception of this unquestionable fact, furnishes the key to the true interpretation of the subsequent record.¹

CHRISTIAN COMMUNION.

We learn from the early report (in Acts ii. 43, &c.) that in the fresh fervour of their new life, the first Christians manifested a marvellous earnestness and simplicity. Their new faith and hope had a very practical and realistic influence; leading them to the voluntary adoption of a singular sort of communism. They “were together, and had all things common; and

¹ “Wherever a Jewish synagogue existed, that was brought, the whole, or a chief part of it—to embrace the Gospel—the Apostles did not there so much form a Christian Church (or congregation—‘Ekklesia’), as make an existing congregation, Christian; . . . . leaving the existing machinery of government, unchanged.”

“Although the many Churches founded by the Apostles, were branches of one spiritual brotherhood, of which the Lord Jesus Christ is the heavenly head, . . . . yet they were, each a distinct independent community, on earth, united by the common principles on which they were founded, and by their mutual agreement, affection and respect; but not having any one head, on earth, or acknowledging any sovereignty of any one of these societies, over others” (Archbishop Whately, Essay on “The Kingdom of Christ,” pp. 40–103 et seq.)

“The foundation of the Church, by the Apostles, was not analogous to the work of Romulus or Solon. It was not properly, the foundation of Christian societies that occupied them, but the establishment of the principles, on which, Christians, in all ages, may form societies for themselves” (Encyclopædia Metropolitana, “Apostolic Fathers.” See also Geisler’s “Ecclesiastical History,” vol. i. pp. 90–92).
they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, according as any man had need.” In this connection we find them uniting in daily worship, and a daily common meal. But there is no hint of a Sacrament in all this. “They continued steadfastly in the Apostles’ teaching and fellowship; in the breaking of bread, and the prayers.” That there might be no mistake about it, this breaking of bread is described as taking place “at home”; and as taking “their food.” But it was a true Eucharist, for they ate “with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people.”

The excessive fervour, which led to daily meetings, naturally soon gave place to the regular weekly gathering, on the first day of the week; as we find frequently intimated, in the history by Luke, and in Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians. (xvi. 2.)

A PREVALENT MISTAKE.

The mention of preaching and worship on such occasions, has led to a serious misapprehension, on the part of many devout persons, who transfer the associations of modern sectarianism, to the simple records of these early times; and imagine a Sacrament, or ceremony, where nothing of the kind was intended.

FALSE CLAIMS.

It has been claimed, that every incidental mention of the disciples having “met together, to break bread,” is a record of the administration of the Sacrament.
Is every such case, then, to be regarded, as an anticipation or ante-dating of the Romish "communion in one kind"? or, as a Sacramental celebration by Laymen?

Are not these notices, rather, to be understood, as referring, simply, to the common fellowship meal?

The record in Acts xxvii. 33-38, has been gravely adduced, as evidence for the Sacrament. But here, surely, the argument is at sea.

The idea that Paul administered the blessed Eucharist, to the hungry sailors, and all his fellow-passengers, to feed nearly 300 persons, until "they had eaten enough," after a fortnight's fatigue and fasting, is too absurd for sober criticism. Did he cheat them into serving Mass, or swallowing the consecrated "elements,"—to satiety, and unintentionally,—by pretending that he himself was only taking some food"? This is simply incredible, as every sober-minded person will admit. How can Sacramentarians suppose, that the great Apostle would desecrate the "sacred mysteries"? Other passages have been pressed into Sacramental service; though they contain distinct intimations, that their true interpretation is incompatible with such a claim. They emphatically protest against it, as we shall see.

Special importance attaches to Paul's celebrated words, addressed to the Church at Corinth; and the history and circumstances present a very affecting case,
THE CHURCH AT CORINTH.

The opulence of the proud city, had gravely imperilled the spiritual life of many who had professed faith in Christ.

The proverbially voluptuous Corinth, from its unrivalled position for commerce, from its historic connection with the old Isthmian Games, and from having become the seat of the Roman Governor, and the Metropolis of Achaia, presented, at once, an important sphere for Apostolic labour, and a dangerous position for new converts to the Christian faith. Accordingly, we find, that here the great Apostle had some of his greatest triumphs in the truth, and some of his greatest trials and deepest sorrows, over those who had been beguiled and overcome by abounding evil.

Many of the Corinthian Christians had been heathens, (ch. xii. 21), though the first converts were influential Jews (Acts xviii. 8).

DANGEROUS POSITION.

Some of them had been ensnared into idolatry and immorality, by accepting invitations to idol feasts; and in admonishing them of this temptation, and beseeching them to "flee from idolatry," he introduces, for contrast and instruction, a reference to the Christian feast.

"The cup of blessing, which we bless," is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?
"Seeing that we who are many, are one bread, one body; for we all partake of the one bread. But, I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils (demons) and not to God; and I would not that ye should have communion with devils. (demons). Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils; (demons). Ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of devils." (demons). (I Cor. x. 14-21.)

**PAUL'S TEACHING.**

Here, we cannot possibly find anything corresponding with a Sacrament. The feast of Christian fellowship, symbolized and expressed Christian union.

The "we" of the brotherhood, the many partakers, constituted the "one body, one bread," not by transubstantiation, or other sacramental mystery; but simply by the intelligent and honest exercise of brotherly love, and unity in Christian faith and hope; which their feast of fellowship was intended to express.

"The cup," or "the table," of "devils" or demons, did not indicate a change of the contents of either cup or table, into the person, or body, or objective presence of any of these evil spirits; or a Sacrament of their appointment. It simply expressed the significance of the idolatrous feast. And as the forms of expression are similar, "the cup of the Lord, and the table of the Lord," must surely be understood in like manner, as
simply characterizing the feast and fellowship of His disciples.

This is more fully expressed, in the familiar passage in the next chapter, (ch. xi. 17 to end); but a tedious analysis is not necessary. The subject throughout, is obviously the same as that already noticed; and it is not difficult, to ascertain the true character of the Christian feast, alluded to, or to estimate aright, the serious evils pointed out and censured by the Apostle.

It was in connection with the weekly fellowship feast, the sad abuses described, had broken out at Corinth; and it is of a social meal, he treats, throughout.

He describes their meeting together, not as if to witness a sacrifice or ceremony, but, as "coming together to eat." Both the evils deplored, and the remedies prescribed, all point to a feast or meal of Christian brotherhood; and while their grieved and faithful teacher, plainly denounces the evils, and as plainly inculcates the way of remedy, and reform; he utters not a word, about any sacramental mystery.

"I praise you not," he says, "that you come together not for the better, but for the worse. For, first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that divisions exist among you, and I partly believe it." Further, remarking on these divisions or heresies, he solemnly declares, "When therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the Lord's Supper."
COMMUNION HINDERED.

Does any earnest inquirer demand—"Why not"? "What hindered the due administration of the Sacrament"? Of Sacrament, Paul says nothing; but the impossibility of their eating the Lord's Supper, is very plainly stated, thus,—"In your eating, each one taketh before other, his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken."

By their selfish gluttony, they had perverted the original feast of Christian brotherhood, into an occasion of gross indulgence of fleshly appetite, on the part of the rich; and of shaming and despising the poor.

1 The social sentiment was largely cultivated by the Greeks; and their popular assembly—ἡ ἐκκλησία—was, in several respects, similar to the synagogue.

They were, moreover, quite as familiar with religious observances, in connection with feasts and social gatherings, as the Jews were; and their club-feasts would, at least, help them to understand one aspect of the Christian fellowship.

We are told that these societies were to be found in almost every part of the Empire, in connection with trade, or politics, or friendly intercourse; and it was usual for the members to unite in a common meal. They contributed, each a certain sum of money, or brought their provisions with them; and in the common life of the Greeks of this period, these "club-feasts" were associated with plans for mutual help, or charity to the poor.

From this, it will be perceived how generally the social customs of the times, facilitated the adoption of the "Agape," wherever the Gospel was received; and also how lamentable abuses would arise, in connection with it, among people not fully instructed in Christianity, and surrounded by the impurities of a voluptuous heathenism, as was the case in Corinth.

"The Agape of the new society, would seem to them, to be such a feast" (as that of their own customs), "and hence came a disorder that frustrated the object of the Church, in instituting it." (Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible"—Article, Lord's Supper.)
Thus "they despised the Church of God," and brought judgment upon themselves; and in their schismatical self-indulgence, they demonstrated a total disregard, or misapprehension, of the true character of a Christian Church, as "the body of Christ."

It is worthy of remark here, that, as all competent translators have discarded the erroneous rendering, "damnation," in this passage, (which had caused so much misapprehension,) so it has been pointed out by Dean Alford and others, that the word ἀναξιωτα "unworthily," in 29th verse, "is spurious." The company of Revisers have further omitted τοῦ Κυρίου,— "the Lord's"; and render the whole verse thus:—"For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body."¹

(μὴ διακρίνω τὸ σῶμα).

The "discerning" or discriminating "the body," is further applied to "ourselves," as members; showing distinctly, that it is of fellowship in the Church, the Apostle speaks.

If anything further were necessary, to prove the original design, we have it in the Apostle's closing admonition—"When ye come together to eat, tarry one for another."

THE ABUSE AND THE REMEDY.

Their waiting for one another, could not transub-

¹ Thus we habitually speak of a society, especially of a religious society, as "a body," and of individuals, as members of "the body."
stantiate their food; or produce Christ's bodily presence in it; or cause any sacramental miracle.

But it would prevent the selfish gluttony and vulgar greed, by which some of them had been "despising the Church of God, and shaming their poor brethren." It might also be a first step towards their recovery from the schismatical degradation into which they had fallen, and help them to act, as in the real presence of the living Saviour, whom they professed to serve. At all events it would tend to restore their meeting together, to its original character, as a profession and a feast of Christian brotherhood.

Similar abuses to those which occurred at Corinth, are glanced at by other Apostles, when they speak of "spots," or "hidden rocks," at the love feasts; "feeding themselves without fear"; and describe some as "creatures without reason, born mere animals"; "spots and blemishes, revelling, in their love feasts, while they feast with you." ¹

These are amongst the many intimations, which the Apostles had so solemnly and sorrowfully to record, of the defection and corruption, which wrought so disastrously amongst the Churches, in their own time, and in the generation immediately following; as we shall have to notice, before we close.

It is remarkable, that some, who eagerly support the Sacramental system, yet when calmly engaged as expositors of the word—apart from defending parti-

¹ Jude v. 12, and 2 Peter ii. 12-14.
cular theories—naturally or unconsciously adopt plain words of historical description.

Dean Alford, in his admirable and scholarly work on the Greek Testament, headed the section, above mentioned, (in 1 Cor. xi.),

"ABUSES OF THE AGAPE," ETC.

This is, precisely, the Apostle's theme. He does not mention, or recognize, or leave room for any Sacrament, distinct from the feast of brotherhood. He recognizes only one recurring occasion of their coming together to eat. "The Lord's Supper," of Paul, was the Agape; "the love feast"; nothing more, and nothing else.

The New Testament record, marks no distinction. The discovery or invention of a dual festival, and the appointment of two distinct observances, were the achievements of a later age.¹

But the original design, and beautiful exposition of the simple Christian feast, with its important practical lessons, are impressively urged by the Apostle, in the subsequent context (ch. xii. 12-27).

¹ Note. The oldest liturgical compositions extant, known as the "Apostolical Canons," and "Constitutions," give precise accounts of both. They claim to have been derived from the Apostles; but were fabricated in the third century and later. The original forgery being in Greek, was partly translated into Latin, in the sixth century. They furnish an interesting view of the Church life, of that age, and constitute the basis of both the Eastern and the Western liturgies, of the present day. (See Coleman's "Christian Antiquities," pp. 21-23, 134, 135.)
"As the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. For, in one Spirit, were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, and were all made to drink of one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many; that there should be no schism in the body; but the members should have the same care, one for another. . . . Now, ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof." (Revised Version.)

In this way, the Apostle sought to correct their errors, and to raise their conceptions to a due appreciation of the spiritual significance of their Christian profession.

From this, we may clearly learn what was the intention and use of their simple but much abused "love feast"; and the great lesson, remaining for us concerning the spiritual reality, apart from all ceremonial substitutes.¹

USE AND LIMIT OF THE OBSERVANCE.

Recurring to the special design of the temporary commemoration of the Passover, glanced at by our Lord, the Apostle urged,—"As often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim (or proclaim ye, do proclaim) the Lord's death till He come." These words indicate, at once, the real purpose of the com-

¹ Appendix, Note G.
memoration, and the anticipation of its discontinuance. To proclaim the Lord's death, as the end and antitype of the Passover; the foundation fact of Christian testimony, and centre of Christian doctrine, in the interval granted to them, should be their supreme object.

This feast was to be to them, the complement and interpretation of the Passover, until all such observances should be done away with, at the coming of the Lord.

EVENT INDICATED.

We are here brought to a most interesting subject of inquiry, on which much diversity of opinion and lamentable misconceptions have prevailed.

"Till He come"! This brief utterance, solemnly, though indefinitely, marks the terminus, at which the observances, under discussion, should cease.

We need not ask the Apostle, "when will that be"? And if he had been so interrogated, it is probable that his reply would have been, "I cannot tell." There are indications in his own writings, that it was not given to him to know the times and seasons, which our Lord had spoken of, as "reserved by the Father."

Paul had not only to correct errors, into which some of his converts had fallen, regarding his own teaching on this subject, but also to utter further oracles concerning it, without attempting to assign a date for the event.¹

¹ 2 Thess. ii.
As the prophets, of old, had to inquire and search diligently, for what the Spirit of God signified, in some of their predictions, so, doubtless, it was with the Apostles; and we should, in like manner, labour humbly and prayerfully, to discover the mind of the Spirit.

Although the precise reference of the Apostle's words, is not stated, yet our Lord's own sayings, which Paul here re-echoes, and the Providential fulfilment of those sayings, in the marvellous events of Jewish history, after the Apostle's death, clearly prove that the Lord's "coming," here spoken of, took place, at the great crisis of the abrogation of all the old ceremonial; in the destruction of Jerusalem.

HIS OWN PREDICTION.

We cannot attempt a lengthened or critical interpretation of the predictions and descriptions of this unparalleled event. It was, confessedly, a great catastrophe, which marked a special Divine providence in the government of the world.

In relation to our present subject, it is important to note how distinctly our Lord described the occurrence, as His own coming. ¹

¹ Similar forms of expression are used, in reference to His spiritual coming; as, in Matt. xviii. 20; John xiv. 18-23; Rev. iii. 20. No words could more emphatically express a real presence; but no person would interpret them literally in these passages. The context and the nature of the subject, suggest the true interpretation. "Will sup" ( века ся), Rev. iii. 20, very touchingly indicates the Lord's purpose, of a true spiritual communion; but certainly does not propose a Sacrament.
In that most impressive series of previsions, in the 24th chapter of Matthew's Gospel, He seems to invest Himself with the executive in the sublime transactions portrayed; and to mark them definitely, as the tokens of His "presence,"—παρώνια; vers. 3, 27, 37, 39 (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. vii. 6, and x. 10; Phil. ii. 27; 2 Thess. ii. 9).

It should be specially noted, that He spoke for the generation then living; distinctly intimating to His hearers, that they might see the fulfilment; while He predicted approaching judgments, as the signs of His "coming."¹

The solemn apprehension of these utterances of our Lord, doubtless filled the soul of His faithful servant, when, with awe, and love, and hope, he anticipated the issue; "TILL HE COME."

We shall have to recur to this subject, in our next section; and, in the meantime, another line of remark is necessary, to complete our sketch of the New Testament record.

We must endeavour, briefly to trace the history of

¹ Commenting on vers. 13, 14, Dean Alford justly observes:—
"The primary meaning of this, seems to be, that whosoever remained faithful, till the destruction of Jerusalem, should be preserved from it. No Christian, that we know of, perished in the siege. . . . . The Gospel had been preached, through the whole 'orbis terrarum,' and every nation had received its testimony, before the destruction of Jerusalem."

He, of course, adds—"it has, also, an ulterior meaning." But it is with the primary meaning, only, we have to do, in our present inquiry.
Apostolic teaching and practice; as indicated by what we may designate as the negative evidence.

This we have already briefly used, regarding Baptism.

It is natural to inquire how the Apostles educated the Churches, on what is represented as the highest attainment and most august act of Christian worship. What can be said, as to the expositions and injunctions, by which these inspired men, formed and fostered the faith of their spiritual children?

This part of our investigation may cause a painful surprise, to persons engaging in it, for the first time.

We have absolutely no such instances recorded, as the case would require.

Let it be clearly understood, that the argument does not turn on the lacking of direct historic testimony. Incidental allusion would be enough. Our use of "the negative evidence," is that which prevails, in all departments of literary inquiry; and is adopted by all schools of theology and Biblical criticism; as is briefly illustrated in our Notes.¹

---

¹ It is argued, for instance, that Peter's silence, about the hierarchical supremacy, when writing in solicitude for the welfare of the Church, after his decease, is conclusive, against the claim of a Roman Pontificate, said to have been begun in his own appointment. If he was the first Pope, how could he think he was doing his endeavour, to serve the Church of the future, when he did not urge obedience to future Pontiffs, or say a word about the holy Roman See? (2 Peter i. 12-15). See Note H.
REMARKABLE OMISSIONS.

It cannot fail to strike the attentive reader, that the New Testament affords no information, of the kind required.

We can find no mention of the Sacrament, in connections, and on occasions, that would naturally require some notice of it, if the Apostles had enjoined and observed it.

We search in vain, through the whole book of the Acts, for the first instance of an Apostolic celebration.

