

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1845.

No. IV.

James S. Graham.
ART. I.—*The Apostles' doctrine and fellowship: Five Sermons preached in the principal churches of his diocese, during his spring visitation, 1844.* By the Right Rev. L. Silliman Ives, DD. LL.D., Bishop of North Carolina. Published by the unanimous request of his Convention. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 148 Chesnut street. 1844. pp. 189.

THIS title page is not, we think, remarkable for its modesty. Dr. Ives styles himself Bishop of North Carolina. Are we to understand by this, that he is Bishop to the exclusion of the Bishop of the Moravians at Salem and its vicinity, the validity of whose ordination his predecessor acknowledged; and to the exclusion of all Roman Catholic Bishops? Is it implied that all other denominations are rebels against his authority? Does he claim jurisdiction *in partibus infidelium*? He prefers to call the convention of Episcopal ministers and delegates of North Carolina "his" convention, rather than the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as has been usual.

The first subject discussed is baptismal justification. We will permit the Bishop to define his own terms. "The term justification," he says, "may be expressed accurately enough for our present purpose, by the terms remission of sins, and regeneration, or, being born from above." In

another place, we have this language: "I say our justification, by which I mean our being in a state of salvation." In this definition, he agrees substantially with the Romanists, disagrees with the Thirty-nine Articles of his own church, and with protestants generally for the last three hundred years. He agrees with the Romanists: The council of Trent says "That justification is not only the remission of sins, but the sanctification and renovation of the interior man." He disagrees with the Articles of his own church: The eleventh article teaches "That we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of Christ." This is the article on justification. The next article, which is on good works, proceeds to say, "Albeit good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow justification, cannot put away our sins." In this case, the good works, which are distinguished from justification, are the essence and evidence of regeneration and sanctification. To be accounted righteous cannot, surely, mean to be born from above. It is too well known to need proof, that the Bishop differs, in his definition of justification, from the great body of protestant writers for the last three centuries.

Having disposed of Dr. Ives' definition, let us now attend to his doctrine. "Repentance alone," he says, "is not sufficient for our justification. Baptism in the name of Jesus Christ must follow. This, for the remission of sins, is indispensable. The necessity of baptism, I do not hesitate to affirm, is rendered, by the ordinary law of the gospel, as indispensable as that of faith, or any other term of salvation. That repentance according to the hope of the gospel comes too late, which shuts out baptism and living faith on the Son of God." The reader will no doubt agree with us, that these are most extraordinary declarations. That gospel repentance comes too late, which shuts out baptism! "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." "Godly sorrow worketh repentance unto life." "There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." But according to Bishop Ives's doctrine, this heavenly joy is rather premature, and men may perish whether they repent or not, and repentance according to the hope of the gospel may be unto death, instead of unto life. In avowing such sentiments on a vital doctrine of Christianity, he has set himself against the Articles of his own church, and the creeds of all other evangelical churches; and he symbolizes with the Romanists, and becomes the advocate of a re-

ligion of forms. The doctrine of the Bishop is the doctrine of the Romish church. The council of Trent says, "If any one says baptism is not necessary to salvation, let him be accursed." The Roman catechism, composed by order of the council of Trent, has this declaration. "All sin, original and actual, however heinous, by the wonderful virtue of this sacrament, (baptism) is remitted and freely forgiven." The agreement, as our readers will see, between a so-called protestant Bishop, and the mother of abominations, is quite remarkable. Both make baptism essential to salvation, and both make it the instrument of justification. The Bishop asserts that baptism "is an instituted vehicle of God's grace and favour to our souls." The council of Trent says, "If any one says that the sacraments do not contain the grace they signify, let him be accursed," and, "if any one shall say that they do not confer grace *ex opere operato*, let him be accursed;" an agreement again, which is very wonderful. The same doctrine is taught in Tract No. 90, the most obnoxious of all the tracts issued by the Puseyites. That tract affirms, "That in justification, baptism is the hand of the giver, and faith the hand of the receiver;" and its authors distinctly enough give their opinion elsewhere, that baptism is the instrument of justification.