At church meetings, Apostolic conferences, missionary gatherings, and such solemn religious services, as are specially associated with the "administration,"—in modern Sacramentarian communities,—we find no allusion to the observance.

Not only is there a blank absence of any such record, but the whole tenor of the extant history, indicates that it is not recorded, simply because it did not occur.

We come to Antioch, after the formation of the first Church of the Gentiles, and remain over a year, during which Paul and Barnabas assemble with the Church, and teach much people; and, as already observed in regard to baptism, we find no mention of any sacramental performance. We accompany the two great preachers, on their grand missionary tour, and return with them to Antioch. They "gather the Church together"; and report the glorious triumph of Christianity over heathenism, by God's "opening the
door of faith to the Gentiles." They remain "a long time, with the disciples." But, as week after week, and month after month, come and go, in all their assemblies, we find no intimation of the observance of any Sacrament!

Could it have been so, if modern Roman Catholic missionaries, or Protestant Parsons, had occupied the place of Barnabas and Paul?

DECREES FOR FREEDOM.

This record of non-sacramental communion at Antioch, becomes emphasized by what followed.

When the famous "Council" assembled at Jerusalem, to answer the inquiries of the Church in Antioch, about the strange doctrines, propounded to them, by some members of the Jerusalem Church,—when the whole force of "the circumcision" believers was against the new liberty of the Gentile converts, and even the most strenuous advocates of that liberty, were disposed to be very cautious and very conservative, in dealing with the innovation,—what do we find, in relation to our present inquiry?

The old Jewish ritual is discarded; and no other ritual or sacramental observance is enjoined instead. Here is a whole heathen population, of several provinces, on their opening to Evangelization, completely freed from the ceremonial law of Moses, and left in utter ignorance of any ceremonial law of Christ! They are admonished about certain "necessary
things”; but these necessary things do not include the Christian Sacraments 1

1 The unanimous decision, arrived at, is instructive, in its wise regard for fraternal relations, as well as for Christian liberty.

It was necessary to admonish new converts from heathenism, to abandon all the immoral practices, with which they had been familiar, in connection with the worship of idols. The use of “things strangled” and of “blood,” was intimately associated with the abominations of heathenism, in the estimation of devout Jews; and as Moses was “read in the synagogues, every Sabbath in every city,” both Jews and Gentiles were constantly reminded of this association. Moreover, many Gentile teachers held similar views, altogether independently of Hebrew legislation. It was, therefore, a measure of wise conciliation, to urge these proprieties on the new converts, while pronouncing their Christian freedom from the Jewish ritual.

The moderation and charity, displayed on this occasion by Peter and James, as leaders of the Jewish Christians, must appear all the more edifying, by contrast with the sad excesses of later times.

After “their incurable turbulence,” under Trajan and Hadrian, had led the latter to make a stern decree, that no Jew should be allowed to come within view of “Elia Capitolina,” (the rebuilt Jerusalem), with its temple of Jupiter, on Mount Moriah, in their last mad revolt against their ruthless conquerors, their hostility to the followers of Christ, was marked with revolting atrocity.

Justin Martyr—who was a contemporary—relates that their leader and pretended Messiah, Barcochebas, ordered the Christians to be executed with dreadful tortures, unless they blasphemed the name of Jesus.

“In this dreadful war, Judea was reduced to a wilderness, and over five hundred thousand rebels fell on the battlefield; besides vast multitudes who perished, by famine, pestilence, and the burning of nearly 1000 towns and villages.” These last efforts to regain national independence, extending to about fifty years after the destruction of the Temple, at once emphasized the era of “judgment,” by the sacrifice of (it is calculated) four millions of human beings, and marked the complete separation of Christianity from Judaism; in the abandonment of the ceremonial law, and the election of a bishop, of “the uncircumcision,” by the Church of Jerusalem.
We find an interesting confirmation of this view, under very peculiar circumstances, several years after this council or conference occurred.

Paul had preached in many places, and exercised his "liberty in the Gospel," while retaining his fidelity to national Jewish customs. At Corinth and Ephesus, and at Philippi, (on laying the foundation of the first Christian Church, of Apostolic formation, in Europe), he had recognized the baptism of Jewish proselytes and others; as we have formerly noticed.

It is remarkable, that after many years of Apostolic labour, he was anxious to go up to Jerusalem, to keep a Jewish feast; and had his head shorn, because he had a vow.

On arriving in Jerusalem, having gladdened the hearts of James and the other Jewish Christians, by reporting the work of God, by his ministry, among the Gentiles,—he was ready, at the instance of these brethren, to join in ceremonies of purification, and offering sacrifices in the Temple, in order to conciliate hostile Jewish brethren.

In the midst of these proceedings, the Jerusalem Christians are careful to remind him of the decision formerly agreed to, regarding Gentile converts:—"As touching the Gentiles who believe, we have written, and concluded that they observe no such thing."

This review of the case, after eight or nine years of the practical working of the law of liberty, shows how fully James and the other leaders of the Jewish
Christians, agreed with Paul, regarding his wider ministry.

The admonition to "abstain from things offered to idols," &c., is repeated. But "no such thing," as the Jewish ritual, is enjoined; and again, there is no mention of the Sacraments.

It must be confessed, that the omission is fatal to the claim for their perpetuity.

The closing record of the book of the Acts, is very instructive, and deeply interesting, in relation to our present theme.

It brings us, through various scenes, and remarkable adventures, to the metropolis of the heathen world; and permits us to contemplate the great Christian missionary, in contact with the central power of Imperial idolatry.

Let us, then, intelligently contemplate

PAUL THE APOSTLE, IN ROME;

and briefly notice his proceedings there.

We cannot be surprised to find him zealous for the seed of Abraham. His "desire and prayer to God," for the salvation of "Israel," are still fresh and fervent.

His first efforts are with the Jews; and what a model of candour and courtesy, of tact and faithfulness, does he display in these interviews!

He is, in a sense, his own accuser; and frankly reports his having incurred the displeasure of his fellow-countrymen; but he will not accuse them,
before the Roman Emperor, to whom he has appealed, in self-defence.

With consummate skill, he represents Christianity as "the hope of Israel"; and tries to lead them to Jesus, by the help of "Moses and the prophets"!

It is not of outward forms, or modes of worship, he has to speak. He pleads for no new rites, or Christian institutions. His one aim is to expound and testify concerning "the kingdom of God," and to persuade them "concerning Jesus."

But, as they will not accept his testimony for Christ, he finally breaks the long-continued truce, saying,—"Be it known unto you, that the salvation of God is sent to the Gentiles; and they will hear it."

The great Apostle is now free! Free from all the trammels of his early education. Free for his great work; and free from all the restraints hitherto observed, for the conciliation of "his unbelieving brethren."

His ministry is to bring,—not circumcision, or Jewish ritual, or Christian sacraments; but, "THE SALVATION OF GOD," to the Gentile world.

CHRISTIANITY FOR ALL MANKIND.

Accordingly, we read that, during two whole years, he continued, "preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ"; without a hint of his having set up any ceremonial, or ordained or practised any sacramental mysteries.

Surely the Gentile Christians then in Rome, were
not Sacramentarians. They were not taught—according to modern Ecclesiology—that water baptism is the sacred portal of entrance to the Christian Church; and the sacrifice of the Mass, or the celebration of the “blessed Eucharist,” or the sacramental use of bread and wine, is “the great central act of Christian worship”!

The recorded Acts of the Apostles, beautifully re-echo the Angels' announcement of the Gospel, as “good tidings of great joy—to all people”!

The peculiarity which we have found pervading the record of “the Acts,” is marked, still more fully, in

THE APOSTOLIC EPISTLES.

Here, the negative evidence is frequently interlaced with positive and direct declaration, of most explicit character.

Not only are there no Canons or Rubrics, regulating the observance of the rites of the Churches, but there is no mention of them, where they ought to be mentioned, if they had been ordained.

The Churches are instructed, doctrinally and controversially, about the inutility, and positive evil of maintaining the old ceremonial.¹ “There is a dis-

¹ Paul especially treats this subject with unsparing severity. After the persistent attempts of “the circumcision,” to enforce the old ritualism, it was no longer a question about things indifferent. It was antagonism to the work of Christ, and perverted His Gospel. It tended to frustrate his design of making peace, and reconciling both Jews and Gentiles, “in one body, unto God.” It attempted to
annulling of a foregoing commandment, because of its weakness and unprofitableness.” (Heb. vii. 18.)

The Levitical ceremonies are designated “weak and beggarly elements”; and language used, regarding “circumcision,” “priesthood,” and “ordinances,” is so sweeping and condemnatory, that the Churches must have been in danger of becoming anti-ritualist, on principle. Yet, in these critical circumstances, no word of exception or warning is given, about baptism; orders; or the Eucharist; as having taken the place of the exploded Levitical economy.¹

When the Apostles allude to any of the old rites, for illustration of doctrine or argument, they are careful to inculcate that it is only the spiritual significance, that is retained in Christianity. “Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us. Let us keep the feast.” How are we to observe it? What are the appropriate rites? *We, ourselves, are to be “unleavened”;

set up “the middle wall of partition,” which He had thrown down; to revive “the enmity” which He had “slain”; and to perpetuate and consecrate, the bond written in ordinances, which was against us, and which He had blotted out, and taken out of the way, nailing it to His cross.

With these views, it was not surprising that the great Apostle expostulated so earnestly, against being “subject to ordinances,” which had been imposed (only) “until the time of reformation,” by the Gospel. So we find that he who had formerly circumcised Timothy, because of the Jews, now vehemently protests, to Gentile converts,—“If ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing.” (Gal. v. 2.)

Here, if anywhere, we should find mention of the milder yoke of the new covenant, and a plea for the Christian Sacraments. But, no; they are not here!

¹ See Note L.
free from malice and wickedness; and the only "bread" required, is "the unleavened, of sincerity and truth." (1 Cor. v. 7, 8.)

FIGURES, OF SPIRITUAL IMPORT.

"Circumcision is that of the heart; in the spirit, not in the letter." (Rom. ii. 29)." In Christ Jesus neither

---

1 This application of the disused rites, is very important and instructive. It really assigns them their most important function, as helping to unfold the vital and essential elements of spiritual Christianity.

Just as the old initiatory rite, pointed to its antitype in "the circumcision of the heart," so the "baptism" which "saves," is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh"; not the outward rite, with the use of water, but the true likeness, or antitype; even "the appeal of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (1 Peter iii. 21.)

This is the "one baptism" of Christianity, permanent and essential; really necessary to salvation, as it is "the washing of regeneration"; the being "born of the Spirit," into the kingdom of God.

Hence this "baptism" is placed in the same category with the "one body," and "one spirit," and "one hope," and with the "one Lord," "one faith," and "one God and Father of all"; in such association as cannot be assigned to any ritual observance. (Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6.)

As it is "one," it excludes all idea of the permanent use of any other; and so the Christian dispensation is described, in the Divine word, not as a code of ordinances; but as "the ministration of the Spirit."

The best service of any symbols, in our dispensation, would be to aid the memory and meditation, to promote the exercise of faith and love; and the experience of many will testify, that such spiritual exercises can be more fully realized, without the disturbing influence of any ceremony.

The brazen serpent, which originally symbolized the Divine purpose of salvation by faith, and afterwards became an object of idolatrous superstition, to the children of Israel, obtained its truest consecration, by our Lord's reference to its history and use; over seven hundred years after the "piece of brass" had been destroyed.
circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith, working through love." (Gal. v. 6.) "We," (who have abandoned and repudiated the outward rite), "we are the circumcision, who worship by the Spirit of God; and glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." (Phil. iii. 3.) Here the context clearly indicates, that by "the flesh" Paul designated, not carnal impurity, but that "blameless" outward "righteousness," of legal, ritual religion, which a recent advocate of ritualism, deliberately describes, as "worship, done by the body"!

In reference to all such things, the Apostle earnestly appeals to Christians,—"Brethren, ye were called for freedom"! "With freedom did Christ set us free. Stand fast, therefore; and be not entangled in a yoke of bondage." (Gal. v. 1, 13—Revised Version.)

In this connection, another subject of Apostolic teaching is plainly indicated.

THE TRUE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION,
is very definitely marked. Paul instructed Timothy and Titus on this subject, and directed them to commit the same instructions to "faithful men, able to teach others."

These co-workers and successors of the Apostles, are urged to vigilance and fidelity, in view of the "perilous times," at hand, when men would "turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables." They are, moreover, placed under the most solemn responsibility, in regard to the future; and
distinctly reminded that these injunctions are laid on them, expressly, that they may know "how men ought to behave themselves, in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." (1 Tim. iii. 15.)

Accordingly, we have here, the original Divine ordering of bishops, and deacons; the necessary character, qualifications, and conduct, of elders and teachers, and their wives;—but no ritual; and NOT A WORD ABOUT THE "SACRAMENTS"! The conclusion seems obvious and inevitable.

ANGLICAN CLAIM OF APOSTOLIC TEACHING.

If further confirmation were needed, we might find it in the attempts of sacramental ritualists, to extort proof of their system, from the writings of the Apostles.

The new Anglican sacerdotalism is making itself conspicuous, in providing curiosities of English literature. A remarkable specimen has been for some time before the public—in a work dedicated to Canon Liddon—"in gratitude for his teaching," and entitled, "The Apostolic Liturgy, and the Epistle to the Hebrews." ¹

The author states that, "one chief purpose of this work, is, to trace throughout the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews, a continuous line of allusion to the Holy Eucharist, showing that the writer keeps this always in view, as the practical centre of Christian

¹ By J. E. Field, M.A., Vicar of Benson. See Note J.
worship, and the highest expression of the Christian faith."

Students of the Epistle will demand the author's methods of proof; and be surprised at the result. With very brief illustration, we must refer our readers, for further specimens, to our Notes.

EXEGESIS EXTRAORDINARY.

In exposition of expressions, in ch. ix., with which every attentive reader is familiar,—we are informed that the "better sacrifices," only stands for the "unbloody sacrifices" of the Holy Eucharist. "The full privileges of the worshippers, procured for them by the one sacrifice of Christ, can only be obtained in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist."

"The will of God" is the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which Christ commanded His disciples to do, &c. Again, as a specimen of "exegesis," by Canon Liddon's disciple, we have the following on ch. xiii. 15,—"The sacrifice of praise." "We will render the fruit of our lips," compare with the Hebrew original, "the calves of our lips"; . . . . "The expression is exactly appropriate to St. Paul's purpose, when he is speaking of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, where the offering of 'calves' is done away with, and the 'fruit' of the earth is substituted." If any one inquires, why this writer speaks for the Apostle, instead of giving the Apostle's own words, the answer is that "the omission is exactly in accordance with the way in which the Holy Eucharist is constantly kept in view, without
being distinctly mentioned, throughout this Epistle.” If pressed with the argument that Paul was addicted to “great plainness of speech,” and did not usually teach, “without distinctly mentioning” his subject, this writer only again alleges, that “the writer of this Epistle had chiefly before him, the command to celebrate the Eucharist, when he treats of the things which God has spoken unto us by His Son.” We have to take his word for it. While he alleges the Apostle’s authority, for the Eucharistic Sacrifice, he admits that, “his allusions to it, are rarely evident, upon the surface of his words.” He pleads that “it cannot be without design, that they are thus veiled over”; (!) and finally, he takes refuge in the subterfuge of modern transubstantiationists, regarding the lacking of explicit testimony from the Fathers.

TEACHING BY CONCEALING.

“We must infer,” he gravely urges, “that the system of concealing the Eucharistic mystery, from unbelievers, was already practised, in the Apostolic age.” (Introduction, p. 8.)

In “the Apostolic age,” he would ingeniously include Apostolic practice. But, in the Apostolic age, many things occurred, contrary to the Apostles’ teaching. Apostasy from the truth, had already begun; even “the mystery of iniquity” was then working; and many had made shipwreck of faith. “The Apostolic age” embraces too much, for even our modern sacerdotalists.
But, Mr. Field further demonstrates his competency to criticise the Apostle. He infers, or assumes, that the readers of the Epistle were "unbelievers." He forgot that it is addressed to "holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling" (ch. iii. 1)—whom the Apostle greets, as beloved brethren (ch. x. 19), whose prayers he solicits for himself and fellow-workers in the Gospel (xiii. 18), and to whom he solemnly declared,—"God is not unrighteous, to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have showed toward His name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister." (ch. vi. 10.)

"Unbelievers," are interpolated, in order to foist upon them the imitation "mysteries," which were borrowed from the heathen, by some of the Fathers, amongst whom this critic would place the Apostle Paul!

By a culpable oversight of the drift and force of the Apostle's own words, and by very adventurous theorizing, the man whose ministry was, pre-eminently, for "the manifestation of the truth," (2 Cor. iv. 2), is represented as an adept in the art of using words, to conceal thought. This luminous Gospel treatise is claimed as an exhibit of sacerdotal occultism; and its expositions of Christian doctrine, are degraded into mystic enigmas of sacramental magic.

We may thank Canon Liddon's pupil, for his expenditure of learning and ingenuity, by which it is demonstrated that the Apostolic teaching of "the Eucharistic mystery," is to be found, only in the imagination of the interpreter.
Truly the Apostle's meaning was not "concealed," or "veiled over," when he predicted of some who should "turn away from the truth, and be turned unto fables." (2 Tim. iv. 4.)

We have reserved for final notice in this connection, the singularly interesting illustration of the negative proof, presented in our fourth Gospel.

It is, of course, well known that there is no record of the Lord's Supper, in

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN;

though it contains a distinct notice of the last supper of the Passover. (ch. xiii.)

Dean Alford, with his usual candour and devout appreciation, remarks that "there can be no reasonable doubt that this meal was the same as that at which the Lord's Supper was instituted, as related in the three Evangelists."

He also gives a discriminating estimate of the special design of this Gospel, which makes the omission before us, appear all the more remarkable, in view of the Sacramental Institutions of modern Christendom.

SPECIAL DESIGN.

"This Gospel presupposes readers, already Christian; and was written, to build them up, and confirm them in the faith." . . . . "To advance, purify from error, and strengthen, that maturer Christian life of knowledge, which is the true development of the teaching of the Spirit, in man; and which
the latter part of the Apostolic period witnessed in its full vitality." . . . "Admirably designed for that which especially was his (John's) portion of the Apostolic work,—THE PERFECTING OF THE SAINTS."¹

The more fully we accept this just estimate of this most precious portion of holy Scripture, the more profound must be our interest in its omission of that Sacrament, which is now regarded as "the central and most august act of worship, of the Universal Church"¹.

. REASON OF OMISSION.

One explanation alone, seems to meet the case. Neither "the feast of the Passover," nor its substitute or modification in "the Lord's Supper," was designed to be a perpetual ordinance of Christianity.

They had served their temporary purpose; and John wrote his Gospel, after they had grown old and become ready to vanish away.

He could truly say,—"A new commandment write I unto you; because the darkness is passing away, and the true light already shineth." (1st Ep. ii. 8.) And as he had survived the transition, from Judaism to "the maturer Christian life, of the latter part of the Apostolic period," above described, it became his special province, to exhibit Christianity, free from all remnants of the rites and ordinances, which had become badges of schismatical superstition, and a yoke of bondage.

WHEN WRITTEN.

This Gospel by John, is believed (not to say fully proved) to belong to the latest portion of our sacred writings. The internal evidence, and all available historic testimony, fix it at the close of the Apostolic age. John had probably seen the full development of the abuses of the "Agapæ," which had, in their earlier working, incurred the censure of Paul and Peter and Jude.

He had also witnessed the fulfilment of Paul's forebodings of the ravages of "grievous wolves," in the flock of the Lord, amongst whom he ministered. He was, therefore, we may reverently believe, led by the Spirit of God, to omit all mention of the remnant of "that which is abolished," in order to direct undivided attention to permanent realities; "that those things which cannot be shaken, may remain."

JOHN'S MINISTRY AND PERSONAL HISTORY.

As John had occupied a peculiar position, in loving intercourse with the Master; and as he had so fully related our Lord's discourses, and even His acts and movements, on the solemn occasion of the last Passover, it is specially significant, that instead of any institution of the Supper, he records the washing of the disciples' feet.

He distinctly informs us, that Jesus said on that occasion—"Ye ought to wash one another's feet; for
I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you."

How can Sacramentalists hold that all Christians are under Divine ordinance, to observe a Sacrament of bread and wine; but not a Sacrament of feet-washing?¹

Evidently the one was intended to inculcate on the disciples, a deeper humility, in their sacred brotherhood, than they may have learned from the other.

But, further, regarding our Apostle. Had his personal history interpreted the strange words which the Lord had uttered concerning him, long ago, in the early dawn, on the beach of Tiberias? Had he indeed, been permitted to "tarry," till the Lord had come?

A LIVING WITNESS.

Even so! The great catastrophe had fallen. Jerusalem had been "compassed with armies." The ruin of the city and the Temple had been complete. Not one stone had been left upon another. The predicted "days of vengeance," had come and gone. The signs of the Master's coming had been fulfilled; and John had survived; to prove the truth of the Saviour's

¹ The devout Mennonites, who adopted the practice of washing one another's feet, did not pretend to any priestly sacrament, in connection with it.

The Pope's grand performance, by way of imitating Christ, in dipping the feet of some of his Cardinals, in a silver basin, as part of a Court ceremony, is a ludicrous travesty, rather profane than edifying. Our Lord's act, was an impressive lesson of true humility for us all.
words—"Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till all these things be accomplished."

Standing by the grave of the fallen city, he could not but see that the old ceremonial and all its remnants, were buried in the ruins; and thus, he learned the significance of the Lord's mysterious intimation concerning himself; and understood, more fully than Paul himself had done, the words of Paul to the Corinthians—"till He come"!

A striking corroboration of this view of this subject, is found in the peculiar testimony of

THE BOOK OF THE APOCALYPSE.

This is the more interesting, because, in discovering what relates to our present subject, we obtain the key, to a just interpretation of that wonderful book.

Adverse critics, and commentators, of different schools, have expended much learning and ingenuity, on this theme, and provided us with abundant material, for the formation of a sound judgment, on various questions involved. We can only indicate a few principal points. It is much to be regretted, that perversity and extravagant fancy have variously explained away this Divine revelation; or tortured it, into imaginary synopses of universal history; to the utter disparagement of its true character; and ignoring of its real function, in the early life of Christianity.¹

It was, in various ways, as the sound of a trumpet;

¹ Appendix, Note K.
arousing the energies, and inspiring the courage of the noble army of martyrs, whose blood was the seed of the Church.

The same process, by which it is proved that John wrote his "Gospel," toward the close of his life, with equal clearness, indicates, that the "Revelation" was the earliest of his writings which we possess.

It is believed to have been written, about A.D. 64–5; perhaps twenty years, or more, before the Gospel;¹ and the dissimilarity of style, and other peculiarities, noted by critics, afford striking elucidation of the authenticity and the Divine testimony of both.

We have no Scripture history of John's movements, after his last recorded appearance in Jerusalem; (comp. Gal. ii. 9, with Acts xv.); but there is no reason to doubt the general tradition, of his long residence and his death, at Ephesus; which is corroborated, by his relation to the Churches of that region, indicated in the Apocalypse.

He probably arrived in Asia Minor, soon after Paul went Westward; perhaps when that Apostle was in Rome; and several of his allusions, to historic personages and events, would seem to synchronize with the

¹ Some expositors, in attempting to uphold the opposite view, are driven to assume that the Apocalypse was written in the Apostle's extreme old age, when he had lost command of his matured attainments, and had to fall back on the use of the provincial dialect, remembered from his youth.

It certainly requires peculiar ingenuity, to discover indications of mental decay, in this vigorous and thrilling composition.
eventful period, which culminated in Paul's triumphant martyrdom.¹

PECULIARITIES OF STYLE, ETC.

As a native of Palestine, John would, of course, not write in such pure Greek, soon after his arrival in Asia Minor, as he could use, say, twenty years later, after long intercourse with philosophic Grecians, of the Alexandrian school; and this coincides remarkably, with the criticisms of many objectors, who have not recognized the force of an obvious fact.

ALLUSIONS TO EVENTS OF DIFFERENT DATES.

It may be noted further, that the perils and sufferings, as well as the errors and corruptions, described in the letters to the Seven Churches, correspond more with those mentioned in the book of Acts, and the earlier Epistles; while in his Gospel and first Epistle, John is evidently in antagonism with those anti-Christianisms, which arose later, out of oppositions of science falsely so called.

It is important to take into account, the prevalent notions, in religion and philosophy, of any people, to whom the word of inspiration was primarily addressed.

The Gnosticism and Platonic philosophy of Alexandria, had been propagated in Asia Minor; and Ephesus derived from Alexandria, as Alexandria, had virtually taken the place of Athens.

¹ Note L.
These well-known facts, with the attested long residence of St. John in Ephesus, afford striking confirmation of our argument.

Moreover, as John employs the very distinctive terms of the Gnostic Platonists, in his sublime doctrine concerning "the Word (Logos)" that "was God"; and in refutation of their errors, we have a cumulative proof, amounting to demonstration, of the chronological relation of the Gospel to the Apocalypse. The former is adapted to the later time, to which the latter did not apply.

These few shadowy sketches of a grand theme, may help us to appreciate a study, on which we cannot now fully enter.

Sufficient for our present purpose, lies on the surface, inviting the attention of every reader. The primary object of the Revelation, and the persons to whom it was addressed, with the most vivid description of their condition, and of the Divine regard for their present encouragement, instruction and warning, are all plainly stated and emphatically reiterated. It is marvellous, and much to be deplored, that these aids to the right interpretation of the book, have been so generally overlooked.

ADDRESS TO CONTEMPORARIES.

As their exiled teacher, their "brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ," John wrote "to the Seven Churches," this Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God
gave him, to show unto His servants things which must "shortly come to pass."

Could they, on reading these words, imagine that the chief burden of the prophecy was for future ages, of which they knew absolutely nothing? If so, how could it have been a Revelation to and for them? A present state of things is described, in which they were most seriously involved. Present sufferings, recent and future martyrdoms of their own contemporaries, are alluded to. Their own religious condition and affairs, are described, as by Him "that walketh in the midst of" the Churches, and "searcheth the reins and hearts."

Their distinctive circumstances are minutely analysed. The lukewarm and corrupt are warned and threatened. The faithful and devoted, are comforted and assured; and all are alike admonished of an impending crisis, of overwhelming judgments, and destruction of Christ's enemies, near at hand. As if to guard against such misapprehensions, as have formed the staple of modern theories of exposition, these first readers of the book, were explicitly assured, that it was written for them.

Over and over, the Lord addresses them directly, saying, "Behold, I come quickly"; "The time is at hand"; "Hold fast till I come." And at the close of the grand series of visions and interpretations, the review and application, are equally explicit. "The Lord God of the holy prophets, hath sent His angel, to show unto His servants, the things which must shortly
be done”; “Behold, I come quickly”; “Seal not up the sayings of the prophecy of this book; for the time is at hand”; “Behold, I come quickly.” (ch. xxii. 6-12.)

Surely, the loving Lord, “the faithful and true witness,” did not mock His suffering servants, by presenting them with a gorgeous panorama, of dissolving views, of the mysteries of historical development of the world’s future; while professing to be about to come quickly, for their deliverance, and the chastisement of their persecutors.

As previously, in the days of His flesh, He explicitly gave the signs of His coming, that the disciples might know when to flee from Jerusalem, before its fall; so here again, by the ministry of the disciple whom He loved, and whom He permitted to tarry till His coming, He emphatically warned the Churches, of the impending overthrow.

THE CROWNING PROOF.

As John had this ministry of prediction and preparation assigned to him, and as he had so often announced this coming of the Lord, before it happened,—when, in after years, he wrote his Gospel, he could not, of course, forget the grand event which he had survived.

Hence it is, that in this crowning glory, of the Apostolic record of the Gospel of the Son of God, “specially designed” (as has been well remarked) “for the perfecting of the saints,” the temporary con-
tinuance of "the feast of the Passover," or its substitute, is not even mentioned!

The marked omission of the Lord's Supper, from the last written Gospel, may therefore be regarded as the crowning negative proof that it was not ordained, for perpetual observance, in the Christian Church.¹

¹ Of the early age of Catholicity, a recent writer has well remarked,—"'The simplicity of the Christian worship, so remarkable at this period, when it had cast off the Jewish ritual, and had not, as yet, sought any new ceremonial; the adoration of the invisible, without symbolic aid; . . . . the bold spirituality, which grasped the idea of worship, 'IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH,' as so grand a reality; all these characteristics of the new religion, were of a nature to scandalize and irritate, by the force of contrast, a world, given to idolatry."

"To the votaries of a materialistic religion, spirituality is Atheism; . . . . it was natural, then, that Christians should be classed among the impious, by the worshippers of Jupiter and Venus." ("Early Years of Christianity" (de Pressensé), vol. ii. p. 5.)

The same author, in describing the Christian missions of the second and third centuries, quotes the famous foe of the Church, CELSUS, as testifying to the heroic zeal of the Christians; and points out that "the Church was the city of refuge, built upon a hill, with gates open to all in whom there had arisen a thirst for the Divine."

"There was no distinction then, between home and foreign missions. Every Church was a missionary centre, radiating Gospel light far and near. Missionaries were not subjected—any more than pastors or bishops—to any course of special training. Their aptitude for the work was tested; and they were chosen, when they gave clear evidence of their vocation. . . . . Everything was free and spontaneous, in the great chain of Christian victories, which, after two centuries, enclosed the empire, as in a vast network."

"The most humble, were often the most powerful. It was an obscure old man who gave Justin Martyr to the Church"; and so of other noble Apologists and defenders of the faith, whose heroic zeal and eloquent pleadings, marked an era in the life and literature of the world, while they convinced, rebuked, or exasperated, Imperial and philosophic adversaries. (Ibid. pp. 10, 19, 21.)
This conclusion, suggests some important

GENERAL REMARKS.

1. Symbolical observances served an important educational purpose, in the old dispensation; and amongst the mixed populations, in the transition period, to the fulness of the Gospel era.

But they are not suitable, as they were not designed, for universal adoption. They are not necessary or helpful to true Christian worship; and their continuance tends rather to misrepresent Christianity, to the world of mankind. It is lawful for all Christian Churches, to adopt rules, for their own fellowship, and to change them, as circumstances may require; but no Church should make a law of uniform obligation, where the Head of the Church has ordained a Law of Liberty.

2. We would not attach undue importance, to the mere rejection of the rite. We adopt the spirit of the declaration of St. Paul,—“Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but the keeping of the commandments of God.” (1 Cor. vii. 19.) Any simple social meal, partaken in simplicity and godly sincerity, in promotion of brotherly love, would be a true “Agape” for true disciples.

It may not be essential or desirable to make a formal rule against forms; but it is both desirable and essential, to maintain simplicity and freedom in Christian worship.

3. Christ's Christianity, for all mankind, or-
dains neither ceremony nor ritual; neither sacraments, nor priests.

It makes all true disciples, a "holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ." (1 Peter ii. 5.) And it is essentially, a spiritual life; not a ceremonial structure.

It is the work of the Spirit of God, in the spirit and life of man; and it is characterized, always and everywhere, by its great central doctrine,—"God is a Spirit; and they that worship Him, must worship Him, in spirit, and in truth." (John iv. 24.)

CONTRAST AND SUMMARY.

What a fearful contrast to Christ's own words, is presented in the systems, which have dominated Christendom, in His name!

Rival priesthoods, with their hostile schools and sects, have distracted, deceived, and degraded, the nations, which they professed and undertook to civilize and save.

The managing directors, of each of these sacerdotal companies, represent God to be a sort of sleeping partner, in their establishment.

The capital and the skill, by which the concern is sustained and worked, are Divine, forsooth; and they attest, and represent the Divinity!

They severally claim, that, by constant miracle or special grace, the Supreme Being, renders their official performances effectual, according to their intention; while He withholds his recognition, from similar acts,
performed by others; however wise and holy these "others" may be.

Who can wonder if Christendom is not Christian? Have not the professed teachers of Christianity, been educating the nations, into Infidelity?

FACTS DEPLORED.

We have seen the sad testimony of the Roman Catholic Bishops, officially rendered to the late Pope, regarding the loss of faith, and the prevalence of irreligion, in their several countries.

Cardinal Manning added a solemn declaration, several years ago, to the effect, that "now, hardly a Catholic nation exists." . . . . "The kingdoms of Europe have either separated altogether, or having lost their unity of faith, have separated their public laws, from the unity of the Church," &c.

Still more recently, we have had the present Pope's pathetic lament, over the unchristian condition of Europe, and the moral defection of the people.

But, how is it, that these thoughtful, observant, educated men, do not appear to understand how these disastrous results have been brought about?

Have they not the principal cause of the evil, perpetually under their own eyes, and even in their own management and direction, in the working of their own religious system?

CAUSE AND EFFECT.

With the fullest and most sorrowful conviction of
prevalent scepticism and ungodliness, in some Protestant countries,—it must yet be admitted, that while in these cases, the reformation has failed to reach and Christianize the people, the Roman Catholic system, on the other hand, has been the direct and educational promoter of Christendom's apostasy and demoralization.

The sacerdotal system, during centuries of intolerant monopoly, held the ground, and wrought its will; and Europe reaps the fruits, to-day.

The blasphemous claims, of priesthood and sacramental grace, already noticed, are the potential factors of impiety and revolt.

It is vain to invite thinking men, at once, to believe these things, and to believe in God.

To attribute to the Deity, infirmities, caprices, absurdities,—that would be disgraceful to a man,—is, virtually, to say "there is no God"!

What is Atheism? and who are the blasphemers? when "Orthodoxy" is assumed, as the title of creature worship; and Christian "priests" expend learning and ingenuity, in pious efforts, to render Christian faith, an intellectual impossibility.

Superstition and indifference may continue to render outward homage to the Christian name. Like children, in a pantomime, they will bow, and curtsey, and perform, and pass on, according to the rehearsal. But, what are intelligent and conscientious men, to do?

If modern, sacerdotal sacramentism, be Christianity, how can such men be Christians?

Deism, Agnosticism, intellectual scepticism,—any-
thing that can invite assent, or entertain an honest doubter, may prove a welcome refuge to earnest thinkers, escaping from the bewildering absurdities of the self-contradictory, and demoralizing sacerdotalism of modern Christendom.

It is sadly evident, moreover, that devout Sacramentarians, who repudiate priestcraft, may protest in vain, while they keep up, by custom and usage, their several forms and ordinances, in shadowy imitation of the great mystic performance of the "priests."

**ALLEGED MIRACLE ; CLAIM TESTED.**

The greatest perplexity is caused by the fact, that pious and learned men, have maintained this system. Let us, with due seriousness and candour, briefly consider the grounds of their devotion to it.

From Paschasius, in the ninth century, to the Council of Trent in the sixteenth, and on, to Cardinal Wiseman and Dr. Pusey, and their followers, in our own times, the maintainers of this sacramental doctrine, have represented it, as a standing special miracle of Christianity. It is distinctly alleged to be a "most marvellous miracle."