But the Bishop differs, as might be expected, from the thirty-nine Articles. The eleventh article asserts, that faith only is the instrument of justification; and the twenty-seventh teaches, that "baptism is not only a sign of profession, and a mark of difference, whereby Christians are discerned from others that be not christened; but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth." The article in question proceeds to state that "the promises of forgiveness and adoption are visibly signed and sealed in this ordinance." This language is sufficiently explicit, and proves that the Episcopal church holds that baptism is a rite of initiation, a sign of a gracious change, and a seal of a covenant; which is the common Reformed doctrine on this subject; and if this is not sufficient, the well known opinions of the authors of these Articles ought to settle the question. Bishop Burnet, in his exposition of the thirty-nine Articles, takes the same view of the subject. Faith then, and not faith and baptism, is here affirmed to be the sole instrument of justification. But in the system of the author, baptism has an equally important place with faith. It is

made a fundamental article of Christian faith. Indeed, Bishop Ives maintains that a man may have living faith without justification, for he says, when speaking of Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, "Faith is the second thing enjoined by St. Peter, and in one sense, living faith, but not so living, as we shall see, as to be relied on ordinarily by the unbaptized for their justification." The faith here spoken of is living, in both cases; but not so living in one case as in the other. It differs, then, only in degree, not in nature. It is not a living faith in one case, and a dead faith in the other. We will venture to affirm that this whole statement about faith, is a mere figment of the imagination, for which there is not the least foundation in scripture. "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," is a sufficient refutation of it. The Bishop also maintains that repentance precedes justification, and he calls an unjustified sinner a "convert." Then it is possible, according to his theory, for one who believes in Christ, repents of his sins, and is converted to God, to be lost, his faith and repentance still remaining; for a long interval frequently intervenes between conversion and baptism. We say, his faith and repentance remaining, for so the context and whole drift of his argument compel us to understand him. Or if he goes to heaven, he certainly, on this theory, goes there an unjustified sinner. The Bishop seems to have made his theory to suit his fancy, without much regard to "the church," which he lauds as the "keeper and witness of the truth."

Those who are acquainted with the arguments of Alexander Campbell, or of the Oxford Tracts on the same subject, will find little new in Dr. Ives's book. The same texts are frequently relied on to prove baptismal regeneration by one class, which are quoted with equal confidence by another, to prove baptismal justification, and by a third party to prove both. Some of the texts which Dr. Ives and others use for this purpose, may be easily explained by a reference to a well known scriptural division of baptism into two kinds, by water and by the Holy Ghost; or by supposing the last clause of a verse to be exegetical of the first; a frequent occurrence in the scriptures. In other cases, baptism by water is added after faith or repentance, in order to inculcate an acknowledged duty, not with the view of teaching a fundamental article of religion, or that we are justified by it. In some cases, it is probable, baptism by water was

not in the mind of the speaker or writer at all : or the external rite may be made to include the thing signified ; that is, remission of sins. This question, however, can be settled in another way. Paul has twice discussed justification at large, in Romans and Galatians. What doctrine does he teach on the subject? In the first three chapters of Romans he proves that it is impossible to obtain justification by what is generally called the moral law ; and at the close of this argument, he distinctly draws the conclusion that men are justified by faith, without the deeds of the law. Then in the fourth chapter, he proves that circumcision cannot justify ; and he again draws his conclusion at the close of this argument, just as he had done before. Now this was the place to mention the instrumentality of baptism in justification if it existed. He denied it of a rite, and a most important one too. Does he deny it of all rites? That he does, is the natural conclusion, if Paul himself does not make the exception. The Jew considered circumcision to be most important, and when Paul, therefore, denied justification of the greater, he denied it of the less. But Bishop Ives himself, in his argument on infant baptism expressly admits that baptism takes the place of circumcision. When therefore Paul denies justification of one, he at the same time denies it of the other. Are we justified by faith as an internal, and by baptism as an external instrument? This is the question for the Apostle to answer in the eight chapters of Romans, devoted to the discussion of the procuring cause, the instrument, the nature and consequences of justification. And as he has only mentioned faith as the instrument, the conclusion is fair that he knew of no other. The same remarks may be made on Paul's defence of the gospel method of justification in Galatians. Circumcision is again introduced, and the same result is arrived at. It is passing strange that in both these cases, no reference should be made to baptism as the instrument of justification, and that indeed, it should be only once mentioned. In this case, the Apostle simply says : " As many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ." Here the context requires that we should understand the phrase " put on Christ" to mean the abolition of the distinction between the Jews and Gentiles, and the renunciation of the old legal system ; for he immediately adds, " There is neither Jew nor Greek ;" and the same idea is in the verse which precedes the one in which bap-

tism is found. "Ye are all the children of God," he says, "whether Jews or Greeks."*

Our readers will smile when told that, according to Bishop Ives, Martin Luther, whose maxim was that justification by the righteousness of Christ, was the article of a standing or falling church, taught his doctrine on this subject. He gravely maintains, that this also was the doctrine of Calvin, of Melancthon, of the Augsburg, Helvetic, and Westminster Confessions, and of the Synod of Dort. Because these authorities teach that salvation is not ordinarily obtained out of the visible church, why forsooth, they hold the monstrous doctrine of baptismal justification. In every case referred to, a positive denial of this doctrine can be found, and in some of them, arguments in favour of the protestant doctrine, which Bishop Ives will never be able to refute. Take two as a specimen of the rest. Calvin says, "Cornelius, who had received the remission of sins, and the visible gift of the spirit, was baptized, not that he might receive a larger remission from baptism, but a stronger exercise of faith." The Augsburg Confession says: "They (the authors) condemn that pharisaical opinion which overthrows the doctrine of faith, and does not teach such a faith in the use of sacraments, as believes that grace is given to us on account of Christ; but supposes that men are justified on account of the use of the sacraments, *ex opere operato*." Can Bishop Ives be so little acquainted with church history as not to know that the creeds of the reformers were mainly formed, in order that they might bear a public testimony to the doctrine of justification by the righteousness of Christ alone, and against the very doctrine which he is now attempting to propagate? Does he not know that this was the main pillar on which the reformation rested? Has he not read history enough to know that Calvin, and Luther, and Melancthon spent their lives in combatting the very errors he now ascribes to them? History will be of little value, if so plain a fact can be successfully called in question; and good men would live to little purpose, so far as posterity is concerned, if their acts

* There is something apparently disingenuous in the manner in which the Bishop quotes scripture. He puts down; "Be baptized for the remission of sins," as a proof text, leaving out entirely the belief which forms a part of the sentiment. "Believe and be baptized for the remission of sins," is very different from, "Be baptized for the remission of sins," as the Bishop has it.

and words, so often repeated, cannot shield them from such unjust imputations.

Bishop Ives makes confirmation a part of a sacrament in the following language. "Would the laying on of hands, if it were designed only as a temporary thing, be thus attached, so as to be made in some sense, a part of a permanent and most essential sacrament of the church?" Again, he makes it the seal of the Spirit. "Every humble Christian, therefore, would hardly fail, one would think, to seek, through the laying on of hands, this seal of God's Spirit, this earnest of an eternal inheritance." He holds the doctrine, that grace is conferred by confirmation, in a sense which no true Protestant would admit. He says: "The moment you come to years of understanding, you need the grace of laying on of hands." In his closing address on the subject, we find the following startling statement. "You have already received from the church all the spiritual nourishment which she is allowed to give you, till you ask for a new measure of grace in the laying on of hands. Should you delay, your souls will soon be in a languishing, starving condition." These, it must be confessed, are most extraordinary statements to proceed from the lips of a Protestant minister. The Liturgy of the Episcopal Church represents confirmation as intended to ratify and confirm the promises made by the sponsors of those baptized in infancy. The same appears in all that the persons confirmed promise to the bishop. In the prayer which follows, we find no mention of this extraordinary grace, without which "they would be in a languishing, starving condition." The bishop prays for the defence of those confirmed by heavenly grace, and for the daily increase of the Holy Spirit. And though we are far from approving the language of the Liturgy, yet the Bishop is not sustained by it, in the extravagant statements he makes as to the efficacy of confirmation. Let us now turn to the Romish Catechism. Here we find it stated; "That confirmation confers grace, that it brings men to the perfection of Christian firmness, and that that which is begun in baptism, is completed in confirmation." Of course, they are no longer in a starving, languishing condition. The Bishop then holds that confirmation confers grace; so do the Romanists. The Bishop calls confirmation a seal, and considers it a part of a sacrament; the Catholics call it a sacrament in full, and would probably agree with the Bishop in calling it a seal, though we have not been able