But it lacks all the claim and proof of miracle, according to Christ's own rule.

All Scripture miracles appealed to the honest exercise of the senses. When our Lord turned water into wine, it was not designated "wine," while exhibiting the qualities of water. Those who tasted and drank it, declared it to be "good wine."
When He fed the multitude, with a few loaves and fishes, they ate and were satisfied, and had basketsful of fragments, to gather up.

When He raised Lazarus from the dead, the weeping sisters were not required to embrace a phantom, as their living brother, while he lay lifeless in the grave. The miracle was evidenced, by his walking and talking, and eating and drinking, in their company.

So of all our Lord's miracles on human bodies; giving sight to the blind; enabling the lame to walk; causing the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak. In all such cases, the proof was open, unmystified and convincing, to ordinary intelligence.

When Christ's own risen body was miraculously present, He challenged the rational proof,—"handle me and see": but He did not present Himself in several places, at once.

**ALTERNATIVES.**

The doctrine of Christ's "real presence," in the Eucharist, ignores and violates all rational and scriptural tests. The marvel is that any sane person, can seriously profess to believe it.

Many devout men, adroitly formulate theories, and maintain a war of words, to enforce the dogma. But their adroit devoutness, is treason against Christianity. It is, at once, cowardly treachery, and daring impiety, to tell men that the sacramental miracle, stands on the same ground with the miracles of Christ, recorded in holy Scripture. It is an insidious libel on the Gospel;
insinuating, that Christianity is the basest and the boldest of "cunningly devised fables."

The claim that our Lord's body and blood, soul and divinity, "the whole Christ, God and man" (as alleged), is present, in every consecrated wafer, or particle of sacramental bread, or drop of consecrated wine; in thousands of places, at the same moment,—that this has been taking place, through all the centuries, since He ascended into heaven; and that every priest, who intends to do it, (even though he be living in deadly sin), can effect "this singular and wonderful conversion," by saying what Christ said, may well attempt to pass, as "a marvellous miracle."

Sober reason and the truest Christian charity, must maintain, that it is either the most marvellous miracle, or, the most deadly delusion; or, the most impious and impudent imposture, in Christendom.

CHRISTIAN CALL OF DUTY.

Here, then, is a manifold demonstration of the duty of all loyal disciples of Christ. They should, with all loving and patient faithfulness, protest against this misrepresentation of Christianity; and, for the glory of God, and the highest interests of humanity, "earnestly contend for the common salvation, the faith, once for all, delivered to the saints." (Jude, ver. 3.)

Christian honesty is a cardinal virtue, for our times. Indifferentism is the newest fashion, in religion.

In the dark ages of superstitious barbarism, sometimes called "the ages of faith," piety promoted persc-
ution; and the proof of earnestness, was, not unfitly,
expressed, in the vulgar logic of intolerance.

Modern refinement has a dangerous tendency to
confound earnestness with vulgarity. The ephemera
of "Society," cultivating sentiment without soul, and
maintaining a code of honour, without conscience,—will
always be ready to confer its tinsel, on the creedless
cynic, who, with a vague consciousness of inanity,
boasts his spurious liberalism, or flippantly demands,
with the first murderer,—"Am I my brother's keeper"?

But Christian charity, and true courtesy, must be
real. Upright manhood despises hypocritical affecta-
tion; and a healthy enthusiasm of humanity, must be
valiant for the truth.

In order to save civilization from irreligion; to
vindicate the Divine justice and beneficence; to re-
christianize society; and to realize a full salvation; we
must repudiate all imposture and pretence, and main-
tain the Christianity of holy Scripture and the human
conscience, in the power of the Spirit of God.
ADDENDUM TO CHAPTER III.

Having sketched the Scripture testimony, it may be interesting to note any available fragments of

CORROBORATION BY EARLY CHURCH WRITERS.

The writings of "the Fathers," of which we have already seen something, are very valuable to us here. The most ancient of them seem to harmonize with the later New Testament evidence, in having no mention of the Sacraments; while subsequent Patristic testimony, is abundant; clearly intimating, how the sacramental system was developed. We shall very briefly summarize the two records.

I. THE NEGATIVE EVIDENCE.

It enhances the value of this line of proof, that we receive it, chiefly from advocates of different views from our own. We may here claim—

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

Writers on "Christian Antiquities," from Augusti, Rheinwald, Bingham, and others, adduce the evidence, that "neither Barnabas, nor Polycarp, nor Clement of Rome, make any mention of the Lord's Supper." It is also added, as "even more remarkable, that the early apologists for Christianity, Minucius Felix,
Athenagoras, Arnobius," &c., do not make any mention of the Sacrament.¹

Dr. Harrison, in his able refutation of Dr. Pusey's work on the Fathers, maintains the Church of England Sacraments,—yet he testifies as follows:—

"Clement of Rome, Hermas, Polycarp, Barnabas, and the unknown writer of the Epistle to Diognetus, are commonly called Apostolical"; (because believed to have had personal intercourse with the Apostles); "they have made no direct reference to the Lord's Supper. They have not been adduced by Dr. Pusey. Their silence was of no avail to him, but is most important to us."

Dr. Harrison analyzes these writers very carefully, showing that they all treated of topics and circumstances, which would logically and almost necessarily, have led to the mention of the Eucharist, and adds, of one after another—"he does not mention it." "Clement does not even allude to the Lord's Supper."²

² This silence of Clement, is all the more remarkable, as it cannot be attributed to brevity. He is tedious and diffuse, even to prolixity; and as he discusses a wide range of topics, apparently being ambitious to press even trivial or fabulous illustrations into service, it must puzzle modern disciples of "the Fathers," to find that this leader of the line, says nothing about sacramental grace, or "consecrated elements."

It is due to Clement and to the Church at Rome, of which he was pastor, to mention, that in the letter "from the Church of Christ in Rome to the Church of Christ in Corinth," the central admonition is—"Let us look steadfastly to the blood of Christ, and consider how precious that blood is, which was shed for our salvation."

Clement is regarded with interest, as the connecting link, between the Apostles and the Fathers; but he does not claim to have per-
Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, dwells on the death and sufferings of Christ, and our having life in Him; but, like his brethren Clement and Hermas, makes not even a passing allusion to the doctrine; nor even refers to the Lord's Supper."

"Barnabas cherished the hope that he had omitted nothing bearing upon salvation; but he made no mention of the Eucharist." Again, of another of these apostolic men, whose words he quotes, Dr. Harrison remarks— "Had the doctrine in question had any place in the belief of this author, it is perfectly incredible that he could have spoken after that manner, without so much as alluding to it."

To the same effect, Dr. Harrison quotes from several later Fathers. Of Lactantius he remarks— "The silence of this eloquent author, in regard to the Lord's Supper, is as impressive and ominous as that of the Apostolical Fathers, noticed above;" and his summing up is in these remarkable words:—

"The fact that these apostolical witnesses, do not so much as allude to the Eucharist, when nothing could have been more natural for them, than to have done it, is one of the most powerful arguments that can be adduced, against the doctrine in question."
Dr. Harrison here alludes to the doctrine of "the real presence," and we would not do injustice to his memory, by attempting to strain his words beyond their legitimate application. We are greatly indebted to him, and gratefully acknowledge our obligations. But we venture to claim that he and other writers just quoted, have, unintentionally, established our conclusion.

The total omission of the Eucharist, by "the Fathers" above named; their habitual silence, and abstention from even allusion to it, on occasions and in connections requiring the mention of it, if they had regarded it as a permanent ordinance, indicates more than Dr. Harrison claimed.

It affords striking corroboration of our proof, from similar omission by the inspired Apostles, that the Lord's Supper was not divinely appointed, for perpetual observance.

The testimony of one of these writers is still further remarkable. The letter to Diognetus (omitting the interpolated addition in ch. xi.), is now placed first in the list; not only from its high character, and the purity of its style, but because internal evidence indicates that it was written before the fall of Jerusalem, in A.D. 70, more than twenty years, probably, before the date of Clement's letter.

This writing (we are assured), "though anonymous,

following centuries, must convince any attentive observer, that what the men who lived nearest to the Apostles, ascribed to the spiritual, was by their successors, attributed to the ritual part of religion." (Bennett's "Theology of the Early Christians," p. 297.)
is manifestly of the highest date, and of the greatest theological worth." It is composed with "all the benevolent grace of a Christian, with all the elegant simplicity, luminous terseness, and logical finish, of a practised author, in his native Greek." . . . . "No Christian scholar can read it, without being inspired with profound veneration for its author, as a noble specimen of the genuine primitive disciples of Christ."

The object of the writer was to give his "most excellent" friend, Diognetus, "a full and clear account of the religion of the Christians"; and in eloquent and impressive sentences, he sets forth their "faith and worship, their character and habits." 1

He then, in fervent language, asserts the Divine origin of their religion; and adds,—"It was not delivered to them, as an earthly invention; nor have they been entrusted with the stewardship of any human mysteries."

This seems to be more than mere negative proof. Taken with the context, it may be regarded as a protest against early attempts at imitating Pagan mysteries, which issued in Patristic sacramentism.

The argument, from historic sequence, appears conclusive. Equally clear and painfully impressive, is the evidence, on

2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SACRAMENTAL SYSTEM.

The habit of fanciful allegorizing, and using strange and far-fetched similitudes, which some of the Fathers

1 Bennett's "Theology of the Early Christian Church," pp. 9, 10.
cultivated to excess, led to a vague and arbitrary style of appropriating portions of Scripture, in connection with prevalent philosophical notions.

In controversy with Jews and heathens, and in efforts to conciliate and convert them, this tendency found full scope for dangerous development, and ultimately produced its legitimate results, in the Patristic Sacraments.

"The germ began in monkery, and in a multiplication of Church offices and ceremonies. Everything that could add to the pomp and ceremony of religion, began to attract attention and approbation. The heathen reproached the Christians, for having no solemn rites, nothing attractive; but only a rude and uninteresting exhibition of their religion." ¹

"Christians, in order to stop their mouths, and also to attract them to Christianity, began to show that they could even outdo the heathen themselves, in many respects."

"Not a few of the heathen ceremonies, with a little variation, were incorporated, in the ritual of the Churches."

"All this was, naturally enough, regarded as a work of piety, and the apparently good effect of it, in attracting the heathen, scarcely permitted a doubt, in regard to its expediency."

"The attachment of 'the initiated,' among the heathen, to their 'mysteries,' and the profound rever-

¹ "Bibliotheca Sacra," vol. i. p. 139. See also Backhouse's "Early Church History."
ence which they entertained for them, made Christians desirous of presenting to them some attractive correspondence in their own religion."

"Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, opened a door of easy access to ‘mysteries.’ In the first, there was the alleged presence of the Holy Spirit, with His regenerating and sanctifying influence, in the consecrated water."

"The sign of the cross, chryasm with holy oil, sponsors and ceremonials were added."

"As to the other Sacrament, none but ‘the initiated’—that is, baptized persons—could be admitted to the Lord’s table! The occasion was compared with the celebration of the Eleusinian mysteries. To throw a sacred awe, around the table of the Lord, to endow the Eucharistic elements with some mysterious qualities, was a natural consequence of labouring to find something attractive to the multitude, which would compensate for the loss of their mysteries." ¹

Earlier writers had spoken of the Supper, or "Agape," as Pliny describes it, in his famous letter to Trajan, as a simple feast, or "harmless meal."

Even Tertullian so described it; and vindicated it, as a religious service, against the charge of permitting "vileness or immodesty."

"The participants, before reclining for meat, taste first of prayer to God."

"As much is eaten, as satisfies the cravings of hunger. As much is drunk, as befits those who remember that during the night they will be occupied in worshipping

¹ "Bibliotheca Sacra," vol. i. p. 140.
God. We talk together, as those who know that the Lord is one of our hearers. . . . Each is asked to stand forth, and sing, as he is able, a hymn to God; either of the holy Scriptures, or of his own composition. As the feast commenced with prayer, so, with prayer it is closed." (Backhouse, pp. 119, 120.)

This is all simple enough.

But the semi-paganism of later times, had an entralling power, and it is lamentable to find how devout and intelligent men were betrayed into grotesque and debasing superstition.

Early in the third century, the Churches concealed their rites, as "mysteries"; and the most prominent and influential of the Fathers countenanced this adoption of heathen superstition, and attempted to explain it, as if it had been of Divine appointment.

Tertullian had already, in the second century, boldly pleaded that "the fidelity of secrecy, is, by the very rule of all mysteries, due to them."

"The Samothracian and Eleusinian are kept secret," he exclaims; "how much more such as being divulged, will provoke the vengeance of man, while that of God is kept in store."¹

¹ This remarkable language of the first great Latin Father, may serve to illustrate the tendency of his age. Cyprian, who called him, Master, of course re-echoed his sentiments, which were adopted by other Fathers, even the most eminent, in after-times.

The style of his allusion to the Greek mysteries, as sanctioning the imitation Christian mysteries, which he defended, receives a striking illustration, in the remarks of a recent critic of Greek customs.

"The Greeks have carefully concealed from us, the teaching of
IMITATING THE "MYSTERIES."

In describing the observance, as celebrated before daylight,—ante lucanis coetibus, and reporting some of the details,—Tertullian freely admits, that these usages are observed, from tradition and the force of custom, without any scriptural authority.

Many of the Fathers, from this time forward, avowed their design of keeping the sacramental rites secret; and in their discourses, delivered in presence of the uninitiated, they avoided the use of the words "bread and wine," in relation to the Lord's Supper, while they spoke freely, in that connection, of Christ's body and blood.

So anxious were they to keep up this concealment, that notwithstanding their profound reverence for the word of God, they sometimes designedly misquoted it, in order to keep the uninitiated, among their hearers, in the dark on this subject.¹

---

¹ "Dr. Pusey's Challenge Answered," Dr. Harrison, pp. 247-8. Such is the fatuity displayed in connection with this Patristic sacramentism, that modern controversialists are fain to plead "the mysteries," as accounting for the lack of explicit testimony by the Fathers, on the very question, for proof of which the Fathers were originally alleged!

"Transubstantiation,"—forsooth,—"was one of the mysteries, about which the Fathers were not allowed to express themselves clearly; as that would discover the secret." Thus does the "mystery" delusion, neutralize the appeal to the Fathers; while its modern advocates, make their own Christianity, a bur-
By this lamentable proceeding, they brought odium and persecution upon themselves, under charges of secret and abominable crimes; while they exposed Christianity to the blasphemous taunts of heathen adversaries.

It is recorded, that Celsus railed at the Christians, for thus imitating the heathen; and Lucian of Samosata, in consequence of their practice, described Christ as "the great Magician, who instituted new mysteries"!

Thus also, they were led to invest the Eucharist, with the character of a sacrifice.

Justin had attempted to meet the cavils of Jewish and heathen antagonists, by representing this ordinance, as a "thank-offering"; and the free gifts of the disciples, to the common feast, were spoken of as "oblations."

By the use of harmless, but ambiguous expressions, the way was opened, for the full adoption of the Jewish or heathen idea of an expiatory sacrifice; and the growth of superstition, in connection with the affection of the "mysteries," imbued the Patristic teaching, with the very soul of heathenism.

In this puerile materialistic mysticism, and the priestly assumptions connected with it, we discover the real parentage of transubstantiation, and the sacramentism of modern Christendom.

lesque. (See the Bishop of Strasburg's argument, from Bellarmine and Schelstrate, in Faber's "Difficulties of Romanism," pp. 299-312.)

CONCLUSION.

On the basis of the foregoing investigation, we venture to urge our appeal, for the revival of Christianity, and the peace of the nations. The one is indispensable, in order to the security of the other. The war spirit, is not the spirit of Christ. The conflicts of Christendom, demonstrate the decline of the Christian faith;—the absence, or the practical disregard, of the divine power of Christianity!

If the Churches of Christendom were faithful and united, in consecration to their mission, a people's league of peace, extending its operations throughout Europe, would render the continuance of the war policy, with its excessive expenditure of blood and treasure—impracticable and impossible.¹

Moral force would soon prove itself superior to brute force. "The might of the right," would be irresistible; and one great final conquest of peace, would be more glorious, than the bloody victories, of centuries of war.

A voice that wields a wide and traditionary influence in Europe,—in a sad review of some of the evils of the age, recently uttered the sober, solemn

¹ Only loyal and peaceable citizens, in each country, should undertake the initiation of this holy work. All cause of jealousy or apprehension should be prevented, by excluding foreign propagandism. When the governments are assured, then the several national peacemakers, can make their "league of peace," international and universal.
judgment, that—"Nothing but Christianity can save society"!¹

Millions, who do not acknowledge the special authority, claimed by the speaker, are yet in full sympathy with him here. They would only add, that it must be revived Christianity, in its native purity and Divine efficiency; not a fanatical dogmatism, or an intolerant superstition, surreptitiously using the Christian name.

As has been well said lately, by another prophet of progress ²—we want "not a new religion; but a renewed religion." Old Christianity renewing its youth, in our age, would prove the power of God, for the healing of the nations.

If the voice of God were heard by the Churches, the apostles of peace and ministers of righteousness,

¹ Papal Rescript, January, 1889. The earnest solicitude for the well-being of Christendom, manifested in this address, should elicit the most fervent sympathy. Oh, that the author may soon discover the real character, and most fruitful source of the evils which he deplores!

If the Pope should participate in the revival of Christianity, so as to become an actual personal promoter of it, who can estimate the beneficial results that might follow? Should he be led, after the manner of inspired Apostles (Acts xiv. 15), to refuse the adulation, with which ignorant superstition habitually addresses him, with names of blasphemy, and ascriptions of Divine honour; should he, in the consciousness of his own participation of human infirmities, determine to stand before his fellow-men, as a fellow-man, honestly desiring to turn them from the "vanities" of idolatry, to worship "the living God," what a glorious revolution would thus be inaugurated for Christendom!

This would prove a greater boon to humanity, than the Papacy has accomplished, in a thousand years.

Should not Christians pray for it?

² Professor Max Müller, Gifford Lectures, Glasgow University.
would be united, as the voice and soul of Christianity, heralding to all the people, the day of the Lord, when they shall not learn war any more!

But, would the rulers and warrior statesmen of Europe, permit this propagandism of peace? Would they, as ancient prototypes of their class were wont to do—imprison and kill, God’s witnesses?

Then, let the Churches show that they prize their calling, and know something that is worth dying for. “The noble army of martyrs,” has always consisted of volunteers. The lists are open, for all who aspire to be good soldiers of Christ, even in modern Europe; and of the vanguard it is written,—“They overcame, by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony, and they loved not their lives, even unto death.”

This is still, the path of victory, and the way of peace. The best interests of mankind would be well served, if, at any price, the powers of Christendom could be taught, that “Providence is” not always, “on the side of large battalions”; and the genealogy of their hereditary glory, might teach them this salutary lesson.¹

¹ The highest prize for Christian Chivalry, might be won by France, if she would abandon the demon project of “the war of revenge,” and give Europe a guarantee for general peace, in an honourable proposal for general disarmament. Germany might win the prize, by allowing Alsace and Lorraine to render their allegiance, according to their choice, under a similar guarantee. The two “great Powers” might obtain it, with the honour and admiration of the civilized world, if they would agree to neutralize their frontier provinces, under a European League, with a charter of home rule, as a “Peace Society,” for Christendom!

Then, all the frowning fortresses might be dismantled, and conse-
The Rome that ruled the world, after centuries of war and conquest, nodded to its fall, when it made wealth and power, the ministers of iniquity; and, forfeited humanity, by placing its tyrants amongst its gods.

The epitaphs of all the dead dynasties, are sermons for the living age; and a thousand voices from the graves of generations passed away, admonish us to-day, that religion is a necessary of life; and a revival of Christianity is the anchor of hope; for the peace of the nations. The Church of the future, will have a short and simple creed, of which a central article

crated to civilization, as manufactories, for the industrial employment and prosperity of the people.

"Such a peace is of the nature of a conquest,
For then, both parties, nobly are subdued,
And neither party loser!"

Do any of the great Christian Powers, prefer the arbitrament of blood and slaughter, to either of these pacific conquests? Then, in what sense, are they "Christian"? Christianity, with shame and sorrow, must disown them; while, as victors, or as vanquished, their glory will be crowned with the execrations of humanity.

If any one of the great Powers, had the moral courage to repudiate the ruinous war policy, others would soon be constrained to follow suit.

When the red-letter day of the inauguration of this "rule of reason," shall have come, then the rescued nations may exclaim—

"Let the bugles sound the truce of God,
To all the world, for ever!"

If Christian common sense ruled in the councils of the nations, a court of arbitration—a real people's Areopagus—could soon be formed, for the settlement of all international questions.

When the people and their rulers have the will, they will soon discover the way, to secure "peace with honour"; and the nations will increase their glory and their strength, by serving one another."
will be that God's remedy for human ills, avails, when human specifics fail. The life and power of true Christianity, will attest its Divine origin, when it is divested of all the additions and artificial fixtures, by which the wisdom of man has attempted to give it effect. When the Churches learn this simple lesson, they will be prepared to proclaim—the Divine Eirenikon.

Intolerant, schismatical, wrangling Churches, cannot be God's peace-makers, amongst the warlike nations.

The angry passions and outraged manhood of the oppressed and exasperated peoples, are not to be subdued,—enchanted,—cheated,—by royal mandates, or tinselled ceremonies; by the trickery of sacerdotal miracles, or the blasphemous pretences of sacramental magic.

As the eye requires, appropriates, and lives in the light, so the rational soul, with its awful, glorious dowry of godlike intelligence, its moral instincts, and illimitable aspirations, can be governed, guided, sanctified, and satisfied, only with Truth, Reality, and God.

In order to the promotion and perpetuity of peace among the nations, the people and their rulers must learn God's way of peace.

By the power of truth; and not by forms and ceremonies, by ecclesiastical charms, or proxy performances of religious "professionals," Christianity will accomplish its beneficent mission for mankind.

It must bring light, and life, and liberty, to dark, dead souls. It must afford Divine relief to the sad
and suffering; in order to be known and prized, as the heavenly messenger of righteousness and peace.

For this, all earnest Christians should witness and work, in the courage of faith and the patience of hope. For this,—let the cry of Christendom, go up to God, continually.
APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

This has been very impressively demonstrated on several occasions, and by representative men, in all the Churches.

We have the greater pleasure in appropriating, on this subject, the words of one whose writings on another topic, we are compelled to deplore.

Dr. Pusey, solemnly declares,—"The office of our Divine Lord, as a Teacher, was, to be the perfect Revealer of the whole truth, as to God, which God willed to disclose to His creatures here. This same office, God the Holy Ghost undertook, after the Resurrection, teaching invisibly to the Apostle, that same Divine truth. Our Lord said to His Apostles, 'He shall teach you, the whole truth.' The whole revelation, then, was completed at the first. It was a personal promise to the Apostles; and fulfilled in them. The Church of this day, cannot know more than St. John; else the promise would not have been fulfilled to him."

"There is this difference between the teaching of the Apostles, and that of the Church after them; that what the Apostles taught, as the original, and Fountain-head, that the Church only transmitted."

"This, I conceive to be the meaning of the Council of Trent, that when our Lord became man, He completed His revelation to man. For the Council, at its outset recognized, as the sources of our knowledge only holy Scripture, and
those traditions, whether as to faith or morals, which had been dictated orally by Christ or by the Holy Ghost, and had been preserved in the Catholic Church."

"According to the Council of Trent, then, as well as ourselves, the revelation was finished, in and through the Apostles." ... "Thenceforth, then, it was the office of the Church, under the guidance of God the Holy Ghost, to transmit, guard, defend, that truth, which our Divine Lord, and God the Holy Ghost, teaching the Apostles, what, during our Lord's bodily presence they had not been able to receive, gave to the Church, 'once for all.'"

... "Again, within the post-Apostolic Church, the Holy Ghost has been pleased to operate. ... He continually propagates the truth. He extends the bounds of the Church. He operates towards or in every soul of Christians. He teaches all true teachers. 'The holy Church, throughout all the world, doth acknowledge Thee.' Through His continued operation and inspiration, the Church, everywhere, in East and West, North and South, confesseth, maintaineth, propagateth, the one faith—that which was, once for all, delivered to the saints." (Pusey's "Truth and Office of the English Church," pp. 84–87.)

This lucid and beautiful summary, we unfeignedly admire and endorse. Only let it be well ascertained that "those traditions," alluded to by the Council of Trent, really "came through the Apostles"; or "were dictated, by Christ and the Holy Spirit"; and all is clear.

But, taking Dr. Pusey's confession, as it stands, we cannot but deplore the infatuation, that mars this Divine unity, of the living, spiritual Church, by additions and requirements, of human invention!

We would not attempt to paint the lily, or to gild the sun.
APPENDIX.

NOTE B.

Passages in the writings of several Fathers, which have been taken as proof of their holding the notion of transubstantiation, or the real presence, are shown to indicate a strange fancy, about the Divine Person of Christ (the "Logos") as uniting himself, for the time being, to the material elements, as He formerly dwelt in a human body. In this way, it is intimated, the bodies of communicants are not only nourished, but made partakers of Christ's incorruptibility; having a capability or germ of immortality, imparted to them. Something very different from transubstantiation, is adumbrated here, though it may be not more scriptural or intelligible. But this is the predominant notion, in the mystic rhapsodies of several of the Fathers.

Some of them attach the principal virtue to the cup, or to the water, always mixed with the wine. So that the modern Roman rule of withholding the cup from the laity, deprives them of the Patristic Sacrament.

Whatever transmutation is alleged of the elements, includes the communicants; who are perpetually admonished to see themselves on the table, and to receive themselves, showing that the original idea was that "the body of Christ," to be perceived, or discerned, was His body, the Church.

So also, when Tertullian, Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria and others, have bewildered their readers, by revelling in rhetorical mysticism, they frequently add some distinct utterance, to the effect that the bread is "the type or figure of His body," and that the wine "allegorizes His blood."

NOTE C.

The wildest flights and most deplorable paerilities, of some of the Fathers, appear in their millennarian theories. It is painful to be compelled, by mistaken eulogists, to mention
some of their follies, which it were more desirable to forget, as they tend to throw ridicule on Christianity.

In their description of the blessings of the imagined literal and personal reign of Christ, in Jerusalem, for a thousand years, the risen saints were to have substantial provision for the body.

Applying to this subject, our Lord's words at the last Supper,—"I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine," &c., they expound very literally; and then they amplify on the theme, after the following fashion,—"The earth shall yield its fertility, and spontaneously produce most abundant fruits; the rocks of the mountains shall sweat with honey; wine shall run down in streams, and the rivers flow with milk." Again,—"Vines shall grow, each having ten thousand branches, and on each branch ten thousand shoots, and on each one of the shoots ten thousand clusters, and in every one of the clusters ten thousand grapes; and every grape, when it is pressed, will yield five-and-twenty metres of wine,—and when any one of the saints shall lay hold of a cluster, another shall cry out, 'I am a better cluster; take me and bless the Lord, through me'! In like manner a grain of wheat will produce ten thousand ears; and every ear ten thousand grains, and every grain ten pounds of pure fine flour; and all other fruit-bearing trees and seeds and grass, shall produce in similar proportion."

It is difficult to believe that men could write in this fashion, seriously, and in possession of rational faculties. Yet this is gravely propounded by St. Irenæus, Papias, and others, as mentioned "by the Presbyters who saw St. John and heard from him, after what manner the Lord spoke of those times." The foregoing is, therefore, reported, as from the teaching of Christ himself. A precious specimen, truly, of Apostolical tradition.

A learned English commentator on the works of the Fathers, remarks on the above, that the Patristic computation, produces, from a single grain, about 446,000 tons of
fine flour, exclusive of bran and sharps; and from a single
vine, more wine, than "would float all the vessels in the
world"; or cover "the whole surface of the globe, about
forty miles deep."

But, the late illustrious founder of the Anglican sect,
alleged that he had proved "St. Jerome to be historically
wrong, in attributing to St. Irenæus, Tertullian and others,
the doctrine of a carnal millennium." He, accordingly,
claimed all the millennial bread and wine, above promised,
for the Eucharist! His opponent, naturally demanded,
whether the other fruit trees mentioned, the grass and all
kinds of seeds included, would also be used for sacramental
purposes; but to this inquiry, no answer has been vouch-
pp. 478-81.)

NOTE D.

Quoting and applying Dr. Pusey's own words, that "there
is no flaw, no loophole," "I have suppressed nothing, I have
not knowingly omitted anything," &c., Dr. Harrison points
out repeated instances of suppression, omission and mis-
representation, in some cases absolutely inexplicable, and in
all cases, most painful to contemplate. Passages, with which
all Protestant expositors are familiar, and which the Re-
formers, Ridley, Cranmer, Jewell, Usher, Hooker, and others
had frequently used in refutation of Romish teaching, Dr.
Pusey most unaccountably ignored, as though he had never
read them; and other passages, not so well known, he
manipulated, in a manner, the exposition of which is truly
astounding. A single instance of this last-named class,
must suffice.

Dr. Harrison states it as follows:—"Cyril of Jerusalem
plainly contradicts your interpretation of a part of the 6th
of St. John, and his teaching upon this point, appears to
have come within the extent of your knowledge, for you have,
with some care, expelled it, from a passage which you have quoted from an English translation of Cyril's lectures. You have quoted paragraph No. 3, which immediately precedes it, and paragraph No. 5, which immediately follows it; and, as if to conceal the omission of the obnoxious paragraph, No. 4, you have actually taken the liberty to change the figures of the paragraphs which you professedly quote. Thus, you profess to quote three consecutive paragraphs, numbered 4, 5, 6; but you really quote 3, 5, 6, and omit No. 4, and conceal the omission by assigning that number to No. 3.

"The paragraph omitted is—'4'—"Christ on a certain occasion, discoursing with the Jews, said,—'Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye have no life in you.' They, not receiving this saying spiritually, were offended, and went backward, supposing that He was inviting them to eat flesh."

Remembering Dr. Pusey's own words—"I have not knowingly omitted anything." It is very perplexing to have to inquire—could this re-arrangement of the numbers of consecutive paragraphs, have been accidental, or undesigned?

Dr. Harrison supplies many omissions, in Dr. Pusey's quotations from Tertullian, Ambrose, Origen, Augustine, and other Fathers, all giving the interpretation of our Lord's words above quoted, and of similar passages, which has been uniformly adopted by Evangelical Protestants; and directly refuting, by anticipation, the views of Paschiasius, Cardinal Wiseman, Dr. Pusey, and the Church of Rome.

Other critics place a grave responsibility on Dr. Pusey's surviving disciples.

One of them remarks,—"No task could be more important than that of testing the real theological value of Dr. Pusey's catena. Its importance does not relate to Dr. Pusey himself, but to the interests of the truth.

"The number of Ritualists who have themselves studied the Fathers, is probably very small. The bulk, at all
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events, will have rested on Dr. Pusey's quotations, and will probably repudiate with indignation, the very suggestion that they are not to be depended upon. We think that this confidence is quite natural, and fully justified by the circumstances of the case. If the authority of the great Anglican Doctor, as he has been called, cannot be trusted, in whom shall confidence be placed? If this authority be overthrown, the main pillar of sacerdotal authority is overthrown, and its cause is lost."

Again, it is remarked, that such men as Bishop Browne and Canon Liddon (following the lead of Dr. Pusey), have been led into "extraordinary blunders," regarding the teaching of Zuingle, Calvin, Cranmer and Hooker; and that even Mr. Keble, in asserting that "the whole Christian world had been, with one voice, declaring its faith in the real presence of Christ in the Sacraments"—candidly added—"This, I do not profess to demonstrate, but accept it, as demonstrated, by Dr. Pusey."

Another reviewer, while maintaining that Dr. Pusey's quotations are untrustworthy, and his conclusions false, yet is unwilling to impute personal dishonesty. "But, if by quoting at secondhand, without verification, or by entrusting the work of forming his catena to others, or because his mind has become so tinctured with a preconceived conception, as to colour everything with his own views, so that he has given forth to the world, an entirely erroneous view of the teaching of the Fathers,—why then, at least, his book is dishonest. And if neither Dr. Pusey nor his friends, choose to notice the proof adduced, of the unfairness and inaccuracy of the book, we fear that it will be impossible to shield them from the more serious imputation."
NOTE E.

This is, in some respects, the most astounding and inexplicable claim for "the Sacrament," with which we are acquainted; and the more so, from the connection in which we find it.

This modern authority—an English Nonconformist Doctor, of distinguished ability and wide reputation—appears to follow, and go beyond, the mystic doctrine of some of the ancient Fathers, whose words we have already quoted.

So far as we can understand, his creed seems to be virtually that of the Council of Trent, without the use of the long word, and as we may suppose, without limiting the marvellous power of giving Christ's "eternal life," with the bread and wine,—to the official performance of Romish priests.

The transcendent sacramental miracle is claimed and appropriated; though its operation is liberally extended, as widely as the distribution of "the bread and the wine." But may it be inquired, what the writer means? and—is his assertion true?

Is not the teaching of the New Testament, distinct and emphatic, that eternal life is obtained simply by faith in Christ; effected in the human mind, by the Spirit of God, apart from the communication of any material substance to the human body?

"HE THAT BELIEVETH ON THE SON, HATH ETERNAL LIFE." (John iii. 36.)

This gifted writer, it may be assumed, does not hold that "the Sacrament" is necessary to salvation; though he seems to say that eternal life is by the Sacrament.

He is—we may suppose—like many others, embarrassed by the maintenance of a ceremony, for which he is anxious to discover some adequate reason; and his logic and conscience have forced him into the region of extravagant fancy.
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An old story represents a philosopher, as sorely perplexed, trying to solve a problem, about a live fish finding room in a vessel, already full of water, without displacing any of the water. The puzzle continued hopelessly, until some one suggested the previous question—"Is it true"?

If this esteemed and thoughtful expositor, and hundreds like him, would seriously entertain the inquiry—"Has Christ indeed ordained this Sacrament, for perpetual observance in the Churches"?—how important might be the result, in the vindication of Christianity!

He and they, might soon find escape from embarrassing mysticism, by a scriptural entrance into the calm bright region, of spiritual freedom; and thus be enabled to help many others, to appreciate "the simplicity that is in Christ."

NOTE F.

Most of the nations which constituted the Roman "World," were pervaded by religious systems, of sacrifices and symbolic rites, some of which, in several respects, resembled the Mosaic Institutions.

"Many of them seemed to express a general consciousness of sin, and a belief in the need of expiation, and a Divine interposition, for human salvation.

"In the principal sacrifices of heathen antiquity, there was an embodiment of the belief, that the life or soul is in the blood. The idea of substitution, expressed in the 'ἀντίψυχον,' a soul for a soul, represented a high conception of religion, in the devotion of the spirit, and the surrender of the will, to God."