to find any statement to that effect, either in the canons of the Council of Trent, or in the Romish Catechism. In one respect, the Bishop seems to have left Rome itself in the back-ground. In answer to the question whether all Christians ought to be confirmed, the Romish Catechism says, "That although this rite is not essential to salvation, holy mother Church very much desires that all Christians should come to it that they may be made perfect." Nothing is said about the inability of the church, by prayer, preaching, or any other means, to do anything for the spiritual benefit of its children, unless they are confirmed. In his respect, the Bishop has expressed himself with less caution and moderation than the fathers of Trent, a virtue for which they were not remarkable.*

We will now attend to Dr. Ives's arguments in favour of this rite. Every case in which the laying on of hands is mentioned in the New Testament, as a rite accompanying the bestowment of extraordinary gifts, is claimed as proving confirmation. But that this laying on of hands conferred extraordinary gifts, is evident from the case of the Ephesian disciples. When Paul's hands were laid on them, it is added: The Holy Ghost come on them, and they spake with tongues and prophecied. It is evident that the last phrase is exegetical of the first; the gift of the Holy Ghost enabling them to speak with tongues, and to prophecy. These two phrases then, the descent of the Holy Ghost, and speaking with tongues and prophesying, mean the same thing. This will be still more evident when we recollect that the gift of the Holy Ghost, which fell on Cornelius and his company, is explained in the same way, for it is added, "and they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God." No laying on of the hands is mentioned in this case. The Spirit descended while Peter was preaching. When Ananias laid his hands on Paul, the restoration of his sight is mentioned, and the Holy Ghost with which he was to be filled; and yet, this occurred before the Apostle's

* Some of the old ecclesiastical writers, in describing confirmation, use the words *signo* and *consigno*. The latter may be translated *seal*, but it may also mean the ceremony of signing with the sign of the cross; and the whole ceremony was, from this circumstance, sometimes called *consignatio*. We find such phrases as this, for example: *Salutari signo vultum consignat*. Σφραγίζω, which may also mean to *seal*, in ecclesiastical greek very often means to sign with the sign of the cross. See Suicer, Bingham's Eccles. Antiq., article Confirmation.—*Eusebii Hist. Eccl. Lib. III. c. 2.*

baptism. According to Bishop Ives's theory, Ananias confirmed Paul, while he was an unjustified sinner, and Paul was filled with the Holy Ghost while in a state of condemnation. As to the Samaritan converts, it is not said that they spake with tongues, yet that is a very natural inference from the whole narration, especially from the conduct of Simon in offering to purchase the power possessed by the Apostles, of conferring the Holy Ghost. These are the only cases in which the laying on of hands is mentioned in the New Testament, in reference to private members of the church, unless the gift conferred by Paul on Timothy belongs to this category. It is not mentioned in the narrative of the conversions at Jerusalem, Antioch, or any other place. How the Bishop, then, can allow himself to say as he does, that the laying on of hands is always appended to baptism in the New Testament, when it is only twice mentioned in immediate connection with it, is to us astonishing; and in one of those cases it preceeds, and in the other, follows baptism. In the case of the Samaritan*converts, baptism was not appended to the laying on of hands.

In this case, as also in that of baptism, an appeal is made to the Fathers. We have reserved what we had to say on this subject, until we arrived at the present point in the discussion, because it is our object to be brief, and simply to give a fair specimen of the arguments and reasoning of this extraordinary performance. The Bishop says: "The practice of the first Christians after the Apostolic age, affords a safe, and we think, an unerring guide to ourselves in settling this matter." We were prepared for some such statement as this, for he had told us in his first sermon, that "Christ promulgated the leading principles of the gospel, in a manner so diffuse and abstract, as to render their meaning and force doubtful." Now, we have the Fathers set forth as an unerring guide. It is presumed that they were not diffuse and abstract, and that their meaning is never doubtful, else they would not be a safe and unerring guide. In another passage, he speaks of "our branch of the Catholic church adhering to scripture, as taught by the early Fathers." We certainly do not intend to enter at large into the inquiry, what authority is to be ascribed to the traditions of the Fathers? But the very same authorities whom the Bishop has quoted to prove confirmation, will prove the duty of administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to children, of using the sign of the cross and chrism

as a part of confirmation; and that infants ought to be confirmed. As to some of these points, the testimony is just as good as it is for the laying on of hands. Why admit these Fathers as unerring guides in one case, and reject them in another? This statement of the Bishop is essentially Romish. But who are these unerring guides? He refers to a fourth epistle of Clement of Rome, and to the Apostolic Constitutions, of which he seems to think Clement is the author. Nothing can be more certain than that Clement was not the author of any of the works thus ascribed to him. These works were probably written in the age when pious frauds were fashionable, and are, according to the opinion of the best judges, not older than the fourth century. Eusebius of the fourth century, whom Dr. Ives calls a saint, and whom he quotes as authority on the same subject, testifies expressly, that many works were circulated in his day, purporting to be Clement's; but that only one epistle, which is the first, is the production of that Father. Jerome, whom he also calls a saint, gives substantially the same testimony. We will not allow ourselves to doubt, that in the mouth of two witnesses, both of whom stand so high in the Bishop's estimation, every word will be established. His next authority in point of time is the work of Dionysius the Areopagite: another spurious book. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome say anything about the writings of this father; although the former gives a short account of him, and the latter wrote a catalogue of the ecclesiastical writers, who lived before the beginning of the fifth century. The general, if not universal opinion is, that the so called works of Dionysius the Areopagite were written in the fourth or fifth century, and that they are downright forgeries. The third witness is Tertullian. We may place this father at the beginning of the third century; he died A. D. 220. Will the reader accompany us while we examine this witness, as quoted by the author? We will turn to his work on baptism. He says, "After baptism comes the holy unction, according to the ancient discipline, priests were anointed, and Moses anointed Aaron. After that follows the imposition of hands, which also followed an ancient rite; for Jacob blessed his two grandsons, and he crossed his hands, by which he portended the blessings which were to come from the cross of Christ." Thus far Tertullian. The reader will perceive that so far as can be inferred from his statement, the same person baptizes,

anoints, and imposes hands. The same authority, that of Old Testament usage, is given for both the latter ceremonies, except that the authority for chrism seems to be the better of the two, as that was a command, and the other was not. No intimation is given that it was an Apostolic practice. Tertullian says expressly in the same passage, that we do not acquire the Holy Spirit by baptism, thus contradicting the Bishop's doctrine of baptismal regeneration. He also says, the Spirit was invoked when hands were imposed, in order to obtain a blessing. The next father on the Bishop's list is Cyprian; then we have Eusebius and Jerome, and others in the fourth and fifth centuries. Their testimony is not more valuable than Tertullian's. Thus we see that the Bishop's primitive church takes its commencement at the beginning of the third century, and ends with the fifth. If we have correctly stated the case in regard to the three fathers first mentioned, it will be admitted that they have not been safe and unerring guides to the Bishop of North Carolina; and we fear the Bishop would not prove a safe and unerring guide to others, in the study of the fathers. Dr. Ives speaks of the Church as witness and keeper of the truth. In his sense of the word church, we are well persuaded, if history is to be believed, she has not proved a faithful witness, nor a trustworthy keeper. In closing our remarks on this part of the book under review, we are constrained to say, that he who can speak as disparagingly as the Bishop does, of Christ's way of instruction, and then hold up the fathers as a safe guide, will not be found, if he is consistent, zealous for the reading of the scriptures by the common people; but as they cannot read the fathers, they must be committed to the instruction of the authorized clergy, who may give them legendary tales, and books which owe their origin to the doctrine of pious frauds, instead of the simple word of God, and the genuine fathers.