Hence it is that in the writings of eminent heathens, both Greek and Roman, we find such pure and sublime sentiments about the character and worship of the gods.¹

¹ Copious and interesting illustration, from the writings of Pythagoras, Zeno, Plato, Plutarch, Seneca, Cicero, and others may be found in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," vol. i. pp. 389-93 et seq.—Essay on the Expiatory...
They sometimes seem to echo the very words of Scripture, which say, emphatically,—"The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord; but the prayer of the upright is His delight." (Prov. xv. 8; comp. Cicero, "De Nat. Deorum," &c.)

The intellect of Greece had, long ago, discarded the old Homeric mythology, of hostile gods and jealous intriguing goddesses, familiar with rape and monstrous crime. While many gods and demons were retained in the popular creed, fervent aspirations were addressed to the Deity, as one Almighty Zeus!

The whole social and national life, was identified with religious rites and customs. They ruled at feasts and games, in war and treaties, and professional pursuits, as well as in approaches to the oracles, and the worship of the gods.

In domestic usages, the libations and lustrations, were as strictly in form, as the punctilios of modern Court etiquette, are with us.

The Attic cook, when contracting for a feast, having satisfied himself about the position of the intended host, assumes to be a Homerist, and in proud professionalism, demands in Doric Greek (after the manner of physicians), who, and how many the guests are to be, for whom he is to prepare "the sacrificial feast."

He goes through the Homeric names of oxen, sheep, &c., and inquires whether they will be "sacrificed," so as to be available for the feast.

The same personage despises the rich skipper, who "gives a feast; but is, during the very libation, computing how much he can charge his ship's company and passengers." ¹

At the dinner of an opulent Athenian, as soon as the guests had washed their hands, unmixed wine was intro-

---

duced, in a large goblet, of which each drank, a little, after
pouring out a small quantity, "as a libation." This libation
was said to be made "to the good spirit," (ἀγαθὸν δαιμόνιον)
and was usually accompanied with the singing of the πάνα
and the playing of flutes.

After this libation, mixed wine was brought in, and with
their first cup, the guests drank to Δίος Σωτήρος. With the
στοντάι, the δείπνουν closed.1

A Christian might be startled, at finding such designations
and resemblances, in such a connection; but social usages
sometimes indicate a wide human kinship, in religious
thought.

NOTE G.

Agape—'Αγαπή, ἀγαπά, from 'Αγαπάω, or 'Αγαπάζω, f. ἡσο; 
&c. Generally equivalent to φιλεω, ἵσω, &c. Both
these verbs are very expressive of the Greek character;
and are found, with their derivatives, in various forms, in
all stages of the language, from the ancient or heroic, in
Homer, &c., on, to the classic perfection of the Attic, and
its subsequent development or corruption, from the time of
the Macedonian conquests.

Both are employed, generally, to express kindness, friend-
ship, hospitality, welcome, &c., and apply to all expressions
of esteem, love, veneration, acts of affection, and habitual
acquiescence, approval, or fondness for doing anything.

Derivatives, or similar forms, are frequently found as
perfect synonyms. 'Αγαπήτος, or φίλήτος, beloved, worthy
of esteem, &c. 'Αγαπήμως, or φίλημως, affectionate,
loving, &c., and so of many others.

Biblical Greek consists of the later or corrupted form of
the language, which came into use, principally under
Alexander's successors, and is still further affected by
Hebrew or Aramaic forms of expression.

These peculiarities appear, not only in the Septuagint

1 "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities;" Article, Coena, p. 306.
version of the Old Testament, but also, in various degrees, along with the marks of style of the different writers,—in the New Testament books.

The position of all these writers, resembled somewhat, that of our modern Christian missionaries in heathen countries. They had to use an acquired language, in the inculcation of a religion, which had not been known to the early possessors of that language; and to adopt forms of expression, in various instances, foreign to its usages. Hence it is, that pure classical Greek, will not always convey the meaning of Biblical writers; though they follow the general laws, and draw supplies from the rich vocabulary of the language.

The two words, above named, served their purpose well. Neither of them had been appropriated, to express, directly, mere carnal desire; while both had a wide application, in connection with pure and noble sentiments of friendship and affection.

Both are employed, to express the highest conceptions of love. The Greeks used them in reference to the affection of parents and children, and the goodwill of the gods toward men.

In holy Scripture we find a similar agreement. The love of God to men, in Christ, and the love of the disciples to the loving Saviour, are expressed alike by both; as in John xvi. 27, with xiv. 21; Eph. ii. 4, &c.

John uses them interchangeably, in reference to himself, as “the disciple whom Jesus loved”; ch. xx. 2 and xxi. 7; and in his report of our Lord’s touching colloquy with Peter, ch. xxi. 15–17.

This, of course, does not prove, or imply, that Jesus and His disciples conversed in Greek. It is simply John’s rendering, in Greek, of what had occurred many years before he wrote. But, by this time, he had become well informed, in the best usages of the language; and it is important to note the *usus loquendi*, of Biblical writers.

We may remark, of another writer, that Paul’s equivalent
of "the love of God" (ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ), Rom. v. 5, &c., is, in Titus iii. 4, "the philanthropia, of God our Saviour." But, perhaps, the most remarkable instance of the interchangeable use of the two words, is given by John.

Our Lord's declaration—"the Father loveth the Son," appropriates "agapa," in ch. iii. v. 35; but gives "philei," as the equivalent in v. 20.

Ultimately, a divergent usage assigns to "phileo" the more common or familiar topics, retaining the more sacred subjects for "agapao."

An extensive vocabulary of compound words, according to Greek usage, is formed with philei, from which we have appropriated only a few,—philosophy, philanthropy, &c.

It also furnished the familiar term of salutation—"philema," a kiss; for which agapa, or agapema, is not used. But the usual "en philemati hagio," with a holy kiss, of Rom. xvi. 16; I Cor. xvi. 20, and elsewhere, finds its equivalent in I Peter v. 14, "en philemati agapes"; with a kiss of love, or "with the agape salutation."

The sacred phrases, ἡ ἀγαπὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, and ἡ ἀγαπὴ τοῦ χριστοῦ, "the love of God," and "the love of Christ," soon became distinctive of the grand theme of the Christian religion.

It does not appear that the designation "agape," was ever applied to any feast or ceremony, until it was appropriated by the early Christians.

But the special use of the word, by John, in his record of our Lord's discourses, and in his own Epistles, and by Paul, in the xxxiiith chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, gave it a unique position; and naturally led to the corresponding expression, ἀδελφοὶ ἀγαπητοί—"beloved brethren," as a designation of fellow-Christians.

From this, doubtless, it arose, that "agape,"—the favourite word for expressing—"that brotherly affection which the religion of Jesus commands and inspires"—was adopted, as the name of their simple fellowship feast.

"The Greeks," said Tertullian, "call it love";
("esteem," "friendship.") He translated "agape," not by "amor," but by "dilectio."

NOTE H.

We may illustrate the use of negative proof, by instances in the well-known writings of two distinguished men, both of Oxford, but of different schools.

Archbishop Whately supplies a remarkable specimen, as follows:—"No such thing is to be found in our Scriptures, as a catechism, or regular elementary introduction to the Christian religion; nor do they furnish us with anything of the nature of a systematic creed, set of articles, or confession of faith. Neither do they supply us with a Liturgy for ordinary public worship, or with forms of administering the sacraments," &c. . . . . "Since no one of the first promulgators of Christianity, did, what they must have been naturally led to do, it follows that they must have been supernaturally withheld from doing it."

The Archbishop furnishes copious illustration of the value of negative proof; and draws important lessons from "remarkable omissions," in the Apostolic record. (See "Peculiarities of the Christian Religion," Essay on Omissions, pp. 203-21.)

Dr. Pusey has left us a similar testimony.

In his searching analysis of the replies of Roman Catholic bishops, to the inquiries of Pope Pius IX. on the subject of "the Immaculate Conception," he points out, that several of them objected, on the ground of the absence of Divine authority; the silence of the Scriptures; &c.; and then he adds his own conclusion:

"When holy Scripture is not even alleged, and primitive antiquity is equally silent, there was, he alleged, no authority, to which he dared to yield his faith."

He puts the argument in a nutshell, when he demands—"If devotion to the blessed Virgin, were so essential, how could it be, that God, in His last and final revelation of
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Himself, is so silent about it.” ("Truth and Office of the English Church," pp. 113-127.)

These are interesting cases of the important use of negative proof.

We may remark that if Dr. Pusey had always acted on the rule which he so clearly stated above, he could hardly have formulated his theory of the Sacraments.

NOTE I.

The mission of the Apostles has been greatly misconceived, as regards the mode of superseding the Levitical economy, and establishing the new dispensation.

They were not appointed to pull down one ritual system and set up another.

Their work was, to preach the word of the new life; and the work of the Divine Spirit was, by the word, to produce and nurture this new life, which naturally clothed itself with outward body, from its surroundings, by the simple process of development and growth.

The Apostles were "labourers" in "God's husbandry"; and the processes of spiritual culture are various, in accordance with nature and life.

"That was not first which is spiritual; but that which is natural; and afterward, that which is spiritual."

In the natural sphere, last year's withered leaves sometimes adhere to the stem on which they had their birth; as if kindly lingering, to welcome their successors, and to afford shelter and defence to the tender buds, until the vigour of the new life, "in the fulness of time," and at the right time, quietly displaces them.

So it was, in the case before us, in the spiritual sphere.

The Apostles began at the beginning. Under the Divine impulse of the Pentecostal endowment, their first enterprise was, not to overthrow Judaism; but to preach Christ.

They were not called to destroy or desecrate the Temple. When that was to be done, Roman soldiers would be ready. In the meantime, as they had opportunity, they would
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gladly, as of old, "go up to the Temple to pray." All their
most hallowed memories, their patriotism, and their piety,
combined, to render the old sanctuary sacred. If they
thought of its approaching doom, at sight of which their
beloved Master wept,—they would remember, that judgment
is the work of God; and they would not attempt to snatch
the weapons from His hands.

They did not even give the priesthood and Sanhedrim,
otice to quit; or, in any way, attempt to molest them.

On the contrary, when these authorities molested them, and
proceeded to persecute and slay them, they only prayed for
courage, and did not cry for vengeance!

These and other incidents, clearly prove that the Apostles
had no instructions or authority, to effect an outward or
violent overthrow of the old system.

Their mission was to proclaim and promote "the Kingdom
of God," by the Gospel; remembering that that kingdom
"cometh not with observation," and consists not in outward
forms and ordinances.

They were, doubtless, as the humblest of their disciples,
subject to the laws of spiritual life and growth; and they
were gradually educated; as well as specially directed.

Therefore, they used the old Institutions, without scruple
or cavil, so long as they suited their educational habits, and
ministered to their piety and usefulness.

It was not until the freedom of the Gospel was assailed,
and the attempt was made to impose the Mosaic ritual, as
a yoke of bondage, upon Gentile converts,—whose Chris-
tianity had been complete, without any ceremonial code,—
that the Apostolic prohibition and denunciation, clearly
marked, for all the nations, the boundary line, between
"the grace of Christ," and subjection to carnal ordinances.

NOTE J.

The structure of this book is remarkable. We have
quoted a few sentences only, from what falls under the
second part of its title. Its main object appears to be, to prove that the Apostles frequently quoted from old Liturgies; and that "the Epistle to the Hebrews, is the one book of the New Testament, in which the alleged quotations occur most abundantly." Several ancient Liturgies and some interesting information about them, are industriously collated; and special note is taken of the one designated "the Liturgy of St. James" or "of Jerusalem," which is alleged to be quoted frequently by St. Paul.

It is stated that the Liturgy of St. James preserved large portions of the text of the Liturgy, with which the Apostles were familiar; and from which "the pre-Christian Liturgy of the Hebrew Church, was first adapted, for use in the Christian Church at Jerusalem."

This is very like making history; but our author follows another writer—"the late Dr. John Mason Neale"—from whom, however, he is obliged to dissent. Dr. Neale held that "whenever two passages occur in the same words, on the one hand, in the Liturgy of St. James, and on the other, in the Epistles to the Corinthians, or in any later Epistles, St. Paul quotes the Liturgy." Mr. Field rejects "this most unfortunate corollary"; but he accepts Dr. Neale's main position—that "certain important passages, occurring both in the Liturgy of St. James, and in the Epistles of St. Paul, are taken, by the Apostle, from the Liturgy, and not by the Liturgy, from the Apostle."

Having thus, by a distinction, not without a difference, magnanimously given the Apostle his due, our author proceeds, to appropriate to the Liturgy, very liberally, from the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Throughout his exposition, he frequently remarks—"St. Paul is taking his expressions, from the Liturgy of St. James."—"St. Paul must be imitating the language of the Liturgy; and is not imitated by it";—"he has made quotations from the Liturgy," &c.

When dealing with a passage which is alike in both, he elucidates as follows,—"If the Epistle be the older, the
coincidence of its language, with that of the prayer (in the Liturgy) must be, in the main, at least, purely accidental. On the other hand, if the Epistle is the later writing, and the author has the prayer in his mind, nothing can be more natural than the use which he makes of it.” (p. 241.)

The logic is so invincible here, that we need only remark on the assumption, that the compiler of the Liturgy, could not, as naturally and purposely, appropriate the language of the Epistle, as the Apostle could quote from the Liturgy! This style of argument, must stand on its merits.

We shall not suppose that this gentleman is desirous of offering any sinister insult to the Apostle; or that he would deliberately degrade the authority of holy Scripture. His object is to exalt the Sacraments and the official priesthood. His emphatic reiteration of the Apostle's use of "liturgical expressions," is to enforce the claim of the Apostle's "constantly having in view the Christian Sacraments"; and to prove "how completely St. Paul regards the celebration of the holy Eucharist, as the great central action of the Christian life"! (p. 422.)

In prosecuting this design, Mr. Field performs some remarkable feats of "exegetical" and argument, such as we have already noticed.

In one chapter, he proposes to "compare St. John's record of the institution of the holy Eucharist" (which every reader of the New Testament knows to be nonexistent) with some other passages; and to this end, he quotes our Lord's words in John xiv. 18,—"I will not leave you desolate" (orphans), &c., which, of course, have no reference to any Sacrament or ceremonial performance. In another place, our author follows the example of some of the Fathers, in misquoting or suppressing holy Scripture, in order to uphold sacramental mysteries.

Professing to quote Paul's words, in 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, he gives them thus:—"Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, and we must keep the feast, of that Passover, with the
unleavened bread." By omitting the words "of sincerity and truth" (ἐλυκρίνειας καὶ ἀληθείας) he makes the Apostle appear to inculcate a sacramental observance, where the Apostle plainly excludes everything of the kind.

It may be inquired, what is the authority for this parade of ancient Liturgies, against the plain testimony of holy Scripture? It will appear incredible to some readers, that this gentleman adduces abundant proof, that his chosen proof is worthless. He gives a copious appendix, with a long list of documents, all claiming to be "ancient Liturgies"; presenting any points of agreement and disagreement; curiously illustrating the boasted unity, and uniformity, claimed for "Catholic antiquity." We have analysis and exposition of more than twenty of these ancient Liturgies, severally attributed to patriarchates, communities, churches, sects, and individuals; with notes on their derivation, resemblances and modifications. The author is careful to apprise us of "alterations" and proofs of post-Apostolic development. He wishes his readers to understand that the Liturgies "which bear the names of Fathers or teachers of the fourth and fifth centuries, must be regarded as representing (query, misrepresenting?) the more ancient Liturgies, used in their respective Churches, before they were remodelled, by those whose names they bear."

This is one way of proving their early origin. But, further, we are informed of an "almost boundless variable ness," amongst these documents. The 17th in our author's list, is named "the Liturgy of St. Peter." It is reported as "edited by Pius the 4th, 1570, and revised by Clement the 8th in 1604, and by Urban the 8th in 1634." We are not informed how it happened that St. Peter's work required to be revised, and the revision required to be revised; or, if Peter ever had a hand in it, how much of it may be his, after the last Papal revision!

Strangely enough, "the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions," said to be unquestionably "the oldest existing Liturgy," claims no nearer approach to the Apostles, than
that "it represents the pre-Constantinian Liturgy, of about the middle of the third century."

Still further, it is alleged that "this Liturgy cannot be accepted as a witness to primitive usage, in those points in which it differs from the other Liturgies." This seems puzzling. If the "unquestionably oldest," cannot indicate primitive usage, we are at a loss to know what and where is the method of proof.

But we must hasten to our conclusion.

"The Greek Liturgy of St. James," is regarded as "the chief representative of what is called that original Apostolic Liturgy, from which all others are derived." "A Syrian version" of this, "retains several primitive features which are obscured in the Greek; but less, on the whole, of the primitive text." How then, are we to judge between them? Here, let us distinctly state, that if there could be obtained any well-authenticated copy of an "original Apostolic Liturgy," we should be very glad to see it. It is quite likely that some of the early Jewish Christians, used some portions of their old ritual, in public worship. But we have no record of this; though we have explicit mention of their using free prayer, composed on or for the occasion reported.

With this instructive silence of Scripture, and absence of credible testimony, before us, we cannot accept the traditions of mediæval times, which do not even pretend to any earlier origin than "about the middle of the third century"; the very time when the Fathers avowedly adopted and imitated the heathen "mysteries"!

But, after all, what is the evidence, adduced for this production, which our author attempts to set up, as the instructor of St. Paul? Here is his own account:

"The Syrian tradition, respecting the origin of the Liturgy of St. James, is thus stated, in a commentary upon it, by Dionysius Barsalibi, a learned Bishop of their sect, in the twelfth century:—"Our tradition is, that on the Tuesday after the descent of the Holy Ghost, the Apostle James performed a Liturgy, entirely the same as this which we
have; and when he was asked whence he received it, he answered,—"As the Lord liveth, I have added nothing, and taken away nothing, from that which I heard from our Lord." Wherefore, this Liturgy is of the highest excellence, and the first of all."