The last sermon in this volume is on Apostolic Succession. As there is nothing new or striking in his reasoning, it is scarcely necessary to make any remark on it. Episcopalians have now generally abandoned the argument from the usage of the word *ἐπίσκοπος*, in the New Testament. They admit that it is used interchangeably with *πρεσβυτερος*; and yet as soon as they find it in a Christian father, even in the first century, they seize it as an argument in their favour. According to their own principles,

the presumption, to say the least, is exactly the other way. The probability is that the fathers would adopt the usage of the New Testament writers, with which they were familiar. This meaning being once admitted, must be ascribed to the word, until a contrary meaning is made probable. Circumstances are mentioned by the fathers whom Bishop Ives quotes, which prove that the New Testament usage was still retained; such as that the Bishop must marry, baptize, and be intimately acquainted with all his flock. The question, what means the word *ἐπισκοπος* is debatable. It will answer no valuable purpose then, for the Bishop to assume the very point to be proved, and which settles the whole controversy; especially when his opponents have nothing to do but to retain the New Testament use of the word, to refute all his quotations at once.

But the most remarkable portion of the book is the appendix, in which we are furnished with a complete list of diocesan Bishops, from John the Apostle, to Bishop White of Pennsylvania. "This catalogue," he says, "has been taken from authentic records, and submitted to the test of the most searching criticism." And this is the only remark he makes about it. We should be pleased to know who made this searching criticism. If the Bishop is the author of it, we must be excused for saying, that this is not sufficient to satisfy us. He reckons without his host, when he supposes that his word alone will settle such a question as this. It is possible that legendary tales may be mistaken for veritable history, and the "pious" forgeries of superstitious monks, for "authentic records." This list comprises eighty-two Archbishops of Canterbury, and thirty Bishops of Lyons. It would seem then, that the author believes that the Bishops of Lyons, and the Archbishops of Canterbury always consecrated their successors; but this was never done in a single instance. Eight of the Archbishops received their consecration from Rome, and after the Norman conquest, the English hierarchy was changed. Lanfranc and Anselm were foreigners, who had foreign ordination and consecration, both Archbishops of Canterbury; yet the Bishop considers them as deriving their ordination from the Archbishops who preceded them. The rubrick of the Episcopal church requires the presence of more than one Bishop at a consecration; and Dr. Ives himself states that the Bishop of Arles assisted the Bishop of Lyons in the consecration of Augustine as Archbishop.

What does he mean then, by giving us one list only, when a canonical consecration requires more than one? He would indeed, have to give us scores of catalogues, for other lines of succession united with that of Augustine; even if we admit, as we certainly do not, that this line had not more than one of its links entirely broken. How is it proved that these ordinations in the period of the violent convulsions in the church, were canonically performed? When avarice and the lust of power pervaded the church, and created schisms, and promoted simoniacal practices every where, is the Bishop sure that his chain is connected in all its links? Does not Bishop Ives know that there was a struggle between prelacy and parity in Great Britain, from the time of the first establishment of Christianity, until the eleventh or twelfth century; and that complaints of the doubtful ordinations of some persons, were uttered by the prelatists during this period? Polycarp, the first in the catalogue, has not the word Bishop in his works at all, and exhorts the Philippians, of whose Bishops Paul speaks, to be subject to presbyters as their rulers. Irenaeus, the third on the roll, affirms that presbyters were the successors of the Apostles. The first three then, ought to be stricken out, as not being prelatists, and as to the rest, they have left no testimony whatever, for several centuries. This catalogue is then defective, in the Bishop's sense, in its commencement, and apostolic prelacy can never come from apostolic parity.