This is the authority, on which we are invited to renounce our Scriptural Christianity, and to believe that the Apostles of Christ inculcated a system of sacramental sacerdotalism. A twelfth century report, of a Syrian tradition; which, at best, is a story, at variance with the Apostolic record; and which no sober-minded student of holy Scripture can regard as true! Such is the most learnedly formulated dogma, of the new Anglican heresy; gratefully attributed to the teaching of Canon Liddon. Let us be thankful for the proof, that such teaching, requires and labours to obtain, other sanction than that of the word of God.

NOTE K.

Overlooking its definite primary purpose, critics and commentators, have set this prophecy afloat through the centuries, for every adventurous speculator to appropriate and apply it, to his own or any other time!

It has been claimed and misused in this way, at intervals during the whole era, down to our own times; and, alas! the mischievous practice has not yet come to an end.

The breaking up of the old Roman Empire, was thought to be the beginning of the end of the world; and Gregory the Great believed that his contemporary and rival, his beloved brother of Constantinople, indicated the advent of the Antichrist, by claiming to be universal bishop.

Again, at the close of the tenth century, and during the fanatical age of the Crusades, a frenzy broke out through Christendom, inducing thousands to flock to Palestine, in expectation of the Lord’s coming, and the end of the world.

Similar excitements have occurred, on several occasions, since the Reformation; and the reaction, in every instance,
has, naturally, manifested itself, in a sad increase of scepticism and worldliness.

Notwithstanding these warnings, many pious but misguided men, persist in publishing their wild fancies, as expositions of Revelation.

Several years ago, one of these (so-called) “expositions,”—by an English clergyman,—produced an immense sensation, had an immense sale, and caused an immense scandal to Christianity. It announced, *inter alia*, that Louis Napoleon (then Emperor of the French) would, in a short time, be sole ruler of Europe; that he would set himself up in Jerusalem, and be the Antichrist; and that the Lord would descend from heaven, to Jerusalem, to destroy Napoleon Antichrist, and set up His own millennial kingdom! Notwithstanding the collapse and fiasco, which followed this vaticination, this writer is still before the public, as an *advertised* interpreter of prophecy; and even in London, groups of devout people, all presumably sane, and able to read, listen to his rhapsodies, while he announces the day of the month, for the ascent of the saints; the descent of the Lord; and the end of the world!

Some recent, scholarly and exuberant “expositions” of the great prophecies, represent the burden of Daniel’s predictions and those of John, as identical and yet future; and, with sundry discoveries and demonstrations, allege that the whole of the Christian dispensation is but “a parenthetical era of grace,” inserted in the history of God’s dealings with the Jews. According to this theory, “the last week” (or seven years, of Daniel’s seventy prophetic weeks), stand prorogued, until the end of the present age; instead of having immediately followed the sixty-ninth week, at our Lord’s first coming. In these seven years “God will resume His dealings with His people and their holy city.” “At this time the Jews will be in possession of their own land, having been restored, it may be, by Antichrist,” with whom they will have accepted a covenant,
But "the Lord will preserve the Jews, while destroying the myriads of Antichrist," and "He will make His people Israel, the kings of the earth, upon the earth"!

Others, more sober-minded, display much learning and imagination, in discovering events of modern European history, in the addresses to the Seven Churches. The Spanish Armada; the persecution of Continental Protestants; the French Revolution; the career of Napoleon Buonaparte; the Crimean war, &c., are all alleged to be set forth in the Apocalypse.

When writers and preachers, have in this way, demonstrated their competency to utter oracles, they sometimes venture to proclaim "the end of the age"; and announce that "the coming of the Lord draweth nigh"; as if this had been recently communicated to them, for the present time; instead of having been uttered by an Apostle, over eighteen hundred years ago, for the instruction and warning of his contemporaries.

Who can estimate the evil consequences of this temerity! One of the saddest of the signs of the present times, is, that devout men, men of scholarship, intelligence, and piety, by their foolish speaking, not only disturb and wound devout souls; but, overthrow the faith of some; and give profane scoffers, occasion and excuse, for treating Christianity with contempt.

NOTE L.

Jerusalem and Rome are as plainly indicated, as if they were named; and both are alike implied to be then standing. The sixth of the "Kings" (Emperors) is represented, as in existence (reigning) when John wrote. He was above all others distinguished as "the tyrant"; the well-known terrible persecutor of the Christians; and their condition of danger, suffering and persecution,—as indicated all through,—most fully corresponds with the acts of ruthless cruelty, which marked the tyrant's reign.
Jerusalem and Rome,—as representing the two great opposing Powers, then harassing and corrupting the Church of Christ; and the acts and methods of hostility, then proceeding from Judaism and heathenism—are the underlying and ever-present themes, in the direct references to the sufferings of the Churches.

Upon these two hostile Powers, the Divine judgments are represented as shortly to fall. On the former a signal, speedy, and complete overthrow, is soon to be effected; while the latter is reserved to a more protracted, and varied series of judgments; like those of ancient Babylon, with which it is compared.

These impending judgments, are sometimes symbolized, in connection with prophetic glances forward, to the future and final judgment of the Redeemer's enemies; as in the 24th chapter of Matthew; and as type and analogy suggest. But the direct and appropriate significance of the Revelation, to and for the Churches to whom it was addressed, is distinctly and variously indicated; and we can best understand its primary object, by trying to put ourselves in company with its first readers.

Great difference of opinion has prevailed, regarding the precise time of John's exile to Patmos.

Many critics have held that his banishment occurred during the reign of Domitian; and several authorities are quoted, in support of that view.

But most, if not all, the earlier of these, derived their notions from a recorded statement of Irenæus; and it has been shown that the words of Irenæus have been misapprehended. Rightly rendered, his remarks refer to the appearance of John himself among the Churches, during the reign of Domitian, (that is, to his having lived on till then), and not to his vision or revelation, as having then occurred.

The early Syriac inscription (as we are informed) distinctly states that John was banished to Patmos by Nero; and a vast amount of collateral and incidental evidence, goes to
establish this representation. It was in reference to the number of the name of "the beast," (Rev. xiii. 18) that Irenæus used the words already referred to. The most obvious and probable solution of that number, gives the name of "Nero," (Neron Cesar, according to the Hebrew numerals), and an early and widespread tradition, quoted from Suetonius and Tacitus, gives the opinions of both Christians and heathens, to the same effect. Many of the early Christian writers, maintained that Nero was "the man of sin," and "the lawless one," described by Paul; and that "the Antichrist will be Nero, raised up from hell."

Some of our most recent interpreters of the Apocalypse—as if to keep up with the ancients,—allege several considerations, in support of this view; and divide the claim, between Nero and Napoleon!

Our notice of these conjectures, is only for the purpose of illustrating the well-earned reputation of "the tyrant," as the first and most terrible of the Imperial persecutors of the Christians.

The general issue, confirms the belief, that John was banished to Patmos, and the book of the Revelation was written, in the time of the persecution under Nero.

Interesting and judicious remarks on this subject, may be found in the Introduction to "Notes on the Revelation of John," by Professor Cowles, of Oberlin, Ohio, U.S.A.; and, in duty to all readers, who may desire to pursue the study, it is here recorded, that this concise treatise, by the venerable Oberlin Professor, is incomparably the most consistent, luminous, and satisfying, exposition of the Apocalypse, with which the present writer is acquainted.

The results of ripe scholarship, and acute analysis, are presented in the simplest form; while the method of proof conducts the reader,—clear of all fogs and fancies,—along the line of sober and intelligible exegesis, to the solid ground of intelligent conviction; by finding, in the book, the true key to its interpretation.
NOTE M.

It may be interesting here, to note something more about these "mysteries." Of course a full exposition is not to be obtained.

A scholarly writer, already quoted, remarks that "we hear so much of them, and yet know so little." He adds, however, that, whatever was their scope, it seems they were meant to satisfy the longing after the perfect; which was inadequately provided for, in the human faith of the ordinary priests and their temples."

(Mahaffy, "Social Life of the Greeks."

Bishop Thirlwall, in his History of Greece, expresses the opinion, that the mysteries were "the remains of a worship that preceded the rise of the Hellenic mythology and its attendant rites; grounded on a view of nature, less fanciful, more earnest, and better fitted to awaken both philosophical thought and religious feeling."

Several of the Fathers descanted with fervour, on this subject. Clement of Alexandria calls the Eleusinian a mystic drama; and it is recorded that both games and a rigid and cruel enforcement of sacredness, were maintained in connection with them. The mysteries in general, are defined, as "sacrifices and ceremonies, which took place at night, or in secret, within some sanctuary, which the uninitiated were not allowed to enter. What were essential to them were objects of worship, sacred utensils, and traditions with their interpretations, which were withheld from all persons, not initiated."

Dionysius, Plato, Aristotle, Strabo, and many others, have written about them, and yet they remain as "mysteries"! It is alleged that the ceremonies of purification employed, were accompanied by a strict investigation into life and character, and absolution from past offences. It also appears that the initiated were regarded as introduced to a higher life.
"The Lemnian Cabeiriæ (said to be derived from the Pelasgi) were celebrated annually, at night, and lasted nine days, during which all fires in the island were extinguished; sacrifices were offered to the dead; and a sacred vessel was sent to fetch new fire from Delos. On its return, the pure fire was distributed, and a new life began, with banquets. (Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities."")

These notices of a venerable and impressive superstition, possess a solemn interest for us, not only as indicating an ancient development of the religious instincts of our race, but especially, because of its lasting and deteriorating influence, on the Christian Church.

NOTE N.

It is deplorable that devout men sometimes virtually invite the world to learn from eminent Christian teachers, the art of systematic falsehood.

In reviewing the Romish question Dr. Pusey truly remarked—"One of the saddest parts of modern controversy, is the thought how much is owing to forged writings." The Doctor referred to the works of several eminent Romanists, admitting and deploring the fabrication of the Papal title-deeds.

Quoting at large from the historian Fleuri and others, regarding "the false decretals attributed to the Popes of the first three centuries, which appeared at the end of the eighth century," and "the proofs which demonstrate their falsity," by which several good Popes were deceived, and betrayed into a false position, and "an incurable wound was inflicted on the church,"—Dr. Pusey delivers his own sad, solemn judgment on the case.

He remarks with not unreasonable severity—"The forgery of the decretals, after they had passed for true, during eight centuries, was owned by all, even in the Church of Rome; but the system built upon the forgery, abides still."

The most astounding part of the history is that after these
confessions and demonstrations have been made so familiar to the civilized world, that it might seem to be superfluous, or a bore to repeat them,—Pope Leo XIII. declares this forgery-founded Papal power to be the ordinance of God, essential to the Christian faith, and Cardinal Manning invites Englishmen to take the Pope's word for it, as infallible proof!

The contagious influence of this religious lying, threatens the very life of Christianity, in more than one section of what claims to be the Catholic Church.

One of the most approved methods of promoting the Anglican sacerdotalism, is to ignore well-known refutations of its claims: and to re-assert them, as if they could not be gainsaid.

A curious instance of this appears in Mr. Field's work on "The Apostolic Liturgy," &c. (noticed on p. 126 et seq. and in Note J).

The worthlessness of the references here paraded, has been long well known, and frequently proved.

Seven or eight years before the appearance of Mr. Field's work, Dr. Harrison in his discussions with Dr. Pusey and others, had shown that "the early Liturgies as they have come down to us are little better than caricatures of the primitive mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper, and no more represent the real teaching of the early Fathers, than obscurity represents light."

In support of this view Dr. Harrison quotes from "the learned Romanist, Dupin of the Sorbonne," as follows:—

"The Liturgies that bear the names of Apostles and Evangelists, were not really composed by them." "The Liturgy, or Greek and Latin Mass, attributed to St. Peter, cannot be that of St. Peter." "There is the Liturgy of St. James, which divers learned men have taken much pains to vindicate, but to no purpose." "The Mass of the Ethiopians that bears the name of St. Matthew, appears evidently to be a forgery," &c. (Dupin, quoted by Dr. Harris, in "The True Bread of Life," &c., pp. 71, 72.)
Yet, after these testimonies had been read by many, and forgotten by some, "the Apostolic Liturgy" represented as the instructor of St. Paul (!) is launched on the flowing tide of public opinion, with all the prestige of a dedication to the Oxford Professor of Exegesis; as though Dr. Harris and Dupin and other protesters had not been known on our planet; and Canon Liddon allowed his name to sanction this performance!

But we are fortified, against all such machinations of those who have "turned unto fables," by the solemn declaration of the beloved disciple, "No lie is of the Truth!" (1 John ii. 21.)

NOTE O.

"The Lord's Supper," the evening meal, originated in the evening feast of which every Jewish household partook, on the night as it might be, before or after the Passover.

"The very name of 'Supper' reminds us that it sprang from a festive meal, amidst eating and drinking, amidst weeping and rejoicing, amidst questions and answers. . . . Amongst the means of Christian edification, not the least are those interchanges of hospitality, where friend talks freely with friend, guest with guest. . . . "The Supper," says Luther, 'which Christ held with His disciples, when He gave them His farewell, must have been full of friendly heart-intercourse, for Christ spoke just as tenderly and cordially to them, as a father to his dear little children, when he is obliged to part from them.' . . . In the communion of the first and second centuries, the character of the Grecian club was manifest, for each brought, as to the common meal, his own contribution in his basket; each helped himself from the common table. . . . It was the memorial of the ancient practice of the contribution of the Christian community towards a common meal."

Amongst the many indications of this original character of the observance, perhaps the most singular to our modern conceptions was the general use of fish at the feast. This
appears to have been common, from the continuous tradition of antiquity, as "bread and fish" were then, pretty much as "bread and cheese" are to the bulk of modern Englishmen.

"The early representations of the sacred Supper (whether we call it Eucharist or Agape) which appears in the Catacombs, almost always include fishes, sometimes placed on the cakes of bread. Sometimes on a platter by itself. . . . There was in the Middle Ages a fish, called 'the Paschal pickerel' and a tradition that the Lord had in instituting the Supper, substituted a fish for the Paschal Lamb."

The one rational conclusion from these recorded facts and fancies, is that the original "Lord's Supper," was a real simple meal. Whether we call it "Love-feast," "Agape," "Eucharist," or "Communion," it was not a sacramental mystery, but a "Supper," at which it was possible to indulge appetite, even to gluttony and drunkenness, as at Corinth (1 Cor. xi. 21).

This is placed beyond dispute, in the subsequent evolution and practice. When abuses continued, and the morally decrepit clergy were unable to restrain them, it became necessary to effect an outward change.

"Gradually the repast was parted from the religious act. From century to century the breach widened. The meal came to be known by the distinct name of 'Agape,' but the Apostolical description of The Lord's Supper was regarded as belonging to a meal, altogether distinct from the Sacrament. Finally, the meal itself fell under suspicion; and in the fifth century, that which had been the original form of the Eucharist was forbidden as profane, by the Councils of Carthage and Laodicea."¹

Thus the ground was cleared for "the Sacrament," afterwards developed by transubstantiation, into the Sacrifice of the Mass.

"One cause of the persistent tendency to the physical interpretation, lay in the fascination exercised over the

early centuries of our era, by the belief in amulets and charms, which the Christians inherited, and could not but inherit, from the decaying Roman Empire."

"In a striking passage in Cardinal Newman's Essay on Development, written with a view to identifying the modern Church of Rome with the Church of the early ages, he shows, with all the power of his eloquence, the apparent affinity between the magical rites which flooded Roman society during the first three centuries, and what seemed to be their counterparts, in the contemporary Christian Church."

"Much in this similarity was from the aspect which early Christianity inevitably bore to the influences by which it was surrounded. It was not mere hostility or ignorance which saw in the exorcisms, the purifications, the mysteries of the Church of the first ages, the effects of the same vast wave of superstition, which elsewhere produced the witches and soothsayers of Italy, the Mithraic rites of Persia, the strange charms and invocations of the Gnostics. In these likenesses it is a strange inversion, instead of recognising the influence of the perishing Empire on the rising Church, not only to insist on binding down the Church to the effete superstitions of the Empire, but to regard those superstitions as themselves the marks of a divine Catholicity!"

"Dr. Arnold— with a truer historical insight— says, 'Christianity shared the common lot of all great moral changes, perfect as it was in itself, its nominal adherents were often neither wise nor good. The seemingly incongruous evils of the thoroughly corrupt society of the Roman Empire, superstition and scepticism, ferocity and sensual profligacy, often sheltered themselves under the name of Christianity; and hence the heresies of the first age of the Christian Church.'"

"The 'sensual profligacy' and the scepticism, no doubt remained amongst the heresies, but unfortunately the ferocity and the superstition, lingers in the Church itself." ("Christian Institutions," supra.)
NOTE P.

Every thoughtful reader of the New Testament can test and appreciate a brief summary of the evidence regarding

The Sacraments.

1st. The two "ordinances," or "Sacraments," as they are named, were observed, as a matter of course, in the transition from Judaism, in mixed communities, where members of a synagogue, believing in Jesus, as the Messiah, formed the nucleus of a Christian Society (as at Corinth, Acts xviii.; I Cor i. 14-18), and proselytes or Gentile converts uniting with them, became, in fact, members of a Jewish sect.