The Bishop farther maintains the monstrous paradox, that Calvin favoured Episcopacy, and sought to obtain it from England, for the church of Geneva. On this point he has been most ably refuted by Dr. Miller; but still he has the boldness to put forth the same disingenuous statements again, though in a form somewhat modified. It is hard to satisfy some people. After having been reviled for two hundred years for his influence in establishing parity, we are now gravely told that Calvin desired to see prelacy introduced into Geneva. In the very passages which are quoted by Bishop Ives, Calvin reasons against Episcopacy, and in favor of parity; and in one or two cases, the quotations given are arguments against the claims of diocesan Bishops. For example, Calvin's commentary on Titus, i. 5, is quoted as proof of the Bishop's position. The whole passage is an argument for parity. Calvin says, that Titus was moderator of the congregations that elected pas-

tors in Crete, and that there was not such an equality among the ministers of the church, but that some one might preside over the rest in authority, and council; that is, might be moderator; and in the latter part of the same sentence, he, in the most emphatic language, condemns the institution of clergymen by Bishops, which he calls profane and tyrannical. The exclusion of the less excludes the greater; if a Bishop has no right to institute a clergyman, he certainly has no right to ordain, in the Episcopal sense. The Bishop either did not read the passage in Calvin, or he did not understand it, or he wilfully perverted it.* In Calvin's work, *De necessitate reformandae Ecclesiae*, he reasons largely against the usurpations of Bishops, and in favour of parity; he speaks with contempt of Apostolic Succession; and yet, because when speaking of the Pope he says, "If such a hierarchy is given us as shall be distinguished for submission to Christ, he will anathematize those who will not submit to it," we are told that Calvin favoured Episcopacy. The meaning simply is, that he would receive all who submitted to Christ, as true Christians. We see some charity and moderation in this, but no conviction expressed, that Bishops alone have the right, by the laws of Christ, to ordain.

To prove that Calvin desired to obtain Episcopacy for the church of Geneva, a letter to Edward VI. is referred to, which, the account states, fell into the hands of two Catholic Bishops, and, it seems, never was seen by king Edward, for these Bishops answered it. Now there is but one person who is witness to this, and he lived long after Calvin, and does not affirm that he saw Calvin's letter. It is wonderful that he, who maintains that every separate fact in accusation must be proved by at least two witnesses, should not even give us one in this case. The Bishop's estimate of evidence seems to change entirely, when John Calvin is the subject of a slanderous report, and when a Bishop of his own church is tried.

Our readers will be amused when told, that Dr. Ives se-

* We might adjourn all discussion with Bishop Ives, until he learns how to translate latin better. He translates "*Episcopatus ipse a Deo profectus est*" thus, "He who is made Bishop proceeds from God himself." This is too bad. He cannot plead that this sentence is equivalent to "The Episcopate itself came from God," which is the correct translation; for Calvin wishes to teach that the law creating bishops, or pastors, (for he uses these names as equivalent) was made by God, and was not a human device. There is scarcely a correct translation in the book.

riously informs us, that when the Apostles preached to the people, as recorded in Acts, no prayers were used, and that the reason was, that there were no persons to make the necessary responses. Equally wonderful is it, that the Bishop should maintain, that saving faith partook largely of a miraculous character, in the Apostolic age. These and other absurdities we must pass over at present. Our aim has been to make our remarks as short as was consistent with a fair and correct understanding of the subject.

Thus have we endeavoured to present our readers with some specimens of the opinions and reasonings of one of the most thoroughly Puseyite productions, which has appeared in our country. Bishop Ives has evidently adopted fully, the spirit and the opinions of the Oxford tracts. His views of religion are radically different from those held by Protestants generally. He can be no longer regarded as standing on the Protestant platform, as to his doctrines. If the book we have reviewed, had been written by any other than one conspicuous for his station and influence in the church, we should have passed it by in silence. We have been surprised at the feebleness with which many of the positions assumed, have been defended; and at the many incautious and absurd expressions and statements the book contains.

Wm. B. Dox.

ART. II.—*Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation.*
New York: Wiley and Putnam. pp. 291, 12mo.

WE have in this work the result of the most elaborate attempt, which has been made in recent times, to establish a mechanical theory of the universe. The author, "working in solitude, and almost without the cognizance of a single human being," has presented us with the fruit of his labours in a compacted theory, for the support of which he has drawn, more or less, from almost every department of human knowledge. Astronomy, geology, chemistry, natural history, ethnography, physical and metaphysical science, are all laid under contribution for the establishment of his theory. His work gives proof of an extensive acquaintance with modern science, and of singular ability to connect together facts in real or seeming support of the su-