2nd. These "ordinances" were not included amongst the "necessary things," enjoined upon churches of the Gentiles, when freed from the Jewish ceremonial (Acts xvi. 28, 29), but even Apostles and elders, who, as Jews, continued to observe the old rites themselves, yet decided that "no such thing" should be required of "Gentiles who believe" (Acts xxii. 25).

3rd. At the formation of the first church of the Gentiles, when the name of "Christians" first came into use, these observances disappeared, and they find no place in the Scripture history of that Church and its great apostolic mission (Acts xi. 26; xiv. 25-28).

4th. They are omitted, in all places where Apostolic teaching condemns and prohibits the Jewish ceremonial, and where they would naturally or necessarily have been mentioned in contrast, if it had been intended that they should supersede the exploded rites, and take the place of circumcision, &c. (Gal. iii. 28, 29; iv. 9, 10-31; v. 1-11; Phil. iii. 1-16).

5th. They are excluded from the permanent Christianity of the future, by the subsequent teaching and practice of the Apostles; and no place is left for them, in the recorded instructions of these inspired Ambassadors of Christ, provid-
APPENDIX.

In this connection a special interest attaches to the Didache Ton Apostolôn—"The teaching of the Apostles," discovered a few years ago by the Metropolitan of Nicomedia, and subsequently made known to Western Christendom and "the world of scholars," by the enterprise and labour of Americans and Englishmen.

Of course this work is no more of Apostolic authorship than is the so-called "Apostles' Creed," or other similar compilations. But its historical value consists in its being a reduced portrait, or under-statement of the Christian system of an early age, and in its illustrations of the simplicity of early Christianity.

The Bryennios MS., as it is called, from the name of its finder, is from the Jerusalem Codex, written in A.D. 1056. But the Didache claims a high antiquity, being quoted or referred to by our earliest Patristic writers, Barnabas, Justin Martyr, &c.

The original treatise is attributed to Clement, and it is believed that parts of it were in use amongst Jewish teachers before the Christian era, and have been appropriated and glossed by a Jewish Christian.

The learned Editor of our version (Professor Rendel Harris, formerly of Cambridge, now of Haverford College, Pennsylvania) has pointed out the abounding Hebraisms of the Teaching, and shown that it is the work of a Jewish Christian or of one familiar with the literature and ritual of the Jews. "It is rooted in rules of Judaism, and was originally designed for a religious brotherhood, such as existed among the Pharisees."

This semi-Jewish character of the work greatly enhances the value of its evidence against modern sacerdotal ritual-
ism. It distinctly marks the link between the Passover and the Agape.

It is now rendering important service to those who are sustaining the conflict in the high places of Anglicanism, against materializing superstition.

Dean Lefroy of Norwich has recently adduced the testimony of the Didache amongst "sub-Apostolic witnesses against sacerdotalism," and similar evidence supports the eloquent protest of Archdeacon Farrar—"God is not a man that He should care for outward trivialities. God is Spirit. He is not only immaterial, but He has no limitations. He is Spirit and Light and Love, and with these three ringing hammer-strokes of the word we may dash in pieces, for ourselves, ten thousand idols of human theology, tricked out with the intricate sham jewellery of human ordinances."

Thus these good men are led to utter truths more far-reaching than they intended, and unconsciously to pronounce against the whole system of modern Sacramentarianism.

NOTE Q.

As the early Christianity of the West was entirely Greek, in language and institutions, so in regard to Baptism, it adopted the Eastern usages of the bath.

Dean Stanley, in his interesting work on "Christian Institutions," describes some of these usages, "to which," as he justly remarks, "no existing ritual of any European Church offers any likeness."

"There was, as a general rule, but one baptism in each city, and such baptistries were apart from the churches. There was but one time of the year when the rite was administered, namely, between Easter and Pentecost. There was but one personage who could administer it, the presiding officer of the community, 'the Bishop,' as the chief presbyter was called, after the first century. There was but one hour for the ceremony: it was midnight, the torches
flashed through the dark hall, as the troops of converts flocked in. The baptistery consisted of an inner and an outer chamber. In the outer chamber stood the candidates for baptism, stripped to their shirts, and, turning to the West, they stretched forth their hands, as in a defiant attitude towards the Evil Spirit of darkness, and speaking to him by name, said, 'I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy works!' Then they turned like a regiment facing to the East, and repeated the belief in the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, which has grown into the so-called 'Apostles' Creed' in the West, and the so-called 'Nicene Creed' in the East.

"They then advanced into the inner chamber. Before them yawned the deep pool or reservoir, and, standing by, the deacon or deaconess to arrange that all should be done with decency.

"The whole troop undressed completely, as if for a bath, and stood up naked before the Bishop, who put to each the questions, to which the answer was returned in a distinct and loud voice, as of those who knew what they had undertaken.

"They then plunged into the water. Both before and after the immersion, their bare limbs were rubbed with oil from head to foot; they were then clothed in white gowns, and received, as token of the kindly feeling of their new brotherhood, the kiss of peace, and a taste of honey and milk; and they expressed their new faith by using, for the first time, the Lord's Prayer."

It is further noticed, in this connection, that—"In the early church, the careful distinction which later times have made between Baptism, Regeneration, Conversion, and Repentance, did not exist. They all meant the same thing. . . . . In the second century, 'Regeneration' (παλιγγενεσία), which gradually was taken to be the equivalent of Baptism, was, in the first instance, the equivalent of Repentance and Conversion." The "long controversy" which occurred in recent years "on the distinction between these words,"
would have been unintelligible to Justin Martyr or Clement of Alexandria."

This may help us to a right estimate of the early Fathers, as theological guides. But we find still more distinctly that in these early times the belief prevailed that baptism was "like a magical charm, which acted on the persons who received it, without any consent or intention of administrator or recipient; that it wiped away all sins, however long they had been accumulating, and however late it was administered!" Out of this moral midnight, naturally came two of the most wonderful instances of "the power of darkness." On the one hand, it led to the postponement of baptism until the hour of death, as in the case of the Emperor Constantine the Great, and of Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, and "according to the bad practice of that age."

On the other hand, it issued in the appalling conception that "no one could be saved unless he had passed through the immersion of baptism," and that "unbaptized infants were consigned to everlasting fire."

"This," says Vossius, "is the judgment of all antiquity. . . ."

"At the close of the fifth century, this belief had become universal, chiefly through the means of Augustine."

"All who profess to go by the opinion of the ancients, and the teaching of Augustine, must be prepared to believe that immersion is essential to the efficacy of baptism; that unbaptized infants must be lost for ever; and that baptized infants must receive the Eucharist, or be lost in like manner. This was a necessary consequence of the same materializing system."1

While we shrink with horror from these shocking misrepresentations of the character and will of God, we should surely be thankful for the light and liberty of a purer Christianity.

---

1 "Christian Institutions," pp. 4, 5, 13, 16.
NOTE R.

The dominating influence of ritualistic superstition has had a sadly interesting history. Amongst the early Fathers it appropriated the most extravagant notions of supernatural or magical powers, which they had imbibed from their native paganism.

Thus they speak of "the sacred age of waters"; "the regenerating water"; "the water of salvation," &c.

Tertullian, though admitting children's baptism (using the Latin tingo, to tinge), yet earnestly urged the delay of the rite, on the ground that the young folk ought not to be exposed to the peril of unpardonable sin; as sins committed after baptism could scarcely be absolved! On the other hand, a whole council of sixty-six bishops, under the presidency of Cyprian of Carthage, decided not to delay baptism till the eighth day—as had been proposed by one member; the reason alleged for the unanimous vote, being that the salvation of the babies ought not to be imperilled, "in case they should die unregenerated"—that is, unbaptized.

Extravagant conceits mingled with gross superstition, in the religion of these Fathers of the Church. They played with the well-known acrostic or monogram of Ἰχθύς (Ichthus), "a fish," formed by the initial Greek letters in "Jesus Christ, God's Son, the Saviour," and represented Christians as "little fishes," born to their great Fish, in the regenerating waters.

Be it distinctly observed that these men were not ridiculing the rite, and did not intend to be profane.

How do we compare with them in these modern times?

The following has recently appeared in a leading London daily paper:—

"A curious baptismal dispute in connection with the "Strict Baptist Church" at Highbury Place, has now been satisfactorily settled. This congregation was accused of admitting into fellowship without the ordeal of immersion, a
lady who, unfortunately, is afflicted with physical deformity, its excuse being that in her case the ceremony was impossible. 'The London Association of Strict Baptist Churches' did not deem this a valid plea, and excluded the place of worship in Highbury. The elders and congregation have now admitted that their 'mistake was in being too ready to accept the idea of impossibility.' The lady in question has been duly immersed, 'seated in her own chair, and wearing a dress specially designed for the occasion,' and the church taken back into the association."

Now, doubtless, these "Strict Baptists" are devout and conscientious people. But if profane wags invented a "Baptist" story, designed to bring contempt on Christianity, how far could they improve on the foregoing?

Is it not fit to go with the "little fishes?"

(Additional Note, from pp. 34, 35.)

"The words in St. John's Gospel (of remitting sins, &c.) were, it is certain, never used during the first twelve centuries for the ordination of any Christian Minister. It is certain that in the whole Eastern Church they are never used for this purpose.

"It was not till the thirteenth century—the age when the materialistic theories of the Sacraments and the extravagant pretensions of Pontifical and Sacerdotal power were at their height, that these words were first introduced into the ordinals of the Latin Church.

"From thence they were, at the Reformation, retained in the Ordination Services of the Episcopal Church of England and the Presbyterian Church of Lutheran Germany. . . . . The only form of confession that was known for four centuries was the acknowledgment of the faults of the penitent, not in private but in public, to the whole congregation, who then publicly expressed their forgiveness. The substitution of a single priest for a whole congregation, as the receptacle of confession, arose from the desire to avoid
the scandals occasioned by the primitive publicity. It was not till long afterwards that the notion sprang up of any special virtue attaching to the forgiveness of a clergyman, or that any private or special confession was made to him. Even in the very heart of the Roman Mass is retained a testimony to the independence and equality in this respect of people and minister.

"There, in the most solemn ordinance of religion, the priest first turns to the people and confesses his sins to them; and they publicly absolve him in exactly the same form of words which he uses, when they in their turn confess their faults to him. Finally, the priest pronounces what is evidently a joint absolution for both him and the people."

The words "Ego absolve te" were introduced at a much later date.

"This striking passage, standing as it does at the forefront of the Roman Missal, is one of the many variations in the Roman Church, which, if followed out to their logical consequences, would correct some of the gravest errors which have sprung up within its pale." ("Christian Institutions," pp. 141–4.)

(Additional Note, from pp. 113, 114.)

"The destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple, were to be the outward signs in Israel, of the advent of the Lord, in the glory and terror of the parousia. The portents that attended the advent of the Lord were, so far as we can judge, limited to Israel (Matt. xxiv. 29).

"The fourth part of the earth" (Apoc. vi. 8, 9), τῆς γῆς, of the land, &c.

"The prophetic vision was probably literally fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem, when Josephus calculated that over a million Jews perished, besides the multitudes that were carried into slavery, and preserved for the Roman triumph."

Other circumstances which exactly fit the facts, "serve to
APPENDIX.

indicate that this vision is concerned with the destruction of Jerusalem, and with nothing else. . . . .”

It is a singular fact, that while there is no Christian record of the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jew Josephus has recorded how the Lord’s predictions were fulfilled.

To say that “the wild beasts of the earth” should have part in the carnage might seem ridiculous; yet it was literally accomplished.

“We should not have known or guessed how the inhabitants of Jerusalem could be destroyed by wild beasts, if Josephus had not told us that the Roman conquerors literally reserved their captives for this very fate. . . . .”

“The coming of the Lord was to be attended with tribulations and sorrow to Israel, such as never had been and never again should be” (Matt. xxiv. 21).

“Supposing that John wrote the Apocalypse about the year 68 or 70 A.D., the opening of the first seal of the seven-sealed scroll was just about to happen when the Apocalypse was written.” (‘Notes on the Revelation of the Apostle John,” by the late J. T. Harris, pp. 496-510.)

NOTE 8.

“In the beginning of Christianity there was no such institution as the Clergy; and it is conceivable that there may be a time when they shall cease to be. . . . .”

“Before the conversion of the Empire, Bishops and Presbyters alike were chosen by the whole mass of the people in the parish or diocese, by show of hands (χειροτονία). No written formula of ordination exists. . . . .”

“The deacons became the first preachers of Christianity. They were the first Evangelists, because they were the first to find their way to the houses of the poor. They were the constructors of the most solid and durable institutions of Christianity—namely, the institutions of charity and beneficence. . . . .”
"The pastoral Epistles, which are the earliest documents or laws describing the duties of the clergy, do not even mention the Sacraments, and are for the most part confined to matters of conduct and sobriety."

In recalling these significant facts, Dean Stanley pleasantly remarked,—"The Pope is a representative of Christian antiquity. In this respect he is a perfect museum of ecclesiastical curiosities; a mass—if we wish so to regard him—of primitive Protestantism. . . ."

"When he celebrates mass in his own Cathedral at St. John Lateran, he officiates not at a stone altar, but at a wooden plank. This primitive wooden table, the mark of the original social character of the Lord's Supper, is an interesting relic of indisputable antiquity, preserved in the very heart of the See of Rome."

Again—"When the Pope celebrates mass, he stands not with his back to the people, nor at the north end of the table, but behind it with his back to the wall and facing the congregation."

Thus the Pope keeps up a perpetual testimony against the modern innovations of Romanism!

Still more interesting are the Dean's notices of what he calls "the undersong of better spirits from the earliest times, which maintains with regard to both Sacraments, that their essence is to be had without the form." "In the vitals of the most mechanical theory of the Sacraments, there was wrapped up a protest in favour of the most spiritual view."

Even when the definition of the fourth Council of Lateran was confirmed by the miracle of Bolsena, and the popular and monkish legends of bleeding wafers,—"the very statement of Transubstantiation, properly understood, contained a safety valve, through which the more earthly and dogmatic expressions of the doctrine evaporate and melt into something not very unlike the purest Protestantism."
"The scholastic distinction between 'Substance' and 'Accidents,' has long since vanished out of every sound system, either of physics or metaphysics. It attempted, as Cardinal Newman shows, to define what "the greatest philosophers know nothing about."

The Dean enforces his view by a very happy illustration—"If the fine lines of Thomas Aquinas in his famous hymn, 'Lauda Sion Salvatorem,' have any sense at all, they mean that the body of Christ is not contained in the bread, nor his blood in the wine, but that something different from each is contained in both, and that something must be either a purely spiritual presence in the hearts of the faithful, or else the presence of two physical bodies, existing on every altar at the same moment; which is maintained by no one."

In full recognition of "the Biblical truth, that the operations of the Divine Spirit on the human soul can only be through moral means, and that the moral influence of the Sacraments is chiefly or solely through the commemoration of the most touching and transcendent event in history"—the Dean delighted in discovering latent traces of this primitive Christianity, in the midst of modern overgrowths of materializing superstition.

"In a society where the whole atmosphere was still redolent of strange rites of Pagan witchcraft and demonology . . . . there are incontrovertible proofs that there was a large mass of sentiment and of usage, which was not only not mediæval, not hierarchical, but the very reverse; a mine of Protestantism, of Quakerism, if we will, which remained there to explode, when the time came, into the European Reformation." They coincide with the fact that the idea of a separate clerical priesthood was unknown to the early Church. "They remain in the ancient Roman ritual, with other well-known discordant elements, a living protest against the modern theories which have been engrafted upon it."
Pursuing his truly Catholic theme, this interesting writer thus eloquently expressed his hope for the Christian future of our country:—"In proportion as England has become and will yet more become a truly free and educated people, able of itself to bind what ought to be bound, and to loose what ought to be loosed, in that proportion will the belief in priestly absolution vanish, just as the belief in wizards and necromancers has vanished before the march of science. As alchemy has disappeared, to give place to chemistry, as astrology has given way to astronomy, as monastic celibacy has given way to domestic purity, as bull-fights and bear-baits have given way to innocent and elevating amusements, as scholastic casuistry has bowed before the philosophy of Bacon and Pascal—so will the belief in the magical offices of a sacerdotal caste vanish before the growth of manly Christian independence, and generous Christian sympathy."

Having sought proofs and illustrations chiefly from eminent men noted for holding the sacramental system which I am led to reject, I desire to record my admiration of their noble candour and loyalty to truth. If in this connection I have been betrayed into undue length of quotation, I must plead in excuse, the fascination of Dean Stanley's wide sympathies, keen spiritual insight, and beautiful Christian charity.

With grateful recognition of his great services to the whole Christian community, I take leave to appropriate here the exquisite lines, which he adopted from "a gifted German poet:"

"It is the Spirit of God which works the greatest of miracles, and shall work greater miracles than we have yet seen. It is this Spirit which breaks down all the strongholds of oppression and sets the bondmen free. It is this Spirit which heals old death-wounds, and throws into the old law new life. Through this Spirit it is that all men become a race of nobles, equal in the sight of God. Through this
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Spirit are dispersed the black clouds and dark cobwebs that bewildere our hearts and brains.

"A thousand knights in armour clad,
Hath the Holy Ghost ordained;
All His work and will to do,
By His living force sustained.
Bright their swords, their banners bright,
Who would not be ranked a knight,
Foremost in that sacred host!
Oh, whate'er our race or creed,
May we be such knights indeed,
Soldiers of the Holy Ghost."

("Christian Institutions," pp. 91-95, 147-201.)

We close with the Apostolic appeal on

WITNESSING AND WORKING FOR CHRIST:

"If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God. If any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth; that God, in all things, may be glorified through Jesus Christ;—to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." (1 Peter iv. 11.